

**PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 10, 2013
6:00 P.M.**

**Wilsonville City Hall
29799 SW Town Center Loop East
Wilsonville, Oregon**

**Approved
May 8, 2013**

Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

Chair Altman called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m. Those present:

Planning Commission: Ben Altman, Eric Postma, Ray Phelps, Marta McGuire, Peter Hurley, Phyllis Millan, and City Councilor Julie Fitzgerald. Al Levit arrived shortly after Roll Call.

City Staff: Chris Neamtzu, Barbara Jacobson, and Katie Mangle

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

III. CITIZEN'S INPUT - This is an opportunity for visitors to address the Planning Commission on items not on the agenda.

Kit Donnelly, a City resident, said he rents from an owner of a house on Frog Pond Lane. The owner received a letter regarding a proposed urban growth study and Mr. Donnelly was curious whether that study would be part of this evening's discussion.

Ms. Mangle responded that the Frog Pond planning would not be discussed directly; tonight's agenda items involved more of a citywide discussion. She offered to meet with Mr. Donnelly and provide him and/or the property owner with more information.

Commissioner Levit arrived at this time.

IV. CITY COUNCIL LIAISON REPORT

A. City Council Update

Councilor Fitzgerald reported that at its last meeting, City Council.

- Continued working on the next steps for the Tax Increment Financing (TIF) Enterprise Zone concept that was passed. Several more weeks were required to work through it, but more news would be available as the next steps were completed.
- Held a first hearing on an ordinance regarding transient camps and how to deal with the situation of people camping on City property. Another hearing would take place at the next Council meeting as the ordinance needed to be refined a bit to be in compliance with state law.
- Discussed the progress on the Oregon Passenger Rail, which heavily involves ODOT. Information would be put in the Boones Ferry Messenger so people could start paying more attention to the planning.

- She confirmed the project would run a passenger rail from Portland to Eugene. She had attended one of several open houses that were held in different communities where different routes were considered and public input received. If plans progressed as far as funding, the rail could be a reality. Three options were being considered. Some options involved existing track as well as old right-of-ways, but every option involved some new track. The Commission was encouraged to view the ODOT website.
- Considered the water rate study the City would be undertaking to review how citizens are charged for water. The study was currently in the planning stages.

Councilor Fitzgerald noted she had been assigned as the City Council liaison for the Tourism Task Force which would begin in the next couple of months.

Commissioner Levit noted that one of the options discussed with the Tonquin Trail layout was to use existing non-used track space on the rail line, but ODOT wanted to reserve that portion for future use. He did not know if that was in anticipation of the Oregon Passenger Rail or more freight rail.

Chris Neamtzu confirmed that Staff would schedule a speaker or presentation about the passenger rail line so the Commission could become more aware of what was taking place.

V. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES

The March 13, 2013 Planning Commission minutes were unanimously approved as presented.

VI. WORK SESSIONS

A. Goal 10 Housing Needs Analysis (ECONorthwest)

Katie Mangle, Long Range Planning Manager, introduced Beth Goodman and Bob Parker of ECONorthwest who were hired by the City to complete a substantial amount of work on the Goal 10 project. City Staff were working on two tasks: the GIS analysis to develop the Buildable Lands Inventory, and the policy analysis to evaluate the Development Code's compliance with state laws.

- The Goal 10 analysis determines the amount of land available and the housing capacity that could be accommodated on that land given the City's existing policies. The analysis then helps determine the City's housing strategy for the next 20 years, which would inform infill development as well as future expansionaries, potentially in Frog Pond and Advance Road.
- The Goal 10 project would be coming before the Planning Commission most every month to allow time for follow-up, questions and feedback. The Planning Commission was acting somewhat as a steering committee for the project to work with City Council to assess the City's strategy and any policy implications.
- She confirmed that the Goal 10 analysis was being done as one of the last two tasks required as part of a scheduled periodic review mandated by the state. The City was also doing the analysis to obtain information and better understand what the City should consider building in areas like Frog Pond.
- Advance Road would not be part of the Goal 10 analysis. The study area was the area included in the Comprehensive Plan: the land area within the city limits, as well as Frog Pond and some parts of Villebois not in the city limits. Frog Pond was within the urban growth boundary (UGB); however, Advance Road was not, so it was not part of the study, although it was important to be thinking about. The Goal 10 analysis was a tool to help identify any need for more land for future housing.

Bob Parker and Beth Goodman of ECONorthwest presented the Wilsonville Housing Needs Analysis via PowerPoint, which was also distributed to the Commission. Key comments and responses to Commissioner questions were as follows:

- The preliminary data presented was intended to provide a high level overview of demographic data, such as who lives in the community, the characteristics of those individuals and households, as well as a first glance at housing market trends and data regarding housing affordability. Factors that affect housing needs over the long-term was also included, and three variables, specifically, tend to have a much stronger influence on the housing choices or needs in the community: income, age and household composition. At present, more work on the data was required.
- The forecast numbers were shown in households, instead of people, because that was how Metro did it. The population change from 1990 to 2012 was shown in people versus households. Information was available regarding household change, as well as housing unit change. Considering average annual growth rates was a good way to compare different types of data.
- The average household in the U.S. has between 2.3 to 2.6 persons per household. Metro's projection for Wilsonville was 2,661 new households. This seemed to be very conservative.
 - Ms. Mangle explained that when considering which forecast to adopt, Metro considered a conservative low growth rate and a higher growth rate and adopted something more in the middle. She believed the forecast was intended to be somewhat conservative, and noted that the 2035 figures definitely included Frog Pond and most likely Advance Road; however, Wilsonville did not many new urban reserves to grow into after 2035. Clackamas and Washington Counties would have other urban reserves where growth could continue to occur within that time frame. The geographic capacity within the 2015-2035 timeframe was a consideration.
 - Ms. Mangle noted the Buildable Lands Inventory table on Page 5 of 12 of the Staff report showed the gross acres available in various land use zones within the city.
- A shift in the age of Wilsonville's population has occurred over time. Wilsonville currently has a higher percentage of people between 20 and 39 years old than Washington and Clackamas Counties, and fewer older working people between 50 and 69 years old.
- Wilsonville had a smaller share of households with children compared to other counties in the Portland region, and a slightly larger share of nonfamily households. Given the median age, such households may have children soon which may have implications on the school systems. Wilsonville had a relatively small share comparatively, especially to Clackamas County, of family households with no children which often indicates slightly older households.
- Housing categories are based on state and Metro rules and generally regard the type of land needed for certain dwelling units. Higher density, attached housing of five or more units were called apartments that could be owner or renter occupied units. Condominiums in a structure with five or more units that were owner occupied were included in this category.
- The economy might have played a role in the renter versus owner occupancy rates due to the number of people who lost their homes. Ms. Goodman noted that had been looked at in the historical data and if that were the case, it would be called out. She did not believe the numbers would change more than a few percent.
- Community service deliverables, like social services, for the higher mix of renter versus resident is usually discussed as part of government subsidized housing, but not in great detail. Schools were not discussed extensively in the current data.
- The four percent difference shown on Pages 11 and 12 for owner-occupied homes could be due to condominiums, as well as some single-family, detached homes and one to four attached units, being renter occupied.
- The analysis used two different sources of data: the 2010 Decennial Census, which asked every household a few questions, and the most recent data aggregated over a five-year period from the American Community Survey (ACS), which replaced the long form surveys used in 2000. ACS data is available on an annual basis for cities with populations of 65,000 or more. Data for a city the size of Wilsonville is aggregated over a five-year period. Data would also be available from 2005 to 2009, but 2000 data was also available. Many data comparison tables in the report indicated figures back in 2000 as well as the current data.

- Such data would offer insight into what the economy was doing relative to the rental mix. The numbers were not a big surprise; although, rentals in the single-family category were expected to be higher. Mr. Parker stated that while the data was more imprecise than desired, Wilsonville still looked considerably different compared to the other broader jurisdictions that use the same data sources. Wilsonville has some very significant differences in housing stock, the characteristics of people and how they chose housing in the Wilsonville community compared to the counties in the Metro region.
- The additional supply resulting from the amount of construction in Wilsonville over the last year to 18 months could be cross referenced as well. Building permit data through 2012 would be available, as well as regional reports that discuss multi-family housing construction in the Metro area in general dating back a few years. The reports pulled out Wilsonville and Canby together, offering a picture of events that took place in Wilsonville relative to other areas. Housing value data and price data would be acquired from other sources.
- Median owner housing value to median household income ratio was 4.3, meaning the housing value was 4.3 times the average income. Median owner value was an owner-reported estimate from [the ACS regarding](#) the value of a home and not an assessed value. The consultants would also be looking at sale price data. Considering people on average make the same mistakes in many places, this provided a fairly simple ratio with which to perform a comparison. Taking data from a single year, rather than a five-year period, would provide a different result. Essentially, median owner value had decreased since 2007, housing has become less affordable in Wilsonville.
 - When comparing 2000 and 2010, Wilsonville had a higher housing value to income ratio than either Washington County or Clackamas County, which could be related to the rental factor. The Housing and Urban Development (HUD) standard for the housing value to income ratio is about 3; a house should be worth about three times the household income, which is HUD's standard for what is affordable.
 - The income numbers were not adjusted for inflation, they were nominal. The housing value was not adjusted for inflation either. The housing value was a 2000 value and the 2007 to 2011 period was a 2011 value.
 - The 63 percent growth in median owner value from 2007 to 2011 was quite surprising. Indications were that housing values had decreased 20 to 25 percent, though they were already inflated.
 - The 63 percent value was the comparison between 2000 and the five-year 2007 to 2011 estimates. Using a one-year value would be more obvious. The statistics represented a portion of the high point of the bubble and reflected all housing stock in the community, at least all the single-family, owner occupied units.
 - A deflation would be seen in some of the data that was pulled. Ms. Goodman predicted the housing value in Wilsonville had not consistently gone below the sales value since the early 2000s, which was the case in most of the communities the consultants have studied.
- When making comparisons to a county, the entire county, both the urban and rural areas, were included unless otherwise stated. The consultants were trying to pull and compare key data points, such as comparing Wilsonville to urban areas in Metro. Wilsonville was included in the data for Clackamas and Washington Counties.
- The HUD number for affordability, a ratio of 3, implied that home value in Wilsonville was based on appreciation or outright ownership rather than cost burden. The housing value to income ratio of 6.7 was a huge difference from the cost burden figure of 30%. While related, the figures were not directly related; it was a complicated relationship.
 - Ms. Goodman believed HUD measured the same thing but in a very different way. According to HUD, spending 30 percent or less of one's income, or three times the household income, on housing is considered affordable. While it was the same figure, she did not believe she would draw the same conclusions about change in affordability and income.

- Mr. Parker noted one of the interesting anomalies in the data was the very high percentage of renter occupied units relative to the region as well as relatively high single-family housing values, and yet, the cost burden was right in the middle compared to the rest of the region. The data had not been studied deeply enough to determine what had occurred to explain that, but he cautioned the Commission about interpreting the data at this point. A number of things that occurred in the housing market over the past five years required further digging and would be significant in terms of interpreting the information.
- It seemed that since 2007, the majority of the housing on the market in Wilsonville was new. People were not selling their homes, which seemed to relate to the high housing costs.
 - One would expect to see a higher cost burden at the height of the housing bubble over the five-year period, unless something was happening with incomes, which was not available in the data being studied. As prices adjusted, the cost burden would have gone down, but that was hard to determine because the current data was a rolling average over the five-year period.
 - With the housing sales data, one would expect to see many more sales at the height of the market and sales for different amounts than those in 2010, 2011 and 2012. Some peaks, a trough and perhaps the beginnings of sale increases were expected to be seen in the sales data.
- Slide 20 appeared to set out a societal issue with regard to nearly a 50/50 burden/unburden on renter versus a two-thirds/one-third burden on owner, which was a very different community.
 - This pattern was seen in many Oregon communities and was not unusual. Considering how the variables relate, renter households on average were younger with a lower income and one would expect to see higher incidences of cost burden among those households than among owner-occupied housing units. While the numbers varied slightly, they were always 15 to 20 percentage points higher for renters in every community studied. While not unusual, it was not necessarily good. The fact that this pattern was seen in the Portland region, and in Clackamas and Washington Counties implied it was a function of the characteristics of the two different types of households, renter and owner-occupied housing.
- Ms. Goodman was uncertain where Oregon stood nationally as far as affordable housing based on the ratio of median housing cost to income. Oregon's income was about 90 percent per capita income and about 90 percent in [Inaudible].
 - A lot of variation exists within metropolitan areas. Studies completed for HUD six or seven years ago showed places like Boston coming out much higher than Portland, as might have been anticipated, but other metropolitan regions were also found to be more affordable. That, however, changed significantly over the last six year period as the housing cycle boomed and busted.
- The effect of Wilsonville's assisted living facilities on the data was discussed. Such care facilities were normally counted in group housing, a separate category, and not in the 48 or 52 percent. Prisoners were also in a separate group. Both groups were accounted for in the city's population figures.
- The percentage of one-person households was very high and there were a lot more older one person households. Thinking back to data with age and tenure and owner/renter income, it all began to tie together in ways that made sense. Single-person households tend to have a lower household income as a result of one earner. It was an interesting phenomenon to pay attention to when thinking about the housing demand in the Wilsonville market over the coming years.
 - Homeowners age 75 and older generally have their homes paid for and as a result, could live much less expensively in that home. Downsizing often results in getting much less for a much higher cost. Older people could live in a larger home less expensively than a smaller apartment in the current market, which might be part of the phenomenon found with one or two person homes in that percentage. This was reflected in the Household Size by Tenure by Age, where some change was seen, certainly a lot more one-person, renter-occupied households exist for those age 75 years or older.

- The Portland area data on Household Size by Tenure by Age graph was more of an average and included three counties. It was important to remember that the data for Wilsonville was predetermined by the housing that currently exists.
 - When looking at housing need, what was happening in the larger region and locally is considered as well as how the larger region and local areas would influence one another as far as future need.
- At present, the analysis included the most current information available for Villebois. The data from permitting would also include the Jory Trail development.
- Villebois seemed to dramatically change the demographic of the community due to building new housing in one particular place which caused a major influx of a younger population.
 - City Staff had shared that Villebois had built out a larger portion of multi-family and would now build out more single-family. Looking at single-family demand across the Portland region, if houses were built in Villebois someone would probably purchase and live in them. This would balance things out in terms of the wilder shifts, such as building more multi-family housing in some periods versus less in other periods. This phenomenon had been seen in most cities where a lot of multi-family housing comes on and takes a while to be absorbed. Whereas, single-family housing tends to come on in bits and pieces and is absorbed more quickly. Not a lot of single-family housing comes on line at once, at least not in the way multi-family housing does.
 - Additionally, planning in Wilsonville was done differently than most communities. Villebois was a master planned community, which definitely had an impact on how the City planned for and thought about its housing need.
- Policy could certainly affect the community's demographics, and the data began to paint an interesting picture that clearly demonstrated how Wilsonville differs from other places in the Metro region with its younger population; more non-family households (unrelated individuals living together); the highest percentage of renters in the region; a more diverse housing stock due to having more multi-family units than other jurisdictions; and a high percentage of renters in apartment buildings with five or more units. However, Wilsonville's cost burden looked about the same, which raised some interesting causation questions that have not yet been sorted out. That work would begin in the next step.
 - Housing demand differed from housing need. Housing demand was manifested by what the market built in many respects. In a completely unrestricted market, it would be a function of what people could afford and what they wanted, though not everyone could afford what they wanted. A market like Wilsonville was different in that master planned communities provided for predetermined ratios. One might question to what extent planned communities influenced what occurred in the Wilsonville market. What complicated the situation was the fact that housing was a substitutable product in the sense that people could substitute housing types, as well as housing in cross communities. Again, raising really important questions about what had occurred in the Wilsonville market. Some questions regarded housing price and whether price affected the types of households moving to Wilsonville. Commuting, mobility and the employment base in the community could be other factors. What was contributing to the fact that so many young households were moving to the community? These were the kinds of questions the consultants would be digging into in more detail in the next round.
 - Over the past five or six years, the market seemed fairly restricted, other than rental units, because residents were not selling their homes. This played out in ways that were knowable in many markets. In the shakeout of the housing crash, there was a huge slowdown in the development of single-family residences. In addition, many jurisdictions saw a slowdown in the formation of households. At some point that bubble had to crack; people started breaking off and forming households. The market response to that was to begin to build more multi-family units in many markets.
 - While not necessarily the case in Wilsonville, the housing supply in many places was overly skewed towards single-family housing units that were not affordable to many

households, even at typical rates much less the inflated rates that were seen. That was beginning to change and more single-family households were emerging in many Oregon markets. As the market recovered, more single-family units would come online and it would gradually get back to whatever the new normal is.

- The housing analysis regarded a 20-year period; keep in mind when planning that the next 20 years might not be like the previous five or even 20 years.
- With regard to housing need, Goal 10 states the responsibility of a local municipality was to plan for housing types that are affordable to everybody in the community. When a lot of people moved into a community, most growth came from outside and it was hard to know exactly what was affordable.
 - In Wilsonville and the Metro area in general, the data suggested that the market was having a difficult time providing affordable units to a very substantial percentage of households. This was simply because the cost of building exceeded the ability to bring in prices that were below 30% of many household incomes, and it would continue to be that way. That was the construct in which the State was thinking about Goal 10.
 - From a planning perspective, Goal 10 involved land use and the Buildable Land Inventory. The Commission's obligation was to plan for the type of housing through the City's land base and zoning system that would best meet the kind of household forecasted to move into the area in the future. Ultimately, the study would lead to making a determination of whether the City had enough land and the right amount of land for the types of households with housing needs in the community now and into the future.
- The 2012 permit data would be added, which included Jory Trail and hundreds of new multi-family units. The permits would be considered over a certain period of time, such as 2000 to 2012. The mix and density of the permits would also be studied.
 - While there was no perfect correlation between housing type and tenure, in Wilsonville that correlation was starker than in many other communities.
- This was the demographic part of the study. Housing supply and land supply, which Ms. Mangle would discuss, were also part of the study. The housing supply research had not yet been done to determine what existing inventory was available, its condition, nature, cost, etc.

Ms. Mangle presented the Staff report on Wilsonville's Residential Buildable Lands Inventory, land that is or could likely be available for residential development in Wilsonville. The inventory includes the area within the city limits and Frog Pond, but not the Advance Road area. She also described the steps taken to create several working maps that were included in the meeting packet.

Key comments and responses to questions from the Commission regarding Wilsonville's Residential Buildable Lands Inventory were as follows:

- The 99.8 acres of residentially planned land shown in the top seven lines were not in Frog Pond.
- The 1,613 acres shown the last column was the total acreage citywide of residential land in the Comprehensive Plan. The entire row was residential land.
- Land zoned or planned for residential use was included, as well as that in the commercial zone. At this point, the amount of mixed use to be assumed was not currently defined, but the zone allowed for a lot of mixed use, especially in Town Center. No industrial or public land was included. Even though some residential could be built in industrial, it was so unlikely Staff decided to exclude it.
- The improvement value was the value of the buildings that currently exist on the site according to the tax assessor. It could be the building, garage or a combination of all those.
- Working Map 2. Though some Significant Resource Overlay Zone (SROZ) land could potentially be developed, it was unlikely and not encouraged. Transfers allowed by the Development Code would be factored in at a later time.
- Working Map 3. Based on information Staff had available, all lots in Charbonneau, including the driving range, were treated the same as the homeowners association parcels and were removed as

being redevelopable. A handful of sites were excluded including isolated commercial sites near the Elligsen Rd interchange, but sites near Town Center were included. Some sites were added to map, such as the mobile home property for sale in Old Town by the river.

Comments and responses to questions from the Commission regarding Wilsonville's Residential Buildable Lands Inventory were as follows:

- Working Map 4. The Fox Chase rowhomes received land use approval for the property on Willamette Way East across from the school, but the building permits were not yet in. The land use permit was valid for years and the application could take several years to come in, so that site was not included yet.
- The area with the barn and mobile home by the Holland property was the last remaining unpermitted for development portion of Brenchley Estates.
- The field south of Mentor Graphics is owned by Mentor Graphics. The north portion was zoned industrial and meant for future Mentor Graphics building growth or whatever they should plan, but the south portion is zoned and intended for residential.
- While it seemed logical that the section north of Frog Pond to Elligsen Rd would be an extension for residential land, the area has been designated urban reserves and would be developed in the next 50 years, similar to Advance Road.
 - Much of the delay had to do with the ease of providing infrastructure services, which was harder in that section than in the Advance Road area. Following the 20-Year Look, the City told Metro the priority was to develop Frog Pond, Advance Road and then Elligsen Rd.
Property on the east side of Wilsonville Rd in the Advance Road area was in the urban reserves.
- The Buildable Lands Inventory draft was also sent to Metro and the State for review.
- Table on Page 5 showed the densities assigned to most of the areas by either the Villebois Village Plan or the Comprehensive Plan. ECONorthwest would review the table to assess how many units the land in the draft inventory could supply over the next 20 years and provide a baseline for what was already inside the city limits and Frog Pond. Assumptions would have to be made about Frog Pond because no densities or housing types have been applied there yet.
- The number of residential acres needed with and without Frog Pond could be provided, but not for Advance Road. If Villebois and Frog Pond build out faster than anticipated, there would be a stronger argument for the City bringing in more residential land at Advance Road when the Urban Growth Report is released in the next round of UGB expansion discussions take place.
 - The idea behind the 20-Year Look conducted approximately five years ago was to be ready for the next round of urban growth expansions. The 20-Year Look also favored the City with regard to the urban rural reserve process.
- The process and timing of this Goal 10 analysis project would move quickly because Staff wanted to start concept planning for Frog Pond in the fall. The objective was to do concept planning for Frog Pond and Advance Rd simultaneously to be ready for the timing of the next UGB decision.
 - The grant proposal for concept planning Frog Pond and Advance Road at the same time was due next week. The idea was to do a two-phase project. One phase was a concept plan for Frog Pond and Advance Road at the level of detail required to meet all of Metro requirements for the entire area, which would take about a year. The second phase would immediately follow with a master plan for only Frog Pond at a higher level of detail in order to prepare it for private investment to take over and start permitting, etc. The idea was to have private investors involved the whole time to get Frog Pond ready for investment when the market was ready. Whether the entire two-phases would be funded was uncertain.
 - The next expansion starts in 2014 and the concept planning must be done in order to be considered. If Wilsonville receives the grant, the concept planning could be done in 2014, depending on the startup process. Intergovernmental agreement (IGA) negotiations can take a lot of time, which could affect the timing.

- Concern was expressed about prioritizing Advance Road for the school district and creating a sense of urgency to make sure Advance Road was included in the next UGB expansion.
 - The school district, with the City's full support, applied for a UGB expansion for the 40-acre school district site. Non-residential development, such as schools and parks, are allowed to apply as a special case once per year. The application was not yet complete, so whether a hearing would be held this summer was uncertain. The school district was pursuing the UGB expansion independently of the larger process partly because of concerns similar to the Commission about coordinating everything, especially when a second middle school was already needed in Wilsonville for which their application made an impressive case. To support the district, Ms. Mangle encouraged the Commissioners to participate at the hearing, which would be held in Wilsonville, and bring pictures of Wood Middle School. She would let the Commission know when the hearing date was set.
- According to the regulations, Wilsonville was supposed to be aiming for eight or more dwelling units per building per acre only in the new areas. The next step of the process would involve the math using the current inventory to begin approximating the number of dwelling units would begin in July. Staff was currently getting information together to start having that discussion. Eight units per acre would inform the assumptions for Frog Pond, but the existing adopted policy would inform the rest of those calculations.
 - Last year, Metro had required eight units per acre but the City was allowed to revisit densities elsewhere and move things around as long as the eight units per acre average was met citywide. The current plan was designed to have highest density in the center around commercial use, but the Metro process currently required urban expansion areas to have higher densities than the City originally had, possibly resulting in all of the density on the edge where the City did not intend.
 - While Metro allowed flexibility on the density, for the area inside the UGB, Ms. Mangle did not believe that would be true for Advance Road planning. Such policy implications would be discussed in late summer or early fall.
- Staff was still refining the draft inventory and the Commissioners were encouraged to contact Ms. Mangle with any other comments or feedback.
- Promotion of the Goal 10 Analysis included an article that had been in the Boones Ferry Messenger in January and a project website was created where material presented to the Commission would be added. Once there was more of a whole picture, the Planning Department would do press releases to share interesting information about the project and use The Spokesman and Boones Ferry Messenger to tell the public about the project. A widely advertised public meeting would also be held once discussions of policy implications started in order to encourage the public to provide input. Staff would also conduct interviews with developers and others soon.

Ms. Mangle reviewed the timeline of upcoming meetings on the Goal 10 Analysis, which included a joint work session with City Council on July 15, 2013 to review and discuss an executive summary. At the next Planning Commission work session in June, the Housing Needs Analysis and more findings from ECONorthwest would be discussed.

B. TSP Code Amendments (Mangle)

Katie Mangle, Long Range Planning Manager, noted the TSP Code hearing would be held next month. A notice had been sent out to every property in the city, which would advertise the whole package of the TSP project -- the plan itself, as well as the related Comprehensive Plan and Development Code amendments. Although some Commissioner's seemed to oppose adopting all the amendments at the same time, the hearings would be opened on the same date in May and the Development Code amendments could be continued, if necessary. She reviewed the major changes made to the TSP Code since the Commission's March meeting.

Commissioner comments and questions regarding the proposed TSP amendments were as follows:

- The definitions for bikeway and bike lane conflicted in Section 4.001(4) on Page 6 of 64; the language should include bike lanes and shared roads, at present it was too limiting. Most people who ride bikes around the city would prefer a separated path.
- Section 4.125(.09). City Attorney Mike Kohlhoff has pointed out that the amendments were using the new TSP intersection spacing standards in the wrong context. [The section addresses intersection spacing, whereas the TSP addresses spacing of the different types of streets.](#) The existing standards, which are based on the urban design plan for Villebois, would remain and would only be updated to make sure the new street names or types of streets names were being used.
 - Section 4.125(.09)(2)(c)(iii) on Page 8 of 64 had an extra zero. Ms. Mangle would verify that the change made to 2.c.iv was correct.
 - This section involves offset intersections, not intersection spacing. If two intersections do not align, they must be 50 ft apart. When intersections are offset, the measurement is made center line to center line.
- Section 4.154(.01)(B) had no direct reference about providing access from the sidewalk to the corner of a corner lot, which was a failure for pedestrian access in the city.
- In Section 4.155(.03)(C) on Page 10 of 64, the noted ODOT standards essentially implemented the design of ADA spaces, which is addressed through the Building Code. The ODOT standards were linked to ADA.

Section 4.155(.03)(B)(3) discussed new development with parking areas of more than 200 spaces, but Section 4.154(.01)(B)(d) on Page 9 of 64, which discussed internal bike and pedestrian pathways, was changed from 200 parking spaces to 3 acres.

 - The standard in (2)(d) was changed because the Metro standard was 3 acres, which was a higher threshold. There are approximately 100 to 150 parking spaces in an acre. Ms. Mangle agreed it was a good question.
- Section 4.154(.01)(B)(5) on Page 9 of 64 stated the pathway width should be no less than 5 ft, which was not consistent with Section 4.155(.03)(B)(3)(c) on the next page which required a minimum width of at least 6 ft.
 - Requirements regarding wheel stops for head in parking were part of the parking standards, but that section was not included in the Staff report.
- Section 4.155(.03)(D) on Page 10 of 64 regarding connecting parking areas on adjacent sites should also be comparable for pedestrian access. If two properties are going to be linked with a driveway, there should be a way for people to walk through as well. While not being excluding, such language often needs to be included so that it actually happens.
- Section 4.155(.03)(F) on Page 11 of 64 about on-street parking being counted seemed too undefined. A qualifier, such as 100 ft, was needed so spaces too far down the street could not be counted. New Section 4.155(.03)(I) which included language regarding motorcycle parking was distributed.
- In Section 4.155(.04)(B)(2)(d) on Page 12 of 64, the 2-ft wide bike parking space would be measured like a bubble around each parked bike. A manufacturer may state a bike rack holds nine bikes, but with the 2-ft Code requirement, only one bike in every other slot may be allowed, which would require more bike parking to be provided.
 - Commissioner Levit noted that bike racks should also be oriented properly, though he was uncertain how to capture that in the Code.
- In response to a question about berths, Planning Staff confirmed that berths, as noted in Section 4.155(.05) on Page 14, have always been interpreted not only to mean loading docks, but also parking spaces. Staff had not recalled this ever being an issue.

With regard to Section 4.177(.02)(D) on Page 16 and 17, a central landscaped island with rainwater management made more sense in the curb line and not in middle of a dead end street because it could interfere with turning maneuvers.

 - Small children at play in the cul-de-sac could also be put in a more dangerous situation due to a narrow area, although traffic would move slower.

- Having a central island could drive an increase in land area consumed. If a feature was not functional, it should not be encouraged. Experience had shown that encouraging a feature typically meant it was expected, especially before the DRB.
- The green street element seemed out of context with what was being communicated in the section and should be included elsewhere, not just at the end of a cul-de-sac.
 - This language was already included in the current Code. The use of cul-de-sacs and dead end streets was briefly discussed.
- In Section 4.177(.01), the fourth line of the new text should be corrected to state, "shall **be** provided".
- Attachment B was the commentary of the Code amendments for readers to get an idea of the changes being made. It would continue to be updated.

Ms. Mangle asked the Commission to email her with any further comments or suggestions. She explained the TSP Code amendments would be seen in two forms at the hearings, which would take place separately but on the same night. The Code amendments would be presented in a table as an attachment to the TSP package and also as a ready-for-adoption version of the Development Code text with its own ordinance. The part in Appendix B would continue on with the TSP if the hearing on the Code amendments was continued, or it could wait until the TSP was adopted. The Commission could have the hearing and act on the main ordinance simultaneously at the next meeting because there would be two hearings on two ordinances next month, either of which they could act on or continue.

The procedure for the upcoming hearing was reviewed.

Ms. Mangle next presented the Comprehensive Plan Amendments, noting the first page and a half were amendments to the narrative in the transportation section of the Comprehensive Plan. Those amendments updated the narrative with projects and to generally agree with the TSP. Only minimum changes were made to bring the narrative up to date.

- Beginning on Page 31 of 64, the policies and implementation measures from various documents, including the Comprehensive Plan, Bike Plan, Transit Plan and the old TSP, were edited to coordinate with the TSP. The goal was to still follow the format and approach used throughout the Comprehensive Plan, while still making sure the important ideas were included. Whatever was adopted or brought forward for adoption in the Comprehensive Plan would reflect the best state of the amendments to the TSP as well. Staff was still working to make this happen.
- A typo was corrected on the second line of Page 30, (20013)
- Generally, the policies and implementation measures were organized under the goals stated in the Comprehensive Plan, which was different from how they were organized in the TSP.

Commissioner comments and questions regarding the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments were addressed as follows:

- The Comprehensive Plan Amendments would be adopted at the same time as the TSP. The Comprehensive Plan amendments and TSP could be adopted in one resolution recommending that the Council adopt the ordinance to codify the changes.
 - The differences seen between the Wilsonville Transportation Policies beginning on Page 39 of 60 was intentional because the Comprehensive Plan was one of four sources used for the TSP update. Also some Comprehensive Plan policies that were not included in the TSP were not intended to be removed from the Comprehensive Plan.
 - Strong themes surfaced during Planning Commission discussion about the policies, such as not pitting modes against each other, and some Comprehensive Plan policies could be massaged to ensure they were consistent with the TSP without changing the underlying Comprehensive Plan policy.
- New policies added in the TSP would not all necessarily be added into the Comprehensive Plan. Staff's approach was to make the documents as consistent as possible, but to have a light

footprint on the Comprehensive Plan, and doing that correctly was a delicate matter. Some new policies were important to put in the Comprehensive Plan, but some only belong in the TSP.

- The Development Code would implement the Comprehensive Plan and the TSP, but only the TSP would have to be used as an implementation reference for development applications.
- Chair Altman stated he was always under the operating premise that as long as the ordinance implementing the Comprehensive Plan was followed, the Comprehensive Plan was met. But historically, Wilsonville has always had a structure where the Comprehensive Plan was continually referenced, so when an application is developed, both documents are addressed. Now the criteria for approval would have to be addressed in three documents: the Comprehensive Plan, TSP and Development Code, which should be avoided. Obviously, the entire Development Code could not be fixed, but addressing the issue in the TSP would help.

Ms. Mangle agreed and offered to work on it, adding it might have more to do with the types of references in the Development Code.

- Implementation Measure 3.3.1.b discussed increasing housing in the Town Center area. Although the Metro was pushing the City to put higher densities at the edge, the language was fine as stated.
 - The Town Center lacked a strong development plan. If Town Center never redeveloped that density would never be obtained. The language, "in or near" would address areas near Canyon Creek, for example.
 - The Comprehensive Plan showed that the highest densities were in the center. However, the densities in and around the Town Center may need to be revisited to move some of the density.
- Implementation Measure 3.3.1.c on Page 32 of 64 would read better if it stated, "Plan for increased access ~~to~~ for alternative modes..."
- Implementation Measure 3.3.1.f on Page 33 of 64, it was unlikely that TriMet could be encouraged to have extended service on WES since the rail was used as a freight line as well.
 - Having a bus follow the WES route during off hours for people could get back to their vehicles would be more beneficial and likely better received by TriMet. The measure should not be limited just to service on WES; perhaps increasing service on the WES route would be better.
- In Implementation Measures 3.3.1.f and 3.3.1.g, "strongly encourage" was changed to "advocate" because Ms. Mangle believed strongly encourage was very passive. When the City was in a position to speak with TriMet, it would not be a passive discussion. This would also be a way to introduce discussion about high speed rail.
- The need for a Bike and Pedestrian Advocates was not included because this was not the final document. Staff was still in the process of updating the entire TSP to reflect the Planning Commission and City Council edits so the advocate had not been forgotten. Brad Coy of DKS & Associates made a list of questions for Staff, which had included the Bike and Pedestrian Advocate.
- Policy 37 on Page 53 of 64 did not appear in Implementation Measure 3.3.1, although that was not bad. Concern was expressed about the edit creeping into Measure 3.3.1 of the Comprehensive Plan. It seemed unnecessary, more editorial and out of character with how the update project was being done.

This change reflects edits DKS had made based on a recommendation from Staff at Metro as a way to acknowledge that encouraging walking and biking was not just about transportation, because other benefits exist. Ms. Mangle agreed the change was not the best way to achieve that and had since edited the policy again.
- Policy 36.a. on Page 53 of 64, advocated for TriMet, but not SMART advocating for Saturday service.
 - The policy was oriented toward WES. It seemed someone should advocate for the City to pay for that additional service. TriMet would do it, but not without funding to expand the present service level.
 - The biggest issue was non work hour transit service.
 - Language could be added to Measure 30.a on Page 51 of 64 about the areas and hours that are not currently served.

- The Commission had to be careful about what are standard work hours; not everyone works 8:00 am to 5:00 pm Monday through Friday.
 - WES does not accommodate the employee work schedules of some of the largest employers in town. Their work schedules were set to minimize traffic flow.
- Staff was asked to review the policies and push the envelope in general on transit regarding non normal work days and hours.
- Increasing service was a matter of funding for both SMART and TriMet. Perhaps advocate was not the best verb to use, or funding sources needed to be explored for transit, which seemed to be the issue.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

A. 2013 Planning Commission Work Program

Chair Altman noted he would not be present in July. Commissioners McGuire and Hurley noted they could not attend the May meeting.

B. Commissioners' Comments

Commissioner Phelps complimented the Public Works Department for the work at the 95th Ave/Elligsen Rd Interchange, in particular for the synchronizing of the signal system, which had traffic flowing nicely.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Altman adjourned the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

By Paula Pinyerd of ABC Transcription Services, Inc. for
Linda Straessle, Planning Administrative Assistant