



**PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 11, 2012
6:00 P.M.**

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

**Approved
May 9, 2012**

Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

Chair Altman called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m. Those present:

Planning Commission: Ben Altman, Eric Postma, Ray Phelps, Marta McGuire, Al Levit, and Peter Hurley.
Amy Dvorak arrived after roll call. City Councilor Steve Hurst was absent.

City Staff: Chris Neamtzu and Barbara Jacobson

II.

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

IV. CITIZEN'S INPUT - This is an opportunity for visitors to address the Planning Commission on items not on the agenda. There was none.

V. WELCOME TO NEW CITY COUNCIL LIAISON STEVE HURST

Chair Altman noted Councilor Hurst's absence, stating the Commission could return to this item if Councilor Hurst arrived.

VI. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES

The March 14, 2012 Planning Commission Minutes were approved as presented by a 4 to 0 to 2 vote with Commissioners McGuire and Levit abstaining.

VII. PUBLIC HEARING

- A. LP12-0001 – Sign Code Revisions. Amendments of Development Code Sections 4.001, 4.030-4.031, and 4.156 to update Wilsonville's Sign Regulations. (Pauly)

Chair Altman called the public hearing to order at 6:08 p.m. He reviewed the conduct of hearing format and called for the Staff report.

Chris Neamtzu, Planning Director, thanked the citizens present for coming to share their thoughts on the Sign Code revisions and introduced Associate Planner Dan Pauly, who had done the bulk of the work on the Sign Code amendments. The Planning Commission and Staff had already met a number of times over the last year to discuss the Sign Code revisions, which came about through collaboration with the Chamber of Commerce about making the Sign Code work better for the community and for businesses. The revision process included meetings and public work sessions, and now the public hearing process. After Planning Commission made its recommendation to City Council, at least two public hearings would be required at City Council, because the proposed ordinance would amend the Development Code. Mr. Pauly's presentation would review some of the Sign Code revisions' background and process to lay the foundation for those new to the process, but more detail could be provided if needed, and Staff was also available to answer any questions.

Commissioner Dvorak arrived at 6:09 p.m.

Daniel Pauly, AICP, Associate Planner, presented the Staff report via PowerPoint (Exhibit L) with these key comments:

- Most of the existing Sign Code has been in effect for 12 years, although changes were made to temporary signs in 2010 to make it content neutral. A variety of stakeholders, including the Chamber of Commerce, business community, sign professionals, developers, and residents, reviewed the existing Sign Code to identify opportunities for improvement. Since July 2011, seven work sessions had been held with the most recent being held last month.
- The recommended updates were reviewed as follows:
 - Two work sessions were held to make the Sign Code purpose statement and objectives more concise and positive, and the end product served as a good foundation throughout the update process and would serve the community well.
 - Clarifying the difference between architecture and signs had come up as an issue in public hearings before the Development Review Board (DRB) several times. With the new language proposed for the definition of sign, lighting bands or stripes around a building, for example, would not be considered signs.
 - Increasing Staff's authority to review sign applications historically considered routine and non-controversial would move some sign applications from the public hearing process before the DRB to a Staff level review, which could be appealed or referred to the DRB. This update could cut review time by about half.
 - Updates regarding waivers help clarify and give added direction to what the DRB has to consider in granting waivers, as well as reduce the number of waivers routinely requested. Specific waiver criteria that reflect the Sign Code's objectives include: adjusting the allowances in different zones to allow signs repeatedly approved as reasonable through the waiver process; and allowing waivers to be approved as part of a Class III sign permit, as well as master sign plans.
 - The proposed sign measurement method balanced ease of administration and use without including too much "empty space" in the calculation.
 - Removing the majority of special regulations for the Planned Development Commercial-Town Center (PDC-TC) Zone would simplify the sign regulations and improve consistency by making the PDC-TC Zone regulations consistent with those of other commercial areas.
 - Town Center has been the topic of visioning over the years, yet the current regulations talk about the zone being in the early stages of development and in need of a unified sign plan. The PDC-TC Zone has developed significantly and similarly to other commercial areas in Wilsonville that have high design standards.
 - Revised language would separate the allowance for building and freestanding signs to have a more consistent allowance of freestanding signs throughout the city, enabling freestanding signs to be considered on their own merits.
 - Under the current Sign Code, an applicant with a large building would have to borrow from the building sign allowance to get a freestanding sign without a waiver. Conversely, an applicant with a small building would have a leftover amount that could be used to obtain a freestanding sign.
 - Basing building sign allowances on the facades of individual tenant spaces rather than the length of the longest building up to 200 sq ft per lot would increase consistency. The recent Fred Meyer development in Old Town Square illustrated the issues about basing building sign allowances on lot size.
 - Criteria from a model sign code were used to define what facades are sign eligible, including facades with entrances open to the public, facing a street, and being adjacent to primary parking areas.
 - Clear and objective standards were established for number of signs and allowed sign area based on existing signs approved through waiver process and considered reasonable and functional.

- Freestanding signs:
 - The allowed sign area for signs facing I-5 or a parallel street would be based upon the number and size of tenants.
 - On other streets, the sign allowance would be based on the gross floor area for a single tenant while multiple tenants would have a 32-sq ft allowance base plus additional square footage based upon the number and size of tenants.
 - The current height limit would remain at 20 ft, except for Town Center, Old Town, and industrial areas where the allowed height would be 8 ft, which is consistent with signs that currently exist today. Town Center and Old Town already require monument style signs.
- Building signs would be allowed for each eligible façade, based on the linear length of the façade. Exceptions for sign area allowed were based on what was already working in the city and include:
 - Transferring the sign allowance from adjacent facades to facades with primary public entrances or street frontage with windows.
 - Increasing a building sign area for facades with multiple public entrances.
 - Consideration of unique situations created by campus settings, such as at Xerox and Mentor Graphics.
 - Transferring sign area to facades facing I-5 that would otherwise not be eligible for signage.
- Revisions regarding the allowances and specific requirements for semi-static digital changeable copy signs would allow cleaner, more modern signs to replace the traditional plastic panel changing signs.
 - A new definition of changeable copy signs was added that included digital semi-static signs.
 - The waiver allowance was adjusted to allow semi-static digital changeable copy signs in all zones of the City.
 - Specific conditions were established, including a time limit of 15 minutes, which was supported by additional information provided in the meeting packet.
- New language for temporary signs for special events would be consistent with other recent changes adopted by the City. The revisions would apply to temporary lawn signs placed in a public right-of-way to promote large events.
- The proposed revisions established clear brightness standards, defining glare by measuring brightness in terms of candelas per square meter. The current term "glare" was subjective and difficult to enforce.
 - As discussed in the packet, the most accurate way to measure luminance or brightness is for a lighting engineer to make calculations using a luminance meter because it considers ambient light. However, using the candelas per square meter would be the most consistent way to measure brightness for enforcement purposes or to get a quick turnaround from a consultant taking measurements.
 - Additionally, this method provides more ready access so a tree or having to measure from the middle of the street would not inhibit taking readings.
 - Staff and a lighting consultant took brightness readings of existing signs and used other research to establish simple criteria for both daytime and nighttime brightness.
 - All existing signs that were tested meet the recommended nighttime brightness criteria.
 - By establishing a clear brightness standard, Staff would have a means of addressing complaints.
 - No additional submission requirements would be mandated for sign applicants, but the brightness standard would be used for enforcement if someone complained about glare.
- Additional minor revisions were made to improve consistency and functionality, for example:
 - A mural is considered a sign. Staff researched the practices of other jurisdictions and some consider murals to be signs; others do not. Given Wilsonville's unique context and Sign Code structure with the waiver process and site design standards, addressing murals as signs made the most sense.
 - The Code would not prohibit murals, but would allow them after due consideration of the various standards and objectives through the waiver process and a public hearing.

- Residential sign regulations were simplified and made more consistent for the different types of residential development. The sign allowance was also clarified for parks and other non-residential developments in residential zones.
- He clarified that the current Sign Code mandates a 20-ft height limit for freestanding signs along the freeway. Based on areas where waivers had been granted in the past, a new provision would allow freestanding signs for multiple large tenants to be increased by three feet per large tenant, up to a maximum height of 35 ft. There would be no opportunity to obtain a waiver for a freestanding sign higher than 35 ft.
- In response to a question raised in an email about how sign height was measured, he confirmed he had checked the revision and was confident that the proposed language did match the provided graphic.

Chair Altman agreed the revision looked good, and explained the measurement would be based on an average grade. Signs located on top of a mound would result in a reduced sign height. The initial concern involved business sites below street grade, such as Toyota, where the sign height calculation would result in the sign being below the grade of the street. The Xerox sign, which sits on top of a berm, required the opposite consideration.

Mr. Pauly entered Staff's PowerPoint presentation into the record as Exhibit L, and noted the following new exhibits, which were distributed to the Commission:

- Exhibit I: Letter from Wendy Veliz Buck, President, Wilsonville Area Chamber of Commerce dated April 10, 2012.
- Exhibit J: Email dated April 10, 2012 from Melissa Hayden, Project Manager, Security Signs.
- Exhibit K: Email dated April 11, 2012 from Commissioner Levit noting his questions, comments and concerns regarding the Sign Code Revisions.
- He confirmed the changes discussed at the last Planning Commission meeting had been included in the revised document and were highlighted in the Staff report.

Chair Altman called for public testimony, noting the Commission would hear all public input and then provide opportunity for Staff to respond to any questions.

Daniel Drake, LRS Architects, representing the Tonkin Family of Dealerships, 720 NW Davis, Portland, OR 97217, stated he had become aware of the Sign Code revisions a couple weeks earlier and had questions regarding two of the Tonkin dealerships in town, the Nissan-Audi dealership and the old Grand Prix building.

- He asked how the Master Sign Plans of both dealerships would be affected by the Sign Code revisions and if the plans would need to be modified.
- He asked about empty space within areas of pylon signs, such as the Audi and Nissan signs across the freeway. The Nissan sign would have had red stripes down the middle of its legs, which would be considered area, but there would have been space in between the stripes. He asked if that space on the Nissan sign would be modified with these revisions.
- He asked if the architectural elements used to convey the branding of national retailers would be considered signage. This has been an issue in other jurisdictions and should be discussed and clarified.
- Would the new Sign Code allow for the same signage area for separate tenants in the same building that have no walls separating them? For example, if Audi and Nissan were in one building, would each tenant be allowed to have the same signage area?
 - Additionally, would separate pylon signs be allowed for each tenant?
 - If only one sign was allowed, could the signage be divided into two portions equal to the size of the larger allowed sign?
- He concluded that he would continue reviewing the revisions and likely pose further questions to Mr. Pauly.

Jerry Jones, Construction and Development Director, Bob Lanphere Enterprises, an owner of Wilsonville Toyota, 9155 SW Boeckman Rd, Wilsonville, OR added emphasis to Mr. Drake's comments regarding pylon

signs and architectural elements versus a sign. He appreciated that the City was considering changes to the Sign Code, because the current version could be difficult to understand for businesses and developers.

- As a retailer along I-5, Bob Lanphere Enterprises was glad to see revisions to increase the allowable sign height, which is very important. Like other larger retailers in the area, auto dealerships are destination points for customers in the region, and the hope was that taller signs would attract more customers, who in turn spend money at local restaurants, clothing stores and other business. Taller signs would hopefully attract greater outside businesses to the Lanphere locations, and if those businesses were allowed more visible signs, Lanphere customers would have opportunity to notice these other businesses and establishments to stop and shop in Wilsonville.
- He praised the City for drafting revisions that still focus on keeping Wilsonville aesthetically pleasing. At the same time, the revisions provided a way for businesses to have increased visibility and Staff to have the flexibility to work with the business community and come up with agreeable sign designs and placement.
- He noted the revisions did not address all the past concerns regarding signage, but were a great step toward looking at the Sign Code requirements as a whole. He hoped future discussion would address topics such as wayfinding and A-board signs.

Glenna Harris, 29585 SW Park Place, Ste G, Wilsonville, OR, said she was the owner of Whipper-Snipper's, which is known to have possibly the worst sign in Wilsonville. Sign Code is more than language; it has a daily impact on small business owners.

- She has discussions with customers about her sign every week. Many customers cannot see her sign and have a hard time finding her business. She always has to make investments in other ways to let people know where her business is located.
- Signage is a major investment for small businesses like hers. She had one shot to get an effective sign, and hired a reputable sign company for that purpose. She provided her marketing objectives and wanted the sign to include brand elements to somewhat identify the look and feel of her business. She then trusted the experts and the process to come up with a sign that would work for her business. When her tiny sign was installed, her heart sank because she knew she had one shot for her investment dollars, and would not be able to redo the sign in the short term. Looking back, perhaps she could have made different decisions, but ultimately she trusted a process to be business friendly that was not.
- She has reviewed the Sign Code revisions and concluded that had they been in place when she was getting her sign made, there would have been a much different result. While she could not invest in a new sign right away if the revisions are adopted, the revisions did create a path forward for her that did not exist today. In her opinion, the revisions are reasonable and would allow for better signage.
- She wanted everyone to understand that the Sign Code had a day-to-day impact on her business and would continue to do so in the short term. The revisions show that the City understands the Sign Code issues and is willing to engage with businesses of all sizes to solve problems. Making changes to the Sign Code was a big deal.

Michael Harris, Owner, Snap Fitness, 3215 NW Sparks Ave, Albany OR, stated he was looking at opening a Snap Fitness gym in the Wilsonville Business Center. He supported the City increasing the allowed signage dimensions. Under the current Sign Code, his sign would be small and less visible than desired because of its length. The average Snap Fitness sign is 50 sq ft, and that dimension is allowed in other cities. The average sign size for Snap Fitness owners in Corvallis and Albany is larger than the 26 sq ft allowed under the existing Sign Code. He believed the revisions would allow his sign to be 36 sq ft. He would like the City to be flexible to allow small business owners, like himself, to have the opportunity for a larger sign.

Mark Pruitt, Professional Sign & Graphics 25999 SW Canyon Creek Rd, Wilsonville, OR, thanked the Staff and Planning Commission for all their work on the Sign Code revisions. The process of revising the Code started about three years earlier when the Chamber of Commerce started looking at the Sign Code. By reviewing a

model sign code and the codes of neighboring communities, the Chamber identified five key areas that needed to be addressed in any rewrite to Wilsonville's Sign Code.

- The process initially got side tracked with the content neutrality issues, and the Chamber helped Staff and legal counsel understand what such rewrites would do to the sign code and their implications. Through that process, City Staff agreed to begin reviewing the rest of the Sign Code.
- While there is always room for things one might want to change, the proposed Sign Code revisions addressed the five key areas identified by the Chamber.
- He was aware some controversy still existed of some things, like the semi-static changing text signs. Emails had been received requesting that the text be allowed to change more frequently. However, when the semi-static display concept was first proposed, a 15-minute interval was desired. The intent was to allow churches, schools, movie theaters, and similar entities to update their reader board signs to be more functional, attractive and easy to maintain. A semi-static sign with a 15-minute interim between changes would accomplish that goal. While other cities allow more dynamic, changing messages, that was not desired for Wilsonville nor was it being requested.
- As a sign professional, he supported the proposed revisions and knew the Chamber of Commerce had also written a letter in support of the Sign Code Revisions.

Scott Starr, 28750 SW Cascade Loop, Wilsonville, said he wanted to echo some of the previous comments. Shortly after he became the Chamber of Commerce President in 2009, the Chamber changed its mission and vision. The Whipper-Snippers sign, the most futile sign ever, provided inspiration for bringing the Sign Code up to date and not have people be forced into some kind of minimum standards that did not achieve what anyone wanted. As Commissioner Phelps says, nothing is totally worthless if it can serve as a horrible example.

- He thanked Mr. Pruitt, the Chamber, Staff, and the Planning Commission for doing the tedious work required to make the necessary and thorough revisions. The Sign Code revisions accomplish what the City wants, and make Wilsonville more competitive in helping businesses succeed.
- His recommended that the Commission move the proposed revisions forward to City Council and reiterated his appreciation for all the work everyone did on updating the Sign Code.

Chair Altman, Mr. Pauly and Mr. Neamtzu addressed the questions posed during public testimony and from the Planning Commission with these comments:

- The Sign Code revisions would not create any legal, non-conformity issues with existing master sign plans. Signs that conform to an existing master sign plan would remain legal under the new revisions.
- The Sign Code is clear that the allowed area is content neutral, meaning the area can be used however the developer or business wanted, not necessarily for tenants.
 - The sign measurement language states that architectural parts of a pylon sign designed to match a building would not be considered signs. When reviewing the Audi pylon sign, Staff concluded that only "Audi" the rings were considered signage.
 - The signage allowance is calculated per façade, so the square footage allowed for that façade would be set; no additional square footage could be obtained unless by waiver. The allowed sign area could be divided amongst multiple tenants in the same footprint however they wanted. The City would not prescribe what is best for those tenants or that owner regarding how to allocate the signage.
 - The new provisions would allow an allocation for each visible elevation. The current Sign Code determined the sign area by the longest side of the building, regardless of the sign's locations on the building.
- All existing master sign plans, including those for the two auto dealerships, would remain valid, but could be changed to benefit from the Sign Code revisions. Extra effort was made during the revision process not to create any nonconforming signs.
- The new Sign Code provisions would allow a single pole sign per elevation. The Audi-Nissan dealer having two pylon signs on the same property was unique in Wilsonville. Two entities operating from the same

building and wanting two pole signs would be unusual enough that a waiver would probably be required. The waiver process was still available under the new revisions.

- Under the Development Code, architectural elements are considered either a sign or a design element. Elements, such as light walls, have been considered signs, but the DRBs granted waivers for a large amount of sign area to allow them. The architectural elements could be considered design elements subject to site design review where the DRB could mandate specific requirements. Mr. Pauly was comfortable that the Sign Code was now clearer about how architectural elements would be considered. Applicants could call the element a sign and request a waiver, or deem it architecture and be subject to site design review.
- The Wilsonville Road Business Center, where Snap Fitness would be located, was already operating under a Master Sign Plan, so signage for Snap Fitness would be guided by that criteria, not the City Sign Code, per se. Wilsonville Road Business Center has four large buildings on a single lot and had been granted a waiver for up to 600 sq ft of signage. However, a tenant occupying a single unit would only get 26 sq ft of signage.
 - Master Sign Plans are usually designed to prevent the initial tenants from using up all the permitted sign square footage. The space for the proposed tenant, Snap Fitness, faced Wilsonville Rd, so Mr. Pauly believed the square footage allowed for the Snap Fitness sign would be 36 sq ft., which would be consistent with signs allowed for facades of that size in Wilsonville.
 - The existing Wilsonville Road Business Center Master Sign Plan could be revised or the tenant/applicant could go through a Class II review for that particular tenant space.
- The City had not received a sign application for Lowrie Elementary School located in Villebois and zoned Village, rather than Public Facility, which is unique to Villebois. Mr. Pauly did not know whether a sign package was approved when the school went through the public design review process. If the school was going to be located in a Public Facility zone, a waiver would need to be obtained. The waiver process provided opportunity for community input to determine if the sign would be appropriate for the neighborhood.

Commissioner Levit:

- Noted his email (Exhibit K), which included several questions about the Sign Code revisions, and stated his main concern regarded the measure of the luminance of the signs.
 - Mr. Pauly clarified that sign companies are not set up to test luminance, the DRB would not review luminance, nor would luminance levels need to be submitted with an application. A sign's brightness would be measured if the City received a complaint about glare.
 - A concern came in regarding the sign at the new Mattress Discounter store. The measurement he and the lighting consultant took showed the sign's brightness was about the same as other similar white signs in the city, which was well below the proposed Sign Code standards.
- Stated he was concerned about the angle of measurement. The technical reports in the exhibits showed that the angle of measurement was critical by up to a factor of 10. It would be almost impossible to measure brightness without using a lift once a sign was in place, because brightness is supposed to be measured normal to the face.
 - Mr. Pauly stated he could forward Commissioner Levit's concerns to Jim Benya, adding the only sign Mr. Benya was unable to get an accurate measure of brightness was the large 76 Station sign. Valid brightness measurements were taken from the ground for other signs, including the Holiday Inn sign. He had not measured exactly how far the measurements were taken from the signs.
- Asked if the signs the Staff and consultant measured had glass or plastic covers, or were exposed LED lights.
 - Mr. Pauly replied all the gas station signs have plastic over the lights as a condition of approval because bare bulb illumination was not allowed by the current Sign Code. Under the revised Sign Code, bare bulb illumination would be permitted for signs with LEDs based on feedback from the sign industry about the automatic dimming technology and brightness standard. They had concerns about the sign covers becoming dingy and not having a good purpose.

- As far as the angle of measurement, he noted Mr. Benya's memo stated the 500 and 5,000 candelas standard was reasonable and would allow virtually all the signs that currently exist in Wilsonville. Mr. Benya also said he could teach Staff to use the luminance meters in an hour's time.
- Asked if the City would purchase a NIT gun.
 - Mr. Pauly replied a couple options were available. Mr. Benya lived locally and was available for consultation. The City could purchase its own NIT gun for a reasonable price, but unless complaints become routine, it might be better to call in a lighting consultant as needed for the occasional complaint.

Commissioner Postma asked if simply indicating the measurements the City sought would be sufficient for someone within the sign industry to measure luminance or did the Sign Code revisions need to specify the methodology?

- Mr. Pauly responded a lighting consultant could write a methodology memo, but he understood the methodology discussed in Mr. Benya's memo was standard in the sign industry, and the methodology Mr. Benya used to take the readings was in the record.

Commissioner Levit:

- Noted the methodology in the memo for measuring luminance was not specified in the Sign Code. There was no way of knowing a sign would conform, until a sign was installed, a complaint was received and the sign was then found to be too bright.
 - The Code was setting a brightness standard without any way to measure brightness before installation, which could create big issues. There had already been several instances where legitimate sign companies have gotten businesses into trouble by doing something that did not comply with the current Sign Code. He did not want the City to open itself up to those types of problems again.
 - Mr. Pauly explained the question regarded having a specific brightness standard, as stated in the proposed criteria, or leave the Sign Code as written with the subjective prohibition about glare.

Chair Altman said he liked the way the revision was written; it gave a specific measurement standard and focused on enforcement. Field tests showed that existing signs were consistent with that proposed standard. He did not believe a situation was being created where the next 20 signs would be that much brighter.

Commissioner Hurley asked if the language could simply state that brightness shall be measured at a specific distance from the sign face.

- Mr. Pauly responded such as a standard would not take into account different scenarios and might require a measurement to be taken while in traffic or from up in a tree.

Commissioner Postma explained his point was that the Code should provide flexibility. The Sign Code would state the objective measurements, and the standard for how brightness is measured would be based on the industry standard, which could change as technology advances, but would allow sign professionals to work within their standards to take the measurements.

Commissioner McGuire noted the sign's location must also be considered. The standard might work well in a commercial area, but could be problematic in a residential area.

Commissioner Levit clarified he was not against having a hard numerical standard for brightness, which he preferred to "glare," the current fuzzy standard. The lighting sciences attachment in the meeting packet included a chart clearly showing that a change in angle of 30 degrees would change the intensity, or candelas per square meter, by a factor of 10. A sign might appear to be within the standard from ground level, but could appear to be out of compliance once elevated and measured from a different angle. He was concerned about the City being put into an untenable situation, which could create trouble for the sign owner. Also, how would the sign be fixed

if it was out of spec. He was uncomfortable with the brightness standard without having something more fixed. He reiterated he was not against having a particular type of sign or specific brightness standard.

Chair Altman responded that the angle was where people viewed the sign from, which is at street or ground level, so it would make sense to take the brightness measurement from street or ground level. He did not see the angle issue as a big problem.

Commissioner Dvorak asked if Staff could provide additional guidance or industry information to sign applicants ahead of time, so potential problems could be caught before a sign was installed.

- Mr. Pauly replied the sign industry explained that within their industry, signs are not generally made brighter than the revised Sign Code standards, because the signs would not be readable. Furthermore, the City had data available on existing signs that have been approved and measured, so the lighting elements and signs' construction were on record. Previous sign permits could be accessed and a new sign could be made with equivalent lighting, if a sign applicant was concerned about exceeding the brightness standard. He noted brightness could be affected by the color of the sign as well.

Commissioner Postma noted Section 4.156.06 Prohibited Signs on page 40 of 274 stated a prohibited sign would have luminance greater than 5,000 candelas per square meter sunrise to sunset and 500 candelas per square meter sunset to sunrise, which would be irrespective of measurement. At any point that the highest measurement was outside those standards, it would be a prohibited sign.

Commissioner Levit responded he was not sure that would eliminate his concern about valid measurements.

- Mr. Pauly added Staff would make sure they had a valid reading before taking an enforcement action in court.

Chair Altman understood Commissioner Levit's concerns, but noted sign companies are not geared to do brightness measurements. They do not have the equipment or lighting engineers to take luminance measurements before a sign is installed. Sign companies rely upon the sign industry to provide signs within a reasonable standard. The important part was that the City was not putting the brightness standard into the Sign Code as part of the permit criteria. Sign applicants would not have to prove to Staff or the DRB that the brightness standard was being met. The standard was within the Code, and if violated, it would be a problem.

- Mr. Pauly noted a violation could be fixed to conform to the new standard, such as changing the color of plastic used on the sign or dimming LED lights.

Commissioner McGuire asked if language could be inserted that prohibited glare in addition to the standards in the revisions to provide some flexibility for the City in the future. A subjective glare standard would provide a backup if measuring candelas failed.

Chair Altman replied that adding the glare standard back would open the door that the City was trying to close.

Commissioner Levit agreed that inserting glare language would be too subjective.

Chair Altman called for further public comment to ensure all questions had been addressed.

Mr. Drake said he had gone through a land use review in the City of Portland that involved architectural elements and how to measure glare, which is considered a bare bulb shining directly into the eye. A cover over the bare bulb diffuses glare. The element they were educated on was to place the bulb behind frosted glass with a fritted surface to create a warm glow. The City of Portland also determined that foot-candle measurement depends upon both the amount of light and the distance from the light source. His concern about having a strict measurement on brightness might limit the exposure of the company's advertisement. The standard should take

into account how far from the property line luminance is measured and where the public would see the sign. Signage with limited brightness on a building that was setback from the street would not be seen. As for Commissioner Levit's concern regarding measurement, Mr. Pauly's response about measuring light from a 20-ft or 30-ft sign was legitimate because the City no longer allows signs that high. He reiterated that when limiting light brightness, the City should keep in mind that visibility decreases farther from the property line.

Commissioner Levit responded that two issues existed with light measurement. According to the exhibits, candelas are a measurement that does not decrease with distance, whereas foot-candles do decrease. If the standard is in candelas per square meter, the distance should not matter, which was a bit surprising.

- Secondly, he agreed that having a sign bright enough to see from beyond the property line was certainly an issue. He was not sure how the revised Sign Code would address something like the Toyota dealer's wall of light. The intensity of the light was low, but if that intensity of light were used on an advertising sign in town, it would be too intense.

Commissioner Dvorak asked if it would be possible to get a waiver to increase the luminance of a sign for buildings that were setback.

- Mr. Pauly answered the luminance standard was not a permit criterion, and therefore could not be waived. The standard was for enforcement only.

Chair Altman noted the assumption was that sign companies would provide readable signs within the standards set by the revisions to the Sign Code. Existing approved signs in Wilsonville were used as the model for guiding the new Sign Code standards. The expectation was that no matter the building setback, businesses should be able to have signs that are readable from the street. The revised Sign Code would allow signage on each elevation, freestanding signs, and for adjustments based upon location factors. The revised Sign Code was certainly an improvement over the existing one.

Chair Altman confirmed there was no further testimony and closed hearing at 7:31 p.m.

Commissioner Phelps moved to adopt Resolution No. LP12-0001. Commissioner Postma seconded the motion.

Chair Altman called for Commission discussion.

Commissioner Postma commended Mr. Pauly, Mr. Neamtzu, Mr. Edmonds, and the other City Staff; the Chamber of Commerce; sign professionals and others for their hard work on the Sign Code revisions, which involved a lot of minutia. He had sat through many DRB meetings on approving signs and was glad to see that the new Sign Code would provide a more efficient mechanism for businesses to get sign approval in a cost-efficient manner.

Commissioner Phelps thanked Mark Pruitt and Ben Altman, who represented the Chamber during the heavy lifting portions of the meetings on the Sign Code. He did not want the significant and substantial contributions of Mr. Pruitt and Mr. Altman to be overlooked.

Chair Altman echoed the thanks to Staff, particularly to Mr. Pauly, who did excellent work on the Sign Code revisions. He was very pleased with the outcome and believed the Code had been substantially improved.

Commissioner Levit added his appreciation for the work that was done. Reading code was difficult, and trying to amend it via committee was even more difficult.

Commissioner Dvorak added she was touched by the testimony from all the community members and thanked them for providing their input.

Resolution LP12-0001 passed unanimously.

VIII. OTHER BUSINESS

A. 2012 Planning Commission Work Program

Commissioner McGuire stated she had sent an email late that evening as a follow up to the February discussion about potentially enhancing the Planning Commission's work program and establishing more check in points with City Council. She wanted to explore that further and get Staff feedback. She believed the Planning Commission could strengthen its relationship with City Council. It would also be helpful to both the Planning Commission and the public for the work program to be more clearly outlined. The public should also know what the Commission is required to do by law versus what items were programmatic. The work plan should also be tied back to the City Council's goals. She hoped the Commissioners would review her email and that the work program discussion could get on the agenda for next month's meeting.

Chair Altman agreed the Planning Commission needed a better understanding of its direction. He particularly liked linking the work program to City Council's goals and having a mechanism to stay on track. He had talked with Mr. Neamtzu about this matter before the meeting and planned to have further discussion. It was particularly important to establish regular check in points with the City Council.

Commissioner Levit:

- Asked if it would be reasonable to project the work program for a year.
 - Mr. Neamtzu replied that would be difficult. He could project out three months most of the time, and six months out sometimes. Many things come up that could not be predicted, but he was willing to try. The work program would definitely be a living document. Some agenda items slide down the schedule constantly, because other priorities come up. He was not sure how helpful it would be to the public to have an inaccurate Work Program schedule because the nature of planning work necessitates frequent revisions. A quarterly calendar might be more accurate than a monthly calendar.
- Noted chickens had fallen off the work program list.

Commissioner Dvorak said she wanted to discuss diverting food waste.

Chair Altman suggested working with City Council to pin down some checkpoints and then the Commission could work within those checkpoints. The work program could say what the Planning Commission planned to accomplish for the quarter, then that progress could be tracked. A work program would keep both the Commission's and Staff's priorities more organized and would help identify areas where progress was or was not being made.

Commissioner McGuire explained that for her, the work program was less about the month-to-month schedule as it was about keeping a running list of significant upcoming projects, such as the Transportation System Update and Sign Code revisions. Variability was difficult factor, but understanding the general scope of other items listed would enable the Commission to track and anticipate those projects. Having an index of the major projects coming before the Commission would be nice.

B. Commissioners' Comments

Commissioner Levit:

- Said he would not be able to attend the May 7 joint work session or the May 9 Planning Commission meeting. Staff would need to contact him about getting his comments before April 27.
- Asked for an estimate of the Staff time and money involved with amending the Sign Code.
 - Mr. Neamtzu agreed to provide that information; the Planning Department keeps time cards on all projects.

Chair Altman commented that all the amendments only added six pages to the Sign Code.

VIII. PLANNING DIRECTOR/CITY STAFF COMMENTS

Mr. Neamtzu stated the Water Master Plan Open House was planned in conjunction with the 10-year anniversary celebration for the Willamette River Water Treatment Plant and scheduled to take place on the same night as the May Planning Commission meeting. The event was scheduled to start at 5:00 p.m. at the water treatment plant. He asked that the Planning Commission meeting start time be delayed to 6:30 p.m. or 7:00 p.m. The Planning Commission and Staff could attend the event and then return for a work session on the Water System Master Plan update with Mr. Mende and the consultant. A work session on the Master Plan at the May meeting would allow a public hearing in June, Mr. Mende's target date.

Following a brief discussion, the Commission decided to hold its May meeting at 6:30 p.m.

A. Draft Community Survey

Mr. Neamtzu stated the Draft Community Survey was not completed yet. The City Council work session resulted in many suggestions for City Manager Bryan Cosgrove and he invited further input from the Commission. He agreed the survey was long, but it could be completed quickly.

Feedback from the Commission about the survey was as follows, with responses from Mr. Neamtzu as noted:

- Mr. Neamtzu believed the survey results would be available for preparing the Economic Development Plan, but he was not sure the results would be available in time for the June summit.
- The survey asks about the quality of life in the respondent's neighborhood, but did not ask in which neighborhood they lived, which was important not only to learn about the city's neighborhoods, but also to know the geographical representation of the completed surveys. .
- The response categories of excellent, good, fair, and don't know, did not provide for accurate feedback if something were unimportant or indifferent to a person completing the survey.
- Question 14 might invite highly political responses, since most people do not know what the federal government actually provides, such as roads. That same issue was raised at the City Council work session; why did the survey ask about federal when most people do not differentiate between federal, state or city functions.
- Why was Question 16 included in the survey, which asked about projected family income in six months? Asking whether the economy would be better or worse did not seem relevant, and did not indicate income diversity.
- Placing the demographic questions on the back of a blank page at the end of the survey could be misleading. Page 5 asks for written comment and the demographic questions were on page 6, the reverse side. The demographic questions could be moved onto page 5, as few people would write a full page of comments.
- Regarding Question 20a, most people in Wilsonville do not know about the permitting process. The question would result in random answers and seemed more appropriate for a focus group or the business community.
 - Mr. Neamtzu confirmed the survey was only to go to residents, not businesses.
- Why was the question on race split? The question required people to answer whether they are Hispanic, and then to indicate their race.

- Would the survey be available in Spanish or other languages? Demographic profiles of Wilsonville are readily available, enabling the City to know in which language to deliver the surveys. Perhaps both English and Spanish versions could be distributed.
- B. Annual Sheriff's Report
 - C. City Managers Report
 - D. SMART Grant Award news
 - E. Summary notes from Economic Development Strategy Advisory Committee Meeting #1

Commissioner Phelps asked when the Commission would address the Economic Development Strategy and (Statewide Planning Goal 9) Economic Opportunity Analysis (EOA) update.

- Mr. Neamtzu noted focus groups were meeting upstairs that evening and a quorum of the Planning Commission was participating in various segments of that project. Staff had been working with Todd Chase of FCS Group on the EOA update. Mr. Chase was working on the final draft, but a family illness had delayed the deliverables to Staff.
 - He believed a PowerPoint sent to the focus group was from a City Council work session where Mr. Chase and Terry Moore had made a presentation about the state of the region and the economy. The material might have been a blend of the original EOA and newer material from Mr. Chase's presentation to City Council.
 - Preliminary findings on the results of the Goal 9 update could be available at the May meeting. Stakeholder meetings were being held in anticipation of the summit scheduled in June. Following the summit, a document would be prepared that would come before the Planning Commission for input and to provide a venue for public discussion. Mr. Chase would have information to share with the Planning Commission well in advance of any [inaudible] or strategy.
 - The minutes from the first committee meeting were included in the meeting packet, and the summary from the stakeholder interviews would also be provided when available. Staff would be making presentations on these topics to the Commission.

Chair Altman confirmed no date was set for the June Economic Development Summit, but the target was the first week in June.

F. Basalt Creek Transportation Refinement Plan

Mr. Neamtzu noted the memorandum dated April 6, 2012 distributed to the Commissioners from Scott Mansur of DKS Associates regarding the Sustainable Transportation Network previously distributed to the Planning Commission. Analysis of bike/ped traffic would significantly increase the cost of traffic impact reports that developers have to do. He wanted the Commissioners to have an opportunity to review Mr. Mansur's response and continue the discussion.

Chair Altman said he had not read the response yet, but believed including bike/ped analysis could be relevant in the context of the Master Plan itself. The level of service (LOS) measurement currently used was a permit criterion and only measured vehicle traffic, which might work for developments, but not for implementing a master plan. Building and designing streets should factor in all modes of transportation.

Mr. Neamtzu asked that the Commission review Mr. Mansur's response and the discussion could continue. He noted City Council would hold a work session April 16 on the revised goals for the Transportation System Plan (TSP) that the Commissioners had reviewed at their March meeting. Council would also have a work session on the French Prairie Bridge and the \$1.25 million Regional Flexible Funds grant that had been awarded to the City of Wilsonville. A booklet available online gave the history of how the bridge was

incorporated into the latest planning document. He would lead the discussion, noting there was a lot interest in the community about the issue, so he expected citizens to be in attendance.

- At the May 7 joint work session, the City Council and Planning Commission would review and discuss the 70-page draft memorandum on solutions to the gaps and deficiencies identified in the transportation system. The draft solutions package included cost estimates and priority rankings as evaluation criteria had been applied to the project lists. The Council and the Commissioners would provide guidance on how to whittle the solution package down to more a more tangible package with a financially constrained component and project list that would include unfunded projects as well to accommodate the cash flow expected over the 20-year horizon.
 - A public open house on the TSP solutions package would be held in late May 2012.
 - The draft document of the Transportation System Plan (TSP) update would be available this summer with adoption scheduled for January 2013. The Planning Commission should review the update in December 2012. Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) is the granting agency and has a tight schedule for adoption. The money must be spent within a specified time frame.

IX. ADJOURNMENT TO THE COMMITTEE FOR CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT MEETING

Chair Altman adjourned the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 8:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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