

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 13, 2013  
6:00 P.M.**

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

**Approved  
April 10, 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, Al Levit, and City Councilor Julie Fitzgerald. Phyllis Millan was absent.

City Staff: Chris Neamtzu, Barbara Jacobson, Katie Mangle, and Jen Massa Smith

**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. There was none.

**IV. CITY COUNCIL LIAISON REPORT**

A. City Council Update

The City Council Liaison report was provided after Agenda Item VII Commissioner Comments.

**V. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES**

The February 13, 2013 Planning Commission minutes were unanimously approved with one correction, "Auto **Offo** Lane" toward the bottom of Page 10.

**VI. WORK SESSIONS**

A. Transportation System Plan Update Chapters 5-7 (Neamtzu/DKS)

**Chris Neamtzu, Planning Director**, noted Scott Mansur and Brad Coy of DKS & Associates would review the last three chapters of the draft *Transportation System Plan* (TSP) document as well as the Executive Summary, and discuss the reorganization of the chapters in the TSP. Jen Massa Smith of SMART, who is largely responsible for the programs the City runs, was also present to offer background and information regarding SMART Options. The Commission would discuss the TSP Code with Darci Rudzinski and Katie Mangle following the chapters' discussion.

Scott Mansur, DKS & Associates, directed the Commission to the revised outline on Page 2 of 62 of the Staff report and explained that Chapter 3. The Standards was now inserted between Chapter 2. The Vision and Chapter 4. The Needs because the needs of the City's transportation system are based on the standards in Chapter 3. He noted the Executive Summary along with (renumbered) Chapter 3. The Standards, Chapter 6. The Programs and Chapter 7. Performance, would be discussed tonight.

**Scott Mansur and Brad Coy, DKS & Associates**, briefly reviewed the new Executive Summary and new Draft Chapters 3, 6 and 7. Key comments, questions and discussion items regarding each chapter continued as follows:

- Executive Summary, on Page 3 of 62, highlighted the major points of the larger TSP document. Unlike prior TSPs, a performance chapter has been included. Previously, the City would adopt the TSP, which

would be used until the next update. The performance chapter included metrics to measure how the TSP was doing, as far as achieving its goals, etc.

- The summary was meant to be shorter in length. However, the volume of needed information could not be condensed in fewer pages. It was well laid out and easy to read.
- The summary should clarify how other master plans work with or are incorporated into the TSP.
- Multi-modal should be defined or described early in the document. It was currently first mentioned on Page 4 of 62 under The Vision section.
- On Page 7 of 62, it was confirmed that the right side of the column was cut off and would be fixed.

Councilor Fitzgerald arrived at this time.

- Chapter 3 The Standards, on Page 9 of 62, provided the framework for the City's standards and revealed the gaps and deficiencies in the transportation system. The City's new Functional Classifications were on Page 12 of 62. One key change was the City now has only one collector classification in the TSP, rather than four different collector cross-section standards. The intent was to have one collector classification, but have flexibility within the cross-section standard to change the cross-section based on the adjacent land use, as presented starting on Page 21 of 62.
- Changes to the Functional Classifications included Kinsman Rd, which is currently a collector, becoming a minor arterial due to the importance of serving traffic completely through the west side of Wilsonville. Town Center Lp East, currently a major arterial, would be changed to a collector. The portion of Wilsonville Rd between Town Center Lp East and Town Center Lp West should be kept a major arterial rather than a collector since the road has four lanes.
  - Freight Routes was a new section within Chapter 3 that highlighted the importance of improved coordination with regard to other users, businesses, adjacent jurisdictions and when making improvements.
  - Figure 3-5. Bicycle Routes on Page 19 had been added since the Commission last viewed the projects list. All existing and future bicycle routes were identified as well the regional trails, multi-use paths, bike lanes and local street bikeways.
  - The Cross-section Design Standards, beginning on Page 20, now included ranges to provide flexibility for the Planning Director; a series of notes have been worked through with the Engineering Department. A low impact development (LID) local street cross-section was added, and Figure 3-11 highlighted the Trail and Shared-Use Path cross-sections.
  - One collector cross-section standard could be implemented into the Public Works' standards with any number of specific, detailed cross-sections that are needed. Chapter 3 would provide more of a policy direction or framework that sets some of the bigger parameters used to lay out the engineering design standards in the Public Works' document.
  - The width differences between the shared use path and shared use path adjacent to the roadway shown on Page 26 of 62 were clarified. The 8 ft to 12 ft width was from the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan and the 10 ft to 12 ft came from the Tonquin Trail Plan. For consistency, those distances would be modified to a range of 8 ft to 12 ft to provide greater flexibility.
  - Mr. Mansur confirmed that they had considered placing bike lanes at the curb and parking cars between the bike lanes and road lanes which is a two-way cycle track. Page 27 illustrated the cycle track, but did not indicate parallel parking spaces; any on street parking would be between the travel lane and the cycle track.
- Figure 3-12 on Page 27 would be changed to show a parked car, indicating parallel parking spaces, to clarify how a cycle track functions with parking, which is always between the cycle track and the travel lane.
  - Keeping bicyclist out of moving traffic is safer. Different design options would be considered.
  - The buffered bike lane was a good option, especially when next to parallel parking because the buffer areas provide space to minimize conflicts between cyclists and opening car doors.
  - Several options were available to separate cycle tracks from motor vehicle traffic. A cycle track in Beaverton has only a yellow painted curb, which appears to be only a painted line to the

unwary bike rider. The track at Portland State University has a 3-ft striped area and candlesticks that separate parked cars from the track. The track shown on Page 27 on Cully Blvd uses a tiered approach with the cycle track, asphalt, and sidewalk separated by a 3-inch height difference. A double-striped bike lane that is used on Tualatin-Sherwood Rd would be more economical.

- Figure 3-13 on Page 29 was intended to identify the desired quarter-mile ODOT spacing standard between accesses; it did not mean that accesses, such as that for the church and office building on Miley Rd, would be removed. As redevelopment occurs or if other opportunities are available, that spacing would be desired through coordination with ODOT. A clarification would be provided, stating that existing and other accesses in the area would not necessarily be closed or removed.
- The total widths of the street cross-sections from Figure 3-8 and higher were given as the range, but Figure 3-7 and lower are given as the average. Using only the range was preferred.
- Mr. Mansur confirmed that Commissioner Levit's comments in his email dated March 11, 2013 would be addressed. One change had already been made on Page 10 of 62 to show that ODOT's jurisdiction actually extends to the entrance to Argyle Square.
- Although the spacing standards on Page 13 and 14 or the access spacing on Page 28 of 62 did not match the existing street system, the intent was to provide good mobility. The main standard of change was from 600 ft to 1,000 ft; however, the intent was not to close every driveway, but to work through the process. Note B was also added that discussed the desired access spacing and show the flexibility that exists for remodels, relocation or redevelopment. New roads in future development would focus on the minimum spacing standard to provide the best mobility for those roads.
  - While the concept of the standard was intended to keep capacity, it did not always work out well.
- Concern was expressed that all major, minor arterials and collectors mention that the medians shall be landscaped when not needed as a left turn lane. Not having the middle lane results in people driving the wrong way and takes away the ability for people to access commerce.
  - A perfect example is on Town Center Lp East in front of the hardware store, a curb prevents people exiting Thunderbird Dr from making a left turn. Although listed as a three-lane roadway, a large portion of the third lane used to turn into businesses and residential areas was taken away by putting in a planter strip at a huge cost. It did nothing but impede the flow of traffic. Some landscaped medians have no functionality. The preference was that medians be landscaped when not needed as a left turn lane, implying that access into driveways is not needed as well. [Inaudible] lane access is important and should be clarified in the chapter.
- The median at Brenchley Estates on Parkway was installed as a traffic separator to offset driveways and concerns about head-on collisions.
  - Some safety reasons exist behind installing green landscaped medians. The focus was not to shut off left turn lanes, but to focus on major streets or public streets with left turns. As medians are installed and the number of driveways on arterials is eliminated, the collision rate always decreases. The City's collision rate is very low because medians are well maintained with good access regulation.
  - Commissioners McGuire and Hurley discussed balancing safety, backed up by collision statistics, and inconvenient land access, which can cause drivers to make illegal maneuvers.
- Chapter 6 The Programs emphasized that infrastructure could not be built without having effective management and keeping costs reasonable. The City currently manages multiple programs and a few new programs were proposed as indicated on Page 31 of 62.
  - Regarding whether any program elements focused on language assistance, Jen Massa Smith, stated some SMART brochures are translated into Spanish, including schedules and some program materials. Spanish translated pages are on SMART's websites and staff is available for callers who want to speak Spanish. She would look into the AT&T language line which provided assistance with all 40 languages spoken in the Metro area.
    - A recent Title 6 seminar discussed proposed requirements that any government receiving federal transportation funding would have to offer a limited language proficiency program for any part of the population that was 5% or 1,000 or less. If this was the case, it would be

beneficial to call out in the TSP that language assistance was being done, which could provide eligibility for further funding.

- On Page 39 of 62, “Transit Needs” and “Transit Projects” should be renumbered under “Other Transit References”; Chapter 3 should be Chapter 4 and Chapter 4 should be Chapter 5.
- One challenge regarding Transportation Demand Management (TDM) was that the light rail schedule did not fit the employees’ schedules. This was also heard from both large and small employers, and when doing public outreach to the freight community in Wilsonville.
- “A Timeline and Cost of Capital Projects” on Page 33 of 62 required some changes to clarify what happens to medium and large projects as the years progress in light of how money is spent in a fiscal year.
  - The timelines were more of a construction period rather than scheduling of the project. Perhaps “Time to Completion” or something along those lines could be used.
  - It could be that the budget of \$500,000 to \$3 million on the medium projects would be split into two different years and instead of budgeting it on all in one year. The large projects would be split into however many years it takes to complete. Further review would be done to confirm this was correct.
  - As far as scheduling, projects on two parallel facilities would be done at different times so that a secondary route would be available for motorists. For example, Staff waited for work on the Wilsonville Interchange to be completed before starting the Boeckman Rd work. The intent was that the 5-Year Capital Improvement Program (CIP) process would identify which projects would be done and at what time; not all the projects would be implemented over the next five years. As the need arises, the CIP determines how the budget would be allocated amongst small, medium and large projects, taking parallel facilities and other needs into consideration. This is how the City currently schedules projects.

Councilor Fitzgerald left the meeting at this time.

- Concern was expressed regarding street projects taking place in the city and the planning of those projects. Companies would like to know in advance if certain streets will be closed or if detours may be present.
  - All the capital projects are identified and updated on the City’s website under the Community Development page to inform people about projects taking place in the city. Currently, the page is being upgraded and improved to include a Beware of Road Construction section. In addition, the Planning Department has a section for private building projects. Both webpages allow one to check and view the projects going on around town. Staff would ensure that start times are also included for each project.
  - On a yearly basis, the CIP has a budget report that identifies upcoming projects. While no timelines would likely be provided, it would identify which projects would take place and when.
- Chapter 7 The Performance tracks the City’s efforts in creating a multi modal system as far as how the goals in the City’s vision are being achieved. As the next TSP is updated, the measures shown in Table 7.1 would be used to determine how the City has been doing.

Mr. Mansur briefly reviewed the two alternatives presented in the memorandum dated March 6, 2013 on Page 47 of 62 regarding the Brown Road Extension Alternatives Comparison. From a transportation planning aspect, both alternatives achieve the goal of providing the second access, but to make a recommendation, understanding how land south of Wilsonville Rd would redevelop conceptually would reveal the best alternative. It was a very close comparison once advantages and disadvantages are considered.

- Also discussed was which alternative made sense with regard to the water and sewer issues; Pages 56 through 58 of 62 of the memorandum depicted the resulting impacts of the different alignments that the City laid out some time ago. These concepts were used in the evaluation

Comments and responses to questions from the Commission regarding the Brown Road Extension Alternatives were follows:

- Land acquisition costs were included in “Design, ROW and Contingencies” in Table 1 on Page 53 of 62.
- The cost comparison figures in Table 1 came from a study done by OBEC for the City. The small difference between the alternatives’ costs, in spite of the fact there was a home on the 5<sup>th</sup> St route, had to do with the linear interpolation of the distance of one road versus the other. The intent was to include land acquisition costs in Table 1, but the actual acquisition costs were not extrapolated, essentially it was based on square footage. Some variation was likely included as far as contingencies to provide a buffer for the land acquisition. They did not want to estimate a \$14.8 million project and have the actual value be \$16 million.
- When the alternatives were originally considered for the TSP and aerial photos were viewed, even though 5<sup>th</sup> St would align with Memorial Dr only a person with delusions of grandeur would think that would ever happen. There was no reason why the project would go that far south.
  - The section of Boones Ferry between 5<sup>th</sup> St and Bailey St has one historic structure on the northeast corner of 5<sup>th</sup> St and Boones Ferry Rd with no room. Whereas, there are three lanes available at Bailey St which seems to make more sense. The 150 ft difference between the two to the railroad tracks was nothing when talking about streets.
- The 5<sup>th</sup> St option would be more intrusive to the neighborhood. Although less than initially believed, the grade would be too steep for bike access to go up 5<sup>th</sup> St and straight across. It would be better to come in on Bailey St and loop around to connect with Memorial Dr. Having bikes go through the neighborhood would be much better than adding cars into the neighborhood.
- Most likely, only pedestrians or bikes would cross I-5, not vehicles. Bailey St made more sense as it is a commercial intersection.
- A vocal comment had been heard that people in Old Town did not feel a need for a connection to the west, but to the east of the highway. Bailey St would be better for keeping traffic out of Old Town. There would be a lot of discussion with the neighborhood before any plans proceed.

Commissioner Hurley thanked the consultants for providing the information regarding ODOT rail.

Katie Mangle, Manager of Long Range Planning, stated the entire document would be presented to the City Council at a work session on Monday, March 18<sup>th</sup>. The draft would then be updated based on comments from the Planning Commission and City Council before going into the public hearings.

#### B. TSP Code Amendments (Mangle/APG)

**Katie Mangle, Long Range Planning Manager**, explained that the draft Transportation System Plan (TSP) Code Amendments did not have to go forward in the TSP package. The Commission could determine whether more time is needed to work on the amendments following tonight’s discussion. The TSP projects are implemented through the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) but the proposed Development Code amendments implement the TSP policies or big ideas in private development. The Code amendments would facilitate getting projects done and also address the need for City compliance with regional and state policies. Staff has been collaborating on the draft Code Amendments with Darci Rudzinski of Angelo Planning Group and sought the Commission’s input about the current draft.

**Darci Rudzinski, Angelo Planning Group**, overviewed the package of proposed TSP Code Amendments, noting that the Commentary on Proposed TSP Code Amendments document on Page 1 of 30 in the Staff report overviewed the amendments and why they were being proposed. The TSP policies and standards are implemented through the development requirements to bring the Code into better compliance with the Transportation Planning Rule, the State requirements for implementing TSPs locally. The amendments also attempt to reflect some of the new goals and policies of the Regional Transportation Functional Plan, which has more detail than the State plan. Some proposed changes would help clarify or cleanup Code items associated with transportation requirements.

- Also included in the packet was the actual Development Code language formatted to show the proposed and deleted language as well as some of the rest of the text to give context. A table

summarized which sections were being amended, as well as the corresponding requirement related to compliance.

- The bulk of the changes regarded general development requirements. The large sections of new text were primarily placeholders that would be completed once the TSP was adopted. Much of that language addressed internal pedestrian circulation.
- Similar to some of the new TSP policies, the amendments focused on the multi modal system. Historically, codes have done a good job making sure roadways and anything within the right of way is planned appropriately and consistently with the TSP, so not many visible changes were proposed there as the Development Code defers to the TSP. For example, Staff or a developer would use the TSP to find requirements regarding the updated cross-sections.
- The new language predominantly addressed some things that have not been in the Code historically.
- She noted Commissioner Levit had provided some comments which might bear some discussion.
- Some comment boxes were left in the draft that were predominantly between those that have been working on the plan. Most were placeholders for Staff and the consultants, many of which had already been addressed but a couple should not be forgotten as this was still a working draft. Although consultants are good at coming up with great model language, they really rely on local staff and commissioners to help them understand how they are implemented locally and where the appropriate language fits appropriately in the Code. It took a bit of back and forth and several drafts to get to the point where the document started to make sense.

Comments and questions regarding the TSP Code Amendments were addressed as follows:

- Using the term “shall” without appropriate contingency plans in place was a concern. It was important to be mindful of using “shalls” when development or other circumstances might make it impractical or simply not cost effective. The concern regarded the fact that alternatives were not being provided for something other than the “shall”.
  - Ms. Rudzinski noted Staff has been sensitive to that as well when working on the Code language. There were areas where references to waiver provisions had been provided.
  - While waivers or variance processes might be a solution, but the preference was to avoid locking the City into things that could not be abided by. The Development Review Board often found themselves trying to fit square pegs into round holes simply because there were many “shalls” without a way to bail out on them.
- The definition section of the Development Code included the dimensions for a standard parking space, which is 9 ft by 18 ft. Developers are allowed to increase the standard size if they desire, such as was done at Costco. A compact space had a definition as well. Whether a definition was captured for motorcycle spaces was uncertain, but including such a standard, if available, might be beneficial to accommodate motorcycles and scooters.
  - The City relied on standard architectural practices, rather than setting its own parking space sizes. Reducing the size of compact spaces was discussed with City Council several years ago and was not well received. The revisions that would have resulted in a small reduction in the length of a compact space were rejected. The realization was that car models tend to get larger and almost never become smaller, which was a trend that lead to a reassessment of the proposal to Council.
    - Regardless of the model of car driven, many people believe that parking spaces are far too small because getting in and out of the vehicle was too difficult.
  - Land is expensive and parking standards take up a large amount of land. Having too many compact spaces causes people to be unhappy and results in less people frequenting certain locations. People have said they will not go to certain places in the community because it is too difficult to get in and out.
  - Wilsonville’s 9 ft x18 ft size is large compared to many other city codes, and seldom seen anymore; many cities have 8½ ft wide spaces.

Chair Altman believed addressing the proposed TSP Code amendments should follow fairly closely to the TSP’s adoption or there would be implementation problems. He has been troubled for some time that a section in the Development Code directs one to the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Postma suggested the Commission's work on the amendments should follow Council's adoption of the TSP by a month or two because any Council changes could cause further revisions of the Development Code.

The Commission reviewed and provided feedback about the proposed TSP Code Amendments with these key comments:

- Section 4.001 Definitions on Page 9 of 30 included new definitions to explain some of the proposed Code language; one such definition was "cycle track".
  - It was recommended that multi modal be added to the section. However, if multi modal is used only in the TSP and not in the Development Code, it should not be defined in here.
  - It was unclear whether an "access drive" would be equivalent to or different from an "alley" or if the term "alley" is defined in the Code. If so, the two terms should be differentiated.
  - "Bikeway-multiuse pathway", noted on Page 1 of 30, was not defined in the Code draft, but would be defined as "Multiuse pathway".
  - The "bikeway" definition included the word "bikeway" to define it. Staff would consider changing this existing language.
- Section 4.012(.02) Public Hearing Notices, the added language of (.02)(A.)(2) was procedural. The City did this anyway, but the language was seen consistently in codes and was advised as it offers comfort to the City's partners that they are also notified when changes are proposed to the transportation system.
  - Providing notice to tenants, not just property owners, was discussed. According to the current Code, the average citizen is not considered part of the City's landscape for noticing purposes. A Code provision should be added about tenants receiving equal consideration with regard to notice.
    - The City regularly goes above and beyond minimum State requirements for notice. The City's radius for notice is 250-ft, while many places are only at 100-ft. The requirement is to send notice to the property owner, but Staff considers the impact of a project and takes the initiative to notice a resident or uses a more generic approach for an apartment building. Consideration for notice was done on project-by-project and planner-by-planner. Currently, the City uses signs on the public right-of-way that give notice to general public.
  - The City uses four methods to post notice, but none of it was in the Development Code. Determining what is or is not a rental property was difficult and cumbersome to track. One way to capture some tenants is to send notice to the local address as well as the registered owner's address.
  - The City's current policy should be reflected in the Development Code.
- Section 4.114 Transportation Facilities in Zoning Districts includes the Significant Resource Overlay Zone (SROZ). A specific exemption category outlines all the various exemptions allowed to occur in a Significant Resource Overlay Zone (SROZ) and construction of roadways and utility work in SROZs are exempt from the regulation.
  - Discussion included whether Old Town was exempt due to the neighborhood's desire to not have sidewalks and curbs, which was addressed in the Old Town Neighborhood Plan. Last year, Staff held a community meeting to look at cross-sections that would be embedded into the Public Works' standards. Staff is proposing to design a rural roadway cross-section without curbs or sidewalks that would include a gravel edge for parking. The curbless section is internal to the residential section of Old Town, not along Boones Ferry Rd
    - Staff would consider whether the exemption needs to be referenced in this Code section.
  - This was a provision to make sure that public facilities are allowed in any zone. In other cities, the zone only extends to the right-of-way. The language states that whatever the type of facility, if it meets the requirements, the facility is allowed in that zone without additional process or land use approval.
- Section 4.125 Intersection Spacing, was unclear about the spacing where collectors connect in intersection. The arterial to arterial spacing made sense, but intersection collectors come between that and it was not clear how that is laid out.

- This TSP standard was in the Code already and is just being updated to reflect the TSP update.
  - The provision for the adjustments was discussed, but what was missing was the reality that on an arterial, a collector might connect to that arterial in less than one mile, which was not necessarily wanted. Staff would review it.
- Section 4.154 On-Site Pedestrian Access and Circulation
  - The Development Code should require a direct pedestrian connection to the corner when development occurs on a corner property.
  - Some type of transition, such as a concrete block, should be used so pedestrians do not have to walk through mud to access the road when the intermediate sidewalk dead ends because the adjacent property is not developed. The Code should make it convenient for the pedestrian.
    - The issue was similar to dead end streets and involved offsite site improvements. Staff would consider what could be universally applied as a standard. The challenge was figuring out how to connect a pedestrian facility to something not designed for pedestrians. Requiring someone to lead one down a path toward a street might not be the best option and could potentially be a liability. Staff would consider and work on the issue.
  - Section 4.154(.01)(B.) included a “shall” with many different requirements and subparts afterward.
    - This was also tricky because there would be interpretations about what is reasonably direct and convenient. The language came from model code and has been modified and tweaked over the years to fit within the Wilsonville’s TSP Code. More flexibility was available than the “shall” might imply as there would be ways to meet the standard without the provision being completely prescriptive.
    - Referencing some method of maximizing the ability to comply with each section would be especially beneficial when speaking with developers. The City should not appear unfriendly to those the City wants to create development in Wilsonville.
    - Removing the numerous requirements and subparts, such as those regarding a reasonably direct and continuous pathway, would result in more dead end streets, no sidewalks and lack of connectivity.
      - Telling the developer to pay for a temporary improvement, such as a connection to a roadway that may not be in a safe place, potentially creates a liability issue. The system needs to have flexibility to avoid certain situations should they arise.
    - Ms. Rudzinski clarified the subject section addressed onsite access and circulation. The requirement was to have a safe system. The language was developed so that connections to buildings internal to a site or to transit or a public roadway or right-of-way would not just be perfunctory. If they are not safe or do not make sense, these provisions point to the fact that the connections need to be reasonably direct. Have an internal system that was not logical and did not get pedestrians where they might want to go was not helpful. While wordy, the provision makes internal circulation for pedestrians a reasonable requirement and has some specificity to make it practical, safe, usable and logical.
    - However, in some instances, the subparts conflict; continuity might conflict with safety in some situations and then what happens.
      - The Type II Administrative Review was added to the address specific circumstances (Page 22). Cross referencing the provision to waiver sections or other review provisions might address the problem.
      - Reordering Items 4.154(.01)(B.)(2.)(a), (b) and (c) could be to set the priorities. Having (b) “Pedestrian pathways are designed primarily for pedestrian safety...” first would make safety the first criteria to consider, and then (c) “The pathway connects all primary building entrances...” would be second, and (a) regarding reasonably direct pathways, third. Structure the provisions so the order states the priorities as mentioned in first sentence “provide for safe, reasonably direct, and convenient pedestrian access...”
      - Citing the waiver provision would then provide a mechanism to consider that hierarchy.
  - The word “shall” provides the flexibility needed and this section is of critical importance in terms of the future transportation system, because some existing developments have significant issues

- with internal circulation onsite. The language was a great step forward in addressing such circulation for future development.
  - The preference was not to remove all “shalls”, but “shalls” are an issue when potentially conflicting provisions exist and no contingencies allow for alternatives.
  - If “shalls” are used, why allow a waiver, which seems to be a contradiction. Providing a waiver for a “shall” undoes the “shall”. Using “should” rather than “shall” ought to be considered because this practice was inconsistent.
- In Section 4.155 General Regulations – Parking, Loading and Bicycle Parking.
  - In Section 4.155(.03)(C.), was at least one ADA accessible parking space required when providing 50 parking spaces or was there an option for more? The City might want to require additional ADA spaces for certain businesses, but would not want to take up too much space either. In terms of policy, would the City want to allow the option for more?
    - Staff would confirm whether the City was implementing the federal ADA standard.
    - As noted by Commissioner Levit, Staff would consider whether something was missing with regard to, “Parking shall be designed for safe and convenient access to building entrances.” A citizen had noted that the ADA parking spot at LA Fitness is quite a distance from the entrance. Adding more language to be more specific about where to locate ADA spaces made sense and Staff would look into that.
  - Section 4.155(.03)(A.)(3.), Staff confirmed the provision regarded private drives internal to a development.
    - Creating more of a street-like system rather than typical parking lot driving lanes would improve areas like the Town Center should it redevelop.
      - The Town Center was not the best example because a three-acre parking lot was not desired there. The provision regarded three-acre industrial-like parking lots and treating the access way like the through route it is and defining where cars go and people walk or bike.
      - Something similar was done at Argyle Square, which was a terrible place to walk and drive.
    - The language, “street-like features” was unclear; including graphic examples might provide further explanation. The idea seemed to emphasize pedestrian flow versus just straight parking and drive lanes.
  - Section 4.155(.04)(B.)(1)(b)(i) regarded automobile parking and was one of three possible triggers.
  - Section 4.155(.04)(B.)(1)(c) regarded accessory building, which is defined in the Code definitions under accessory building or use. The provision used standard planning language.
    - The Commission discussed what buildings are considered to be accessory or primary buildings. Mentor Graphics communications building was an accessory building to the main campus building. The Jory Trail Apartment Complex is the primary building and the club house would be an accessory-use building. Parking garages are clearly accessory buildings.
  - In Section 4.155(.04)(C.)(1)(d) the language “or other obstruction” should be added.
    - Language regarding long term bike parking geared toward employees versus short term bike parking should be made clearer. For example, people would not go to Rockwell Collins on a short term basis, so providing Code language regarding office building-type environments would be beneficial. Covered bicycle parking should be provided to the side of the building rather than right at the front door, resulting in more parking for the company, while not tripping up pedestrians. At Goodwill, parking was provided in the rear for employees and also in front for patrons/visitors.
    - Covered bike parking or possibly lockers should be provided for employees, leaving the front bike spaces for the coming and going patrons/visitors.
      - In Section 4.155(.04)(C.)(2), the duplicate (a) on Page 14 of 30 required that bike parking be within 100-ft of an entrance that would be used by intended users.

- Section 4.155(.04)(C.)(1) states, “bicycle parking shall meet” and subsection (b) states, “Locate within 30-ft of main entrance to the building or inside a building.” Some reference to the waiver section might be needed for some semblance of flexibility.
- Purpose sections seem to invite additional understandings of definitions, rather than what is in the definition section. Substantially trimming the purpose section was suggested, placing the definitions in Section 4.155(.04)(C.) in the front along with the small purpose sections. Give the definition and then address the requirements and standards following that. Structurally, it would eliminate excess language which could be an invitation for unwanted interpretations. Combining Section 4.155(.04)(C.) with Section 4.155(.04)(A.) and then proceeding to the requirements was the suggestion.
  - While new language was available defining the standards for long term bicycle parking, Section 4.155(.04) Bicycle Parking was structured the same as the Village Zone. The purpose, general provisions and bicycle parking standards were all in the Village section of the Code for the Village Zone, which might be why it reads differently. Changing the structure of Section 4.155(.04) would result in changes to the Village Zone. The purpose statement, in working to describe what was happening in Villebois, may have been expeditious at the time those amendments were made. Keeping Wilsonville’s Code updated in a coordinated comprehensive way was difficult.
  - This section was modeled off of an existing Code section. That needs to be kept in mind and it would be looked at again. Changing the purpose statement and the definitions to a definitions section could be done. Having the general provisions before the specific short term/long term provisions made sense.
  - Staff has struggled with the new concept of long-term bicycle parking. Bicycle parking standards and codes have existed in the Metro area for a while, but this refinement was new, and while it seemed to bear explanation, not including that explanation in the Code made sense.
  - The intent of the purpose statement was that it applied to the intended user, such as how the spaces would be used or who they would be used by, whether long or short term, and then it speaks to where they are located because that makes a difference.
- Section 4.155(.04)(C.)(2) on Page 14 included two letter (a)s; however both (a)s might be incompatible.
  - The required number of short-term bicycle spaces was provided in the table. Of those requirements, 50% of the total must be long term as described and referenced under Section 4.155(.04)(B.)(1)(b).
  - Concern was expressed about the security of bike parking 100 ft away but the options to provide lockers or a detached bike garage were available.
- Table 5 Parking Standards on Page 15 of 30 had only two changes. The first set a minimum of two bicycle spaces for apartment buildings in the first line; otherwise the number standards start at nine units. The bicycle parking minimum was also changed for churches on Page 16 of 20.
- Section 4.155(.045) on Page 20 of 30 should include an option for smaller facilities that do not require a loading dock. Smaller facilities do not use truck docks at all; offices have UPS type deliveries. A recently approved fast food restaurant was approved where the delivery trucks park in the drive lane and work around parking for a short period of time. Offering a clear option for situations where a truck dock is not needed would be beneficial.
  - Adding the Type II adjustment option was helpful.
- Section 4.155(.045)(B.) on Page 21 of 30 regarded exceptions and adjustments specific to off street loading. The required off street loading language included an option of not having to provide that physical space onsite, but rather to use the right-of-way for loading.
- Section 4.155(.06) included two subsection (B.)s. The second subsection (B.) did not provide an option for short-term visitor parking closest to the door. Concern was expressed about a building owner balking at that or trying to do something different. While premium carpool and vanpool parking was encouraged, flexibility should be available for building owners.

- The phrase “employee, student or commuter” is not intended to exclude visitors, so a clarification would be made.
- Section 4.155(.07)(B.). Electric vehicle charging stations are to be encouraged, but reducing the parking that might be needed for a site by 10% was questioned. Ways should be found to encourage electric vehicle charging without congesting parking lots. Having a charging station would not reduce the number of other cars. Typically, parking is reduced where transit exists because fewer cars are expected. Subsection (B.) did not make sense, but Subsection (A.) was fine.
- Section 4.155(.07) (A.) was included partially because only a certain amount of space is available for parking and providing a transit option like a bus stop would reduce that total area. In addition, amenities were being provided that would encourage a different mode of transportation. The language was incentivizing people to charge vehicles.
  - The electric vehicle charging station still requires a parking space. It did not make sense to reduce parking for one electric vehicle station and penalize another person without a parking space.
    - Developers might install the charging stations because the incentive to the developer is to reduce the cost of providing more physical parking. It is incentivizing providing a charging station even if there is no direct correlation to minimizing people driving to the site.
  - Incentivizing electric vehicles over other forms of transportation was questioned and involved a more philosophical discussion, but it did reflect the TSP and regional goals to reduce vehicle miles traveled, greenhouse gas emissions, etc. A correlation does exist and the provision creates an opportunity for a different type of amenity, as well as encouraging people to use it. If the charging station is there, people would be thinking about it and it would be convenient so they might purchase a hybrid electric car.
  - State requirements would begin to require local governments to address greenhouse gas emissions reductions, which will be addressed, in part, through transportation planning, so this was an opportunity to get a head start on that.
- As written, Section 4.155(.07) would provide no incentive for redevelopment if the parking lot had more than the minimum number of parking spots for the intended use and either (A.) or (B.) occurred. The minimum parking requirement could be reduced by 10% and the project could still have more than the minimum requirement. No net gain would be realized as far as the Code is concerned.
  - If a larger building or another pad site is planned that could not be done because of parking requirements, this might offer more flexibility to create more spaces.
  - The incentive was only one angle of looking at the provision, the other was how to deal with new charging stations in existing parking lots, and whether a site design review was needed to modify the parking site plan to put the facility in. The current Code was not clear about how that would count against their parking ratio.
  - Rather than framing this as an incentive, perhaps there as a better way for addressing the issue. Encouraging private and public citing of alternative fueling stations is a TSP policy, and this was one ways to allow for it. In that case, it belonged under (.07), but maybe not under the reduction.
  - Another approach would be to allow existing parking lots to add electric charging stations without a re-review of parking standards, minimums and maximums, parking space locations or bike parking as long as an electrical permit is acquired. The City should penalize someone wanting to install electric charging stations if nothing else is changed.
    - This would be almost like an exemption, which made sense and would be a more direct way to address it.
- Section 4.177 Street Improvement Standards. Section 4.177(.02) referenced the TSP for the actual widths so the flexibility in the TSP is implemented through the Development Code.
  - Section 4.177(.02)(A.)(1) was a big piece that had been missing in the Town Center in particular, because no connection exists between Frye’s and the theater so one has to go back out onto the street to get across the lot. Adding a provision for cross easements was important.
    - There was no (A.)(2); perhaps (A.)(1) should be numbered accordingly.

- Section 4.177(.05) on Page 24 of 30, Public Works' standards would dictate the construction of the multiuse pathways and whether they were to be paved, though it was not stated directly. Staff was working to separate the onsite improvements and right-of-way improvements currently combined in the current Code. This provision addressed facilities in the public rights-of-way and the responsibility of private development in the right-of-way when the improvements could not be accommodated. For example, if a pedestrian/bicycle connection was still needed, it could be separated from the roadway.
  - Although the definition was not clear about whether multiuse paths needed to be paved, Ms. Rudzinski believed they would be because they are supposed to function as if they were in the public right-of-way.
- Section 4.177(.06) Transit Improvements had some typos that needed to be addressed.
  - Adding "to" the second line of Section 4.177(.06)(A.) to state, "provide improvements as described in this section ~~to~~ any bus stop," should clarify any confusion regarding the proximity of bus stops.
    - Major transit streets and major transit stops are defined, so it was not every street or every bus stop.
    - The Transit Director can decide whether a connection or stop is required, which would tie it all back together.
  - The missing item (2) in Section 4.177(.06)(B.) was inadvertently placed under Section 4.177(.06)(E.) and would be corrected.
- Section 4.177(.07) regarding residential private access drives and Section 4.177(.08) regarding access drives and travel lanes needed clarification regarding whether alleys were included.
- Section 4.177(.11) on Page 27 of 30 might incorrectly reference subsections (.05) and (.06). Staff would confirm the correct references were included.
- Section 4.178 on Page 27 of 30 had been moved and modified, it was not deleted.

Ms. Mangle thanked the Commission for their detailed and philosophical comments and questions. Staff would continue working on the draft and return for another work session. She confirmed that the Commission was comfortable getting the TSP Code amendments done soon after the adoption of the TSP to allow time for any needed changes from Council. The best available draft would become an appendix of the TSP because it was important to make findings on compliance headed in that direction. The draft would just be an appendix, not adopted as ordinance. Staff would return to the Commission with it so Council could see it in that form.

## **VII. OTHER BUSINESS**

### **A. 2013 Planning Commission Work Program**

Katie Mangle, Manager of Long Range Planning confirmed the Commission would be looking at the revisions from tonight in April, as well as Goal 10 information. The City had hired EcoNorthwest to work as consultants on that project and work was pushing forward. The City was about to send out a citywide notice at the end of the month or early April for the TSP hearing.

### **B. Commissioners' Comments**

Commissioner Levit stated that a meeting was held for the northwest portion of the county regarding the Clackamas County TSP revision. Approximately ten top projects likely to get funding were prioritized that now have to be reconciled with the rest of the county to determine the final list. The French Prairie Bridge was included, and improvements on Stafford Rd were in the first and second tier depending on their location. Other projects included improvements on Borland Rd; the intersection at 65<sup>th</sup> Ave and Elligsen Rd was in the top tier. Included in the second tier of high priority projects was the straightening of Advance Rd and taking care of the two dips, which were important safety items because of the schools being built; the second project was projected at a few million dollars. He is unsure as to what is going to be done, but coordination with the rest of the county was needed to determine the final list.

Commissioner Phelps asked how realistic it was to schedule a public hearing for the TSP as well as work sessions all on the same night in May and June.

- Ms. Mangle reminded that more than one meeting a month may be required, separating the hearing from the work sessions. The Basalt Creek Concept Planning would not take long; Staff would update the Commission about progress on the project. With the Planning Commission working as the advisory group, the Goal 10 Housing project would need to be discussed every month.

Chair Altman suggested that the Commission consider separating the hearing from the work session.

Commissioner McGuire preferred doing everything in one night rather than adding another night meeting due to other commitments.

Ms. Mangle assured she would let the Commissioners know if a separate meeting was needed. She noted that not many people attend work sessions but was unsure about the pattern for public hearings at the Planning Commission. The schedule would be discussed further at future meetings.

The Commission returned to the Council liaison report at this time.

#### **IV. CITY COUNCIL LIAISON REPORT**

##### **A. City Council Update**

Chris Neamtzu, Planning Director, stated Councilor Fitzgerald, who arrived at the meeting during the work sessions, had provided him information to update the Commission about the following City Council actions:

- The Economic Task Force was still underway and the next meeting would take place March 20, 2013.
- The Tax Increment Financing (TIF) Zone recommended advisory vote passed roughly by an 80 percent margin. TIF Zone applications would be added to the Commission's work program for a work session in May with a public hearing scheduled for June in order to hit the desired timeline for establishing the urban renewal district.
- On March 18, 2013, the City Council TSP work session would be conducted with Scott Mansur and the consultant team presenting their overview. Council would also discuss the Visitor Information Center and a Strategic Planned Task Force for tourism. Ms. Mangle would also provide a brief update regarding the Housing Needs Analysis at that meeting.

#### **VIII. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS**

- A. Ice Age Tonquin Trail Master Plan
- B. Metro 2012 Compliance Report

#### **IX. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Altman adjourned the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 9:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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