



**PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2012
6:00 P.M.**

**Wilsonville City Hall
29799 SW Town Center Loop East
WILSONVILLE, OREGON**

**Approved with
Correction on page 1
March 14, 2012**

Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

Chair McGuire called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. Those present:

Planning Commission: Marta McGuire, Amy Dvorak, Ben Altman, Al Levit, Eric Postma and Peter Hurley. Ray Phelps arrived during the Pledge of Allegiance. City Councilor Scott Starr was absent.

City Staff: ~~Chris Neantzu~~, Barbara Jacobson, and Daniel Pauly

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

III. WELCOME NEW PLANNING COMMISSIONER PETER HURLEY

Chair McGuire welcomed new Planning Commissioner Peter Hurley. Mr. Hurley stated that he has lived in Wilsonville for four years and has served two terms on the DRB.

IV. ELECTION OF 2012 PLANNING COMMISSIONER CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR

Commissioner Phelps nominated Ben Altman to serve as Planning Commission Chair for 2012. Commissioner Postma seconded the motion, which passed 4 to 0 to 3 with Commissioners McGuire, Dvorak, and Levit abstaining.

Commissioner Phelps nominated Eric Postma to serve as Planning Commission Vice Chair for 2012.

Commissioner Hurley seconded the motion, which passed 4 to 0 to 3 with Commissioners McGuire, Dvorak, and Postma abstaining.

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

VI. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES

The December 14, 2011 Planning Commission Minutes were approved as presented by a 6 to 0 to 1 vote with Commissioner Hurley abstaining.

VII. CITY COUNCIL LIAISON REPORT

No Council Liaison Report was given due to Councilor Starr's absence.

VIII. WORK SESSIONS

A. Sign Code Revisions (Daniel Pauly)

The following documents were distributed to the Commissioners for review

- Memorandum from Daniel Pauly dated January 23, 2012, "Recommended Changes to Sign Permit Process."
- Email from Melissa Hayden, Security Signs, dated February 02, 2012, regarding freestanding and ground mounted signs, signs on buildings and digital changeable copy signs.
- Email from Melissa Hayden, Security Signs, dated February 03, 2012 providing comments from Daktronics, a company that manufactures digital display signs.
- Letter to Marta McGuire from Daryl Winand, Portland Metro Association of Realtors, dated February 8, 2012, regarding "Wilsonville Continuation of Recommended Sign Code Updates."
- Email from Susie Stevens, Charbonneau, dated February 07, 2012 regarding recommended Sign Code changes.
- Email from Daniel Pauly to M. Pruitt at The Sign Pros, dated February 07, 2012, acknowledging his comments about auto dimming and screening.

Dan Pauly, Associate Planner, presented the Staff report via PowerPoint, reviewing the Sign Code changes made based on prior feedback and comments from the Planning Commission and Chamber of Commerce. Paper copies of the PowerPoint presentation were distributed to the Commissioners.

Key comments from the Commission and discussion with Mr. Pauly regarding the Sign Code revisions were as follows:

- The numbering system in the Sign Code was already frustrating and the changes proposed to the numbering system only seemed to perpetuate current issues. For example, it was difficult to know from what section one was reading. Finding other ways to designate the numbering was suggested, such as the European method or some similar continuous decimal. Mr. Pauly agreed to discuss the suggestion with Staff.
- Mr. Pauly confirmed the Development Review Board (DRB) is notified about all Class II decisions in order to be able to call up an application.
 - Requests that go to DRB for review include reviews on all development, buildings, master sign plans, master sign plan modifications, subdivisions, waivers, variances, and others. The DRB makes a decision whether or not to approve an application based on findings prepared by the applicant.
 - The current Sign Code requires that about 95% of signs go before the DRB; Staff has limited authority.
 - Very little flexibility existed in the current Sign Code. Staff recommended that a number of items be added to allow a Class II review. At times, it is practical for a sign item to go to the DRB because it is packaged with other items being reviewed by the DRB, or there is community interest or discretion needed because of waivers or major changes to a master sign plan.
- Master sign plan modifications regard changes being made for multiple tenants and require a Class III review. Master sign plan adjustments only involve a single tenant and a Class II review.
 - For example, Oswego Grill went to DRB because the business occupied multiple tenant spaces and wanted an enlarged logo not in the Fred Meyer Master Sign Plan. A single tenant with signage that met the master sign plan area requirements would be allowed a Class II review.
 - The recommended changes would result in Oswego Grill being treated similarly whether attached, or occupying several units of a row building, or detached, like the existing isolated building.
 - The proposed changes would make determining whether a sign had to go to DRB much clearer.

Commissioner Dvorak left the meeting at 6:30 p.m.

Mr. Pauly continued his PowerPoint presentation with these key comments and discussion:

- Mr. Pauly clarified some waivers would still be needed, but not as routinely as under the current Sign Code. The recommended changes would require fewer waivers in most instances. Big box stores and some designed large stores would want more signage and seek waivers.
 - Different criteria would also apply for waivers under the updated Sign Code.
- Chair Altman reminded that the Commission discussed reviewing the purpose and objectives once the sign criteria were revised. The Fred Meyer development was a diverse project with many different scenarios that

challenged the Code. It would be a good representation for the Commission to compare and contrast how waivers and other Sign Code update recommendations would apply.

- It is important to remember that the Sign Code revisions would also apply to other development in Wilsonville, not just multitenant retail.
- The business park at Wilsonville Rd and Kinsman Rd near OrePac did have waivers.
- Argyle Square's signage only features three or four actual businesses although many more stores were in the development. The chart on Slide 32 identifies the maximum sign height and face area allowed based on the number of tenants (Page 42 of 85 of the Staff report). The developer/property owner would decide how that space is divided amongst tenants.
- For consistency, Staff recommended calculating building sign allowances on a per tenant basis, treating each tenant space as a separate building regardless of being attached/detached.
 - Slide 37 on Page 19 of the paper PowerPoint presentation, showed some of the lot lines on the existing Fred Meyer development, and inconsistencies that result from calculating Building Sign allowances based on lots, not buildings, were described:
 - Building J is attached to the larger Fred Meyer building (Building A), and both buildings were on their own lots. Currently, the sign area for Building J would be based on the longest length of a side of the building; however, Oswego Grill, Building C, which has Chase, Subway, UU Yogurt, etc., and building with Qdoba, Biscuits Café, etc., were all on same lot, so under the existing Sign Code, the maximum sign area was based on 'X' for all these buildings. Such inconsistencies were why it made sense to base sign area on a per building approach.
 - Building K was also attached to Building A and open to the deli section in Fred Meyer. A new dental office by Qdoba was architecturally different and offset, but attached. Whether these buildings were attached or detached was arguable.
 - Slide 39 (Page 20 of PowerPoint presentation) illustrated how the proposed revisions would result in signage that is in proportion to the architecture as well as other signs on a building. Several examples from the Fred Meyer project were reviewed.
 - Sign companies want flexibility for their clients when combining tenant spaces, but legitimate concerns exist about maintaining proportionality and a uniform look to protect the integrity of previously approved master sign plans.
 - The proposed language would encourage applicants to incorporate their signage into the architecture and landscaping of their projects.
- Mr. Pauly clarified the 200 sf maximum signage per tenant would only apply if the tenant would otherwise exceed 200 sf. A tenant with 100-ft frontages on two sides and a 50-ft frontage on a third side would still only be allowed 200 sf of signage.
 - Multipliers would still apply. The end occupant on a row of buildings with two doors and three facades, for example, could have 300 sf to 400 sf of signage due to multipliers, but only if the total facades of the building added up to at least 300 to 400 sf. No multipliers allow extra signage for the total façade. A multiplier essentially creates a ceiling and allows that ceiling to be increased, but the amount of signs allowed would not be affected if the length of the facades were less than that ceiling.
- Signage requirements would still be tied to design review, and general architectural compatibility language would still apply. Tenants in buildings with distinct architectural sections, like the Chase building in the Fred Meyer development, would be subject to architectural standards regardless of whether the sign was approved in the master sign plan or through a Class II major adjustment.
- The top building front on Slide 39 illustrated issues similar to Precision Countertop where the Master Sign Plan required all signs to be the same height and length. Precision wanted a bigger font because its name was longer than the prior sign. It made sense to maintain the proportionality to the building elevation by adding additional architectural detail. Adding height would result in increased capacity for the sign to stay proportional.
 - The proposal would have addressed the issue with Whipper Snippers, where descenders made the sign look disproportionate to the building. However, a number of proposed items addressed the Whipper

- Snippers issue to ensure signs were readable, including ensuring the applicant knew how their proposed signage would look.
- Staff would continue looking at different scenarios to ensure no unintended consequences would prevent reasonable signs.
 - If readable, it would not matter if a sign covered two sections that had different architecture.
 - Special event sign regulations involve lawn signs. This is the only area with temporary sign language.
 - The large, electrical trailer signs used to direct traffic from the City right-of-way had not been addressed. City signage in the right-of-way regards transportation, and use of the trailer signs are based on the City Engineer's recommendation. The City Engineer makes decisions regarding signs used to direct traffic.
 - Mr. Pauly works with different City departments during their events to maintain the same signage standards required at other events.
 - Commissioner Phelps did not believe the City should exempt itself from the same criteria required of others.
 - Special event sign regulations are "content neutral" and cover events like church rummage sales, the school's robotics fair and Fun Run, as well as sidewalk sales.
 - Right-of-way is defined as publicly-owned property connected to transportation use, including planter strips, bike lanes, and sidewalks. Special event signs could be placed in certain planter strips. Special event signs would not be allowed in privately maintained planter strips, like at Town Center where irrigation lines exist. The signs would be allowed in the strip between the railroad tracks up toward the schools where fewer irrigation lines exist. Maps are provided to applicants.
 - Signs could also be placed on one's own property. The ordinance only applied to public property.
 - Fewer applications would be seen because if 10 people agree to have a sign placed in their lawn, no permit is needed.
 - Mr. Pauly noted the correspondence with Charbonneau acknowledging the long held MOU allowing the Country Club to remove signs when necessary. The proposed language would not affect that MOU.
 - Mr. Pauly explained the 10 sign limit within the right-of-way has worked well historically, especially with the limited number of areas where such signs are allowed. Ordinance 701, relating to special events that was adopted last month, allowed additional signage on private property if written permission is provided by the property owners. Many events are in Town Center, which has prohibited right-of-way, but large event organizers could pursue placing signs there with permission.
 - Currently, digital changeable copy signs are only allowed within a planned development zone, PDC, PDI or PDR, when a waiver is granted. Schools are not in planned development zones so such signs are prohibited.
 - Provide a definition of "changeable copy signs" that include semi-static digital signs is being recommended.
 - The recommended change that waivers be allowed as part of Class III sign permits would apply to schools in this scenario.
 - Several comments were received from the specialists sign industry about establishing specific conditions for granting waivers for digital changeable copy signs. Staff would make changes based on the comments received.
 - Staff had recommended the conditions based on conditions of approval applied to the digital fuel price signs, which looked good.
 - LED technology is changing drastically and quickly so it was good that Staff would be making further changes. Considering how LEDs are made, it was not necessary to put panels on in front them.
 - Panels were applied to the Chevron sign because of existing prohibitions on bare bulb illumination. Staff might need to tweak that language as well to accommodate LEDs.
 - The clear panels were applied to a fuel sign that was only illuminating red, which was not impeded the same as multicolored LEDs.
 - Many more sign applications could be expected with LED lighting capable of having interesting and vibrant colors. LED signs are less expensive than standards signs with lighting behind a panel. The City

should not discourage something that was attractive, would become more popular in the future, and that was both cost and power saving.

- Mr. Pauly clarified that signage is exempt from the outdoor lighting ordinance.
- Staff believed the additional changes would result in an ordinance that worked well and provided flexibility as technology evolved.
- Mr. Pauly clarified a theatre would still be allowed to come in under the existing Sign Code, because Town Center was a planned development.
- Other minor changes included adding language about non-conforming signs to say if a sign being moved because of a public taking maintains the same level of nonconformity, then the sign would be allowed to stay through the Class II process.
 - Currently, moving a sign out of the freeway would be considered destruction of the sign and the sign would have to come into conformance. This revision only applied when a public taking is involved. Otherwise, if a tenant vacates a building, any non-conforming sign would be left for the next tenant and changed through a copy change. If the sign were taken down, the non-conforming status would be lost.
- Wayfinding signage was an ongoing community conversation. Staff was not recommending any wayfinding related Sign Code updates; changes could be done in the future if needed.
 - Wayfinding plans were currently allowed, so no Code amendments were required; however, the process of getting a wayfinding plan approved was unclear. Public Works and the Engineering Department need to be involved in determining that process.
 - Chamber members with west side businesses wanted wayfinding signs.
 - Chair Altman stated he was trying to get a small group together to figure out how to proceed. There might be a point where the community considers a uniform wayfinding signage program like Sherwood, which involved a different process than Code amendments.

Mr. Pauly reviewed the proposed sign measurement language and presented mock ups of how the new measurement method would affect the look of signs on buildings via PowerPoint.

Comments and responses to questions from the Commission were as follows:

[Note: deleted text struck through; added language in bold, italicized text.]

- Mr. Pauly clarified that no changes were proposed for measuring cabinet signs; the major changes regarded individual element signs.
- The proposed measurement method essentially excluded descenders of standard letters from the sign area.
- Concern was expressed about not having a master sign plan or directional plan in residential areas. Finding addresses in large apartment complexes was difficult, which was a safety issue for emergencies and for wayfinding. Creating such plans might involve a different discussion.
 - Mr. Pauly explained that master sign plans were for nonresidential projects, adding that from the Code's standpoint, occupants were viewed differently in residences versus businesses.
 - Villebois was the only residential development with a directional-type sign plan.
- With the Sign Code changes allowing more signage, an expedited process should exist for those wanting to match their sign to the updated Code, rather than having to go through the entire Class III proposal.
 - Mr. Pauly agreed to make note of the suggestion, adding Mattress World had submitted an application to allow additional signs. Perhaps Village at Main could be encouraged to expand to a master sign plan.
- Trademark logos are often required to be a certain size or proportion. Concern was expressed about how a logo's proportionality would affect the signage, perhaps forcing a business to have a very small sign. Multiple sign allowances were described in the third paragraph on Page 5 of 85 of the Staff report and other Code elements might create an issue.
- On Page 5 of 85, the fourth paragraph discusses wayfinding and blade signs. Language should be added about assisting with auto wayfinding, not only pedestrian wayfinding, so people driving in a development know which direction to go to reach the store they wanted.

- The current Sign Code has an allowance for local directional signs that is not used a lot. That language would not be affected by any Code revisions.
- How do hand held signs displayed by employees fit with temporary signs, as discussed on Page 6 of the Staff report?
 - Mr. Pauly replied the City Attorney determined not to regulate hand held signs due to freedom of speech and content neutral issues. The criterion was based on a memo from the City Attorney.
- Previous conversations lead to the decision that content neutral temporary signs are allowed to be in place for the duration of an event. Given the current economic climate, commercial for lease properties could be for lease for a while and the open language was used so lessors would not need to worry about getting approval for a for lease sign after a certain period. A property being for rent is considered an event, and as long as the property was for rent, the event was considered to be ongoing.
- Engineering staff should be notified about specific issues regarding regulatory construction signs. Contacting the engineering staff was difficult given their workload.
 - Commissioner Levit noted that the I-5 interchange project at Wilsonville Rd was a disaster for pedestrians, bike riders, and drivers.
- Clarification was requested about the added language for Definitions 263. Sign shown in the first paragraph on Page 10 of 85. If the architectural style were related to a business, it would obviously be giving a message.
 - Staff looked at the history of applications like Toyota, Honda, Sysco, Lazerquick, etc. that have stripes on buildings. With some exceptions, like gas stations with canopies, it was determined that although the stripes convey a corporate branding of sorts, they were not signage.
 - As far as City regulations, if an architectural element was not a sign, it would be regulated through site design review in terms of color, etc. If the applicant claimed the building color could not be changed because of free speech, that indicated the element was a sign. Colored downlighting might even reflect a corporate image, but was not necessarily a sign.
 - This had been a particular issue with service stations because the entire canopy was counted as sign area, requiring a waiver for 3,000 sf of signage, for example. It was actually an architectural feature that the City still had review control over.
 - Simply adding language, “such as color banding” could clarify what is being distinguished.
 - Staff would continue to study and work with legal staff to ensure the language optimally conveyed the Commission’s intent without opening a new window.
- Definition 263(C) Changing Image Sign needed to address lenticular images, which give a holographic or prism type image that changes when the viewer’s perspective shifts. Language could be added stating, “creates the appearance of movement otherwise.”
- Using ‘portable’ was suggested rather than ‘moveable’ in the last sentence of Definition 263(M) Lawn Sign on Page 11 of 85. Moveable could imply that signs could have changing images. Using the word ‘may’ was also questioned.
- Definition 263(Q).(1.) Projecting Sign did not include posts, such as a lamppost, for blade signs.
- With regard to Section 4.156.(02).(A.) Permit Required on Page 22 of 85, Mr. Pauly clarified that signage on the inside of windows would not require a permit.
 - The City does not do design review on the interior of a building; so no interior signage is addressed either as a matter of consistency.
- Section 4.156.(02).(D).(2).(a).(iv.) on Page 23 created a subjective provision that was not appealable through a Class I sign permitting process. The language used “readable,” which was subjective. Additionally, the vehicle travel lane would affect mobile readability, also subjective and affected by vehicle speed.
 - Something more objective than “readable” needed to be used, or remove this adjustment from a process that was non-appealable.
 - Class I reviews should be on items where no one would need to receive notice.

- The paragraph regarding minor adjustments under Section 4.156.(02.)(D.)(2.)(b.)(ii.) also involved a subjective language. Rather than determining what could bump down to a non-appealable standard, determine what negatively impacts visibility; subjective standards must have oversight rather than trying to eliminate oversight.
- Delete the extra comma in the third line of Section 4.156.(02.)(E.) on Page 23.
- Section 4.156.(02.)(E.)(3.) included another subjective standard, however major adjustments to approved master sign plans were reviewed under a Class II through planning staff; however the requests are submitted to DRB who could review the adjustment if they wanted.
- Section 4.156.(02.)(H.)(1.) on Page 25 seemed like a concession to the fact that the City could not find an objective standard for a waiver. Did no objectives standards exist?
 - Mr. Pauly replied waivers by their nature are somewhat subjective. Typically, a special situation is identified and the applicant tries to meet the Sign Code objectives another way. The applicant must meet the objectives of the site design review criteria and the master sign plan of the planned unit development regulations. If an applicant is able to do so and come up with a better concept, the City would listen.
 - The Sign Code was moving from attractive and functional to a process where a longer list of factors would be considered to inform the decision.
 - The Commissioners were asked to send suggestions about which items they wanted to see tested against the objectives.
- On Page 25 of 85, the fourth line in Section 4.156.(02.)(H.) was missing a word.
- Concern was expressed about the 20% variance in Section 4.156.(02.)(H.)(2.)(a.) resulting in huge signs, especially with regard to signs along the I-5 corridor where a 35-ft sign could go up to 42- ft high with a 20% allowance.
 - Staff proposed that 35-ft high signs not be subject to a variance or waiver, only signs 35-ft or less. The variance criteria are very hard to meet and rarely used for signage; a hardship must be demonstrated and compelling.
 - Running a variance through a Class I review with no appeal was problematic. Section 4.196 Variiances was full of subjective terms, which would be applied by staff without any appeal mechanism, or review by DRB or other body.
 - When applicants know they can get a request a variance through a Class I review, the City would see more Class I applications.
 - The variance could be made a Class II review, or not to exceed 10% when [inaudible].
 - Once Staff completed the height review for non-freeway signs, they should consider whether it was

- The waiving an area for a single tenant, but making height waivers for free standing signs more difficult. He was asked to provide verbiage for the tiered waiver concept.
- Section 4.156.(03.)(B.)(1.)(c.) on Page 29 should clarify whether “round” referred to a circle, cylinder or sphere. Additional language was also needed to clarify how three-dimensional signs are m

- appropriate to waive height on non-freeway signs as well
- Mr. Pauly suggested a tiered approach could be used for granting waivers; for example, using the plainer dimensions of the text or the apparent projection. The method needed to be clear to avoid contention; from the ground, 11 inches of text could look like 6 inches.
- A typo was noted on Page 30 in Section 4.156.(03.)(B.)(2.)(a.)(ii.), “within ten (20) feet”.
- In reference to the additional text at the end of Section 4.156.(03.)(C.) on Page 31, Mr. Pauly confirmed that if grandfathered signs moved because of a public taking would not be subject to the 20% variance discussed in Section 4.156.(02.)(H.)(2.)(a.) because the signs tend to be taller.
 - The last phrase of the added language included “no less conforming” after talking about non-conformity in Section 4.156.(03.)(C.). “No less conforming” was not quite as clear as using, “not an increase in non-conformity,” which would make the language more congruent.

- The language in Section 4.156.(05).(H.) on Page 36 was intended to mean “supported by.” An a-frame sign chained to a tree would not be considered attached, but a theft deterrent.
- The second section of the chart on Page 42 in Section 4.156.(07).(A.)(2.)(b.)(iii.) should read, “Adjacent to I-5 and street sections ~~continuous~~ *contiguous* with I-5.”
 - This section indicated that the square footage is allowed to increase as the sign height tops out at 35 ft, so a wider sign would be allowed, or less area between the ground and sign. Width has not been an issue yet on signage contiguous to I-5; height has been the main concern. If added width were an option along I-5, it could result in wider signs than intended.
 - A maximum sign width could also be added to the Sign Code.
 - Width could be limited due to engineering; the sign might not be able to be built if it was too wide.
 - Speed on the freeway dictates the readability of a sign, which might be self-regulating.
 - Staff might want to consider having a maximum number of tenants that could be displayed on the sign, which would then limit the sign’s width and height. Argyle Square’s sign only identified three major tenants; it was not appropriate to include every tenant.
 - Mr. Pauly agreed to look at the proportionality issue and run some scenarios. People tend to like signs as tall as possible; the allowed area would control it to some extent.
- Section 4.156.(07).(B.)(1.)(e.) on Page 43 had a typo, “...signs shall be remain constant...”.
- Commissioner Levit noted that with all the add-ons and options allowed in the Sign Code, a 200-sf sign could result in 440 sf of signage, which seemed too large.
 - Mr. Pauly reminded that the building would need to have double frontages with multiple entrances on the same frontage, such as Fred Meyer, which has two big signs for the different entrances.
 - Chair Altman suggested eliminating the multipliers and setting a maximum signage amount per elevation. Allowing proportionality per building elevation would eliminate the need for multipliers because each building elevation would have its proportional signage, which might be easier to administer. If a business had two facades to sign, why divide that signage based on one side or a maximum?
 - Building widths are not typically as long as the length, so a smaller amount of signage would be on two of the building sides.
 - Unless viewing a sphere, L-shaped building or from the building’s corner, both sides of the building could not be seen at one time, so it did not matter how much signage was on the other side.
 - Mr. Pauly agreed to run numbers and calculate scenarios on existing buildings. He explained that a courtyard would be looked at as having four elevations; he would look into how an L-shaped building would be calculated with a single tenant.
 - If the allowed signage amount is based on the façade on which the sign would be installed, then concerns about applicants picking the largest walls to get larger signage would be addressed. Making the signage proportional to the elevation on which the sign would be placed would result in the signage being proportional to the building.
- Section 4.156.(07).(B.)(f.)(iii.) on Page 43 was missing words. “Fifty (50) percent where the *sum of* all building...” was suggested.
- Further typo corrections would be submitted to Staff electronically in light of the time.
- Regarding the email from Melissa Hayden about raising the minimum height of monument signs from six to eight feet high, Mr. Pauly explained that signage for a Stage II development is already coordinated with landscaping and other site conditions so the sign was more visible, and as functional as possible.
 - The Sign Code revisions were based on what works in Wilsonville today, not for the standard commercial arterial.
 - Current and long-term master plans were not opening up new commercial projects, but redeveloping existing commercial areas.
 - The monument sign’s base is included in the height of the sign, which is measured from the ground.
- An even bigger sign would be needed to look over another vehicle from the second traffic lane. The City could not accommodate seeing over all vehicle sizes either.

- No street addresses are included on monument signs making it difficult to find some addresses, which was also a public safety issue as far as emergency identification. Although in the Code, having an address visible from the street should be emphasized. Because such signage was not always possible, internal wayfinding signs would be helpful.
- The differences between the ground-mounted and freestanding sign definitions in Section 4.001.263.(H) and (I) on Page 10 needed to be further clarified.
 - Ground-mounted signs seemed to be monument signs, a low sign mounted on the ground like the Just Store It monument sign across the street from the freestanding sign at the Lowrie Shopping Center.

Chair Altman said he was pleased with the progress on the Sign Code update, noting one more work session would be held on the edits from tonight's discussion before the revised Sign Code went to public hearing in April.

IX. OTHER BUSINESS

- A. 2012 Planning Commission Work Program
- B. Commissioners' Comments

Commissioner Levit noted he would be absent at the March and May Planning Commission meetings and confirmed that the community survey on the agenda for March was a review of the questions.

- He was concerned that in late summer/early fall, the Commission had requested a meeting with City Council to get direction regarding the CCI and no direction had been received.
- He noted nominations needed to be held for the CCI Chair and Vice Chair.

Commissioner McGuire suggested following up with Councilor Starr, or sending him a memo. A TSP joint work session was scheduled with Council for April 16; perhaps the matter could be added as an agenda item for that meeting.

Commissioner Phelps stated it seemed as though the CCI had just evaporated even after all the work that had been done.

Chair Altman understood that City Council has shifted goals and sustainability dropped off the radar. He believed it may come back as a goal but many other major items were before Council at this time. A lot of work had been done by the CCI so sustainability should be kept on the table.

- Having citizen involvement was required on land use actions and having the CCI as a designated body was an extension of that involvement. No specific requirements exist on how the City should promote citizen involvement.

Commissioner Levit stated the community survey should technically be addressed by the CCI, not the Planning Commission.

Commissioner McGuire said she had suggested adding an action to the Communications Plan that would establish mid-year and end-of-year joint sessions so the Planning Commission could check in with City Council and facilitate communication, which would benefit all parties involved.

- She had talked with Mr. Neamtzu about creating a more detailed work plan going forward on an annual basis that included time lines for the major statutory requirements, like the TSP, and the related Council goal. This would enable the Commission to see how its work would help fulfill Council goals for the year. At the two joint work sessions, the Commission could review the work being done and discuss any issues that have arisen.

- Creating a more detailed work plan would enable the Commission to identify and project the huge items the Commission is required to address by law, and more clearly see the relationship between Council's goals and the items Council assigns to the Commission.
 - This would have resolved the CCI problem because the Commission would have known that sustainability was off the work plan.

Commissioner Postma suggested that City Council have a consistent, annual or biannual agenda item to discuss what the Council wanted the Planning Commission and CCI to do.

Commissioner Phelps suggested communicating in writing to the Council to ask what the Council wanted the Planning Commission/CCI to do, or to send Council the Planning Commission/CCI's work plan to show Council where they are going.

Chair Altman asked that Staff communicate to Mr. Neamtzu that the communications Plan and community survey be put onto the CCI agenda for March as well as elections for the CCI Chair and Vice Chair.

VIII. PLANNING DIRECTOR/CITY STAFF COMMENTS

A. Transportation Systems Plan Update Open House Review

Commissioner Levit stated he was impressed by the amount of comments about biking and pedestrians, and the relatively few comments about the roads, which showed what is important to the community. Tomorrow, he and his wife would be promoting Wilsonville as a tourist attraction at the Clackamas County Bicycle Tourism Studio.

Commissioner Phelps complimented Commissioner Levit for his work in promoting the open house amongst bicycle constituents.

Commissioner McGuire requested a work session to discuss the work plan at some point. She had drafted and sent her idea to Mr. Neamtzu, but it would be worthy of a group discussion.

B. Stephan Lashbrook is the City's new Transit Director

Mr. Pauly reported that Stephan Lashbrook would be missed in Community Development, but with his wealth of experience, he would do a great job for Transit.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Altman adjourned the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 9:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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