

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 13, 2019  
6:00 P.M.**

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

*Meeting Minutes were  
approved at the April  
10, 2019 PC Meeting*

**Minutes**

---

**I. CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL**

Chair Jerry Greenfield called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m. Those present:

Planning Commission: Jerry Greenfield, Eric Postma, Peter Hurley, and Kamran Mesbah. Simon Springall arrived at 6:07 pm. Phyllis Millan and Ron Heberlein were absent.

City Staff: Chris Neamtzu, Miranda Bateschell, Amanda Guile-Hinman, Kimberly Rybold, Zach Weigel, and Jordan Vance

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

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

**ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

A. Consideration of the February 13, 2019 Planning Commission minutes  
The February 13, 2019 Planning Commission minutes were accepted as presented.

**II. LEGISLATIVE HEARING**

A. Town Center Plan (Bateschell/Rybold)

Written comments regarding the Town Center Plan were received from Greg Nelson, Jared Ray, and Bob Applegate.

Commissioner Springall arrived at 6:07 pm.

Chair Greenfield read the legislative hearing procedure into the record and opened the public hearing at 6:09 pm.

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, introduced the project team and the Town Center Plan via PowerPoint, stating she was excited about tonight's legislative public hearing. She was grateful for the vision and foresight of the Tourism Committee and Urban Renewal Strategic Plan to do this project, and importantly, the City Council, who had established the Town Center Plan as a priority goal, and the commitment of the Planning Commission in helping to shepherd the project through and directing Staff to engage the full community in a meaningful way.

- Staff had actively worked with the community for two years, and she was incredibly proud of the work that they and the City had done. The project team had been in the schools, including the primary schools, middle schools, and focus groups with both high schools and the Oregon Institute of Technology. The team had partnered with various schools to reach out to Latino families in the community and had met with PTA groups and booster clubs. The team also engaged in monthly visits at the Wilsonville Community Sharing and lunches at the Community Center.

- Business and property owners also worked hard on the Town Center Plan, meeting with the team one on one, attending focus groups at City Hall, and taking time out of their busy schedules to provide critical input that directly helped to shape the Plan and the implementation actions. She thanked the Chamber of Commerce, who had been excellent co-partners on the project and had helped host a number of events in the community around economic development.
- Residents, employees, and business owners in Wilsonville attended focus groups, workshops, and open houses, taken three different surveys, and answered two years' worth of Questions of the Month online, at the library, and at community events such as Fun Run, Fun in the Park, Rotary concerts, Brew Fest, and Trivia Nights. Their commitment and vision had set the priorities outlined in the Plan being presented tonight.
- She was also proud of the hard work done by the Task Force, who stayed true to the community input they had heard, while helping the team work through the details that had come through in the Plan.
- She acknowledged everyone present who had followed the project and contributed to the Plan and hoped they would contribute more this evening. She thanked the Commissioners for their diligence and thoughtfulness around implementation, noting the Commission had spent several work sessions over the last six months working through the details. She recognized SMART for its support with the transit section of the Town Center Plan and for advertising community engagement on its buses, as well as the communications team, all of the Planning and Engineering staff, especially Tami Bergeron, who had been a huge support throughout the entire project, and Community Development Director, Chris Neamtzu.
- She noted tonight's presentation would highlight the modifications made to the Town Center Plan and Development Code based on the Planning Commission's final work session in January and City Council's work session in February. The Planning Commission's action would be a recommendation to City Council to adopt the Wilsonville Town Center Plan and the amendments to the Wilsonville Comprehensive Plan Text and Map, Zoning Map, and Wilsonville Zoning Code. She noted the Town Center Plan and the land use actions applied to the area within and adjacent to the Town Center Loop, as shown on the displayed map. (Slide 3)
- She entered the following exhibits into the record:
  - Resolution No. LP 19-0003
  - Exhibit A: Staff report and its attachments, including:
    - Attachment A: Wilsonville Town Center Plan and supporting appendices.
    - Attachment B: Wilsonville Town Center Plan Findings Report, outlining compliance with all state, regional, and local requirements.
    - Attachment C: Town Center Plan Planning Commission Public Record Index. Most of the more than 1700 pages of comments were linked electronically. Attachment C was amended to include two letters which had been distributed to the Commission at the dais:
      - ODOT letter of support, dated March 12, 2019 from Seth Brumley, ODOT Senior Planner.
      - Letter from Garrett H. Stephenson, Schwabe Williamson & Wyatt, dated March 12, 2019.
- She noted the public record had been posted on the City's website for more than seven days and hearing notices were posted and mailed to 62 property owners, more than 270 interested parties via email, and noticed in the *Boones Ferry Messenger* and *The Spokesman*, meeting all State requirements for public review.

Molly Cooney-Mesker, Project Manager, MIG, presented the Town Center Plan, continuing the PowerPoint and reviewing the project's history and the process of developing the Plan with these key comments:

- As mentioned, the numerous community engagement events resulted in the robust, community-driven Town Center Plan. The City was committed to this being a community-driven vision and plan and hosted a multitude of events at various venues and with various activities to achieve that. Through those events, the project team heard from a diversity of community members, including a strong youth voice, and while there had been a range of perspectives, common threads had quickly emerged. From those threads, and with the assistance of the Task Force and Planning Commission, the team was able to create a planning framework that would guide the process moving forward as well as the implementation of the plan.

- Community input on parks, open spaces, land uses, and transportation informed the initial building blocks that eventually evolved into the current proposed plan. Early in the process, it was apparent that parks, open spaces, and places to gather were very important elements for both the current Town Center and what was envisioned for the future.
  - The project team took the initial ideas and presented the community with a few concepts of what the proposed Town Center could look like. There was a desire to meld some of the ideas, such as the Emerald Chain and Solar System concepts for the open space network, and move forward with the modified Emerald Chain, which was anchored by the future bicycle/pedestrian bridge over I-5 and that would connect down through Town Center and into Memorial Park.
  - With the transportation network and street grid, community members had stressed the importance of a walkable, pedestrian-friendly, and accessible street network that was still accessible by car to places people currently went to and would continue to go to in the future. A preliminary future street grid was designed which became the Main Street concept that would extend Park Place to create the connection through Town Center which was identified early on as a missing component.
  - From the beginning, community members expressed a desire for more active land uses, as well as a mix of uses, including locations that stayed open passed typical work hours and more vibrant community gathering places. The team had looked at how to address that desire in a manner compatible with current land uses to ensure a harmonious connection to what already existed.
- These building blocks were refined into what became the Community Design Concept, which looked very similar to the current proposal. The Community Design Concept combined the three building blocks and identified subdistricts that included the land uses and types of activities people wanted. The community provided input on land use placement and street grid usability, and refinements were made based on that feedback.
  - Because the community had really connected with the idea of a Main Street, the project team explored what that concept would actually look like and what people would experience when walking down the street. Further details were gathered from the community about what people wanted to specifically see on the Main Street. Activities included providing the type of experiences people could have on the street, such as the two-way bike lane. (Slide 16)
  - With community input and incremental refinements, the project team developed the proposed Town Center Plan and formalized the building blocks into the Land Use Plan, which included the street grid and park system that was very similar to the Community Design Concept. (Slide 18) Included were the Emerald Chain concept that connected Memorial Park to the future pedestrian/bike bridge and a street network with streets that served specific functions.
- The Main Street and local street grid would serve the community by being pedestrian and bicycle friendly with slower vehicle traffic, and Wilsonville Rd and Town Center Loop being utilized to get people through and around Town Center. Figure 3.3 showed how the different street types would work together to create a transportation network that would serve all users. (Slide 20)
  - In addition, a multi-modal network was proposed to facilitate connectivity. In the future, missing pedestrian and bicycle facilities would be added to allow people to come from the pedestrian/bicycle bridge into Town Center while accessing many of the destinations along the way. (Slide 22)
- The project team looked at the types of development that were feasible, along with the available land, to determine what was likely to develop where in Town Center. The market analysis showed what was more likely to develop first due to current marketing conditions and what would likely develop later. Town Center development would be an incremental transformation that would occur over time. She described how the Town Center would develop over time in three phases (Slides 25 through 27):
  - Phase 1 Infill. Development would occur within the next 10 years and consist of development or infill on undeveloped parcels or underutilized parking. The Main Street would be established with development around that area followed by some of the local street network.

- Phase 2 Main Street. Development would occur 10 to 20 years into the future with more amenities such as the pedestrian/bicycle bridge and the network starting to take shape. A greater diversity of development would also be seen, such as offices and more mixed-use buildings.
- Phase 3 Full Build-out. This was likely beyond 20 years when the multi-modal transportation network would be fully built-out with highly active land uses present. All of the tested development types were likely to become feasible.

Alex Dupey, Director of Planning Services, MIG, continued the PowerPoint presentation, reviewing and describing the Implementation Categories for implementing the Town Center Plan, which addressed the short-medium- and long-term strategies that would be adopted with the Town Center Plan and the types of things that would be maintained through the planned development. (Slide 29) He noted the Implementation Category structure the Commission had seen throughout the previous Town Center Plan elements had been maintained, so nothing new was being presented His comments were as follows:

- More than half of the Town Center Plan was dedicated to very specific implementation measures, which included quick wins, things that could be done immediately, as well as longer-term strategies, such as larger infrastructure projects and parking management, that were not necessarily needed presently, but might be needed over time to manage certain aspects of the Town Center as the area developed.
- Regulatory Actions adopted with the Town Center Plan included some immediate changes to the Development Code and Comprehensive Plan, as well as minor changes to the parking requirements within Town Center to provide more flexibility for mixed-use development within the Town Center.
- Short-term Actions. Some big infrastructure pieces were already happening within the City. The pedestrian bridge and gateway was an ongoing project that was already within the existing Capital Facility Plans. Such projects were seen as short-term achievements for Town Center because they were already planned.
  - Most of the short-term projects were easy to implement, such as potential lunch time food trucks or parklet competitions. A great way to rethink parking to some degree, but even more so to generate excitement and synergy among business owners for some of the longer-term strategies and recommendations, such as developing a business association for Town Center, which was a longer-term recommendation. Short-term projects could happen now at a lower cost and while the City could be a part of the process, the projects could also be privately driven. For example, the parklet competition could be done through the Chamber of Commerce or a local businessperson. (Slide 31)
- Mid-/Long-Term Actions. The pedestrian bridge and gateway was an amenity but also a bridge between the different types of projects being implemented, especially, the Main Street and Park Place connection; whether considering the design from Park Place to the north or what the Park Place connection to Wilsonville Rd would look like to complete the Main Street connection. These projects were more expensive and required more planning, as well as more private investment for the adjacent uses.
  - A farmer's market was another piece envisioned for Town Center based on community input. While there was space to accommodate one now, an organization was required for implementation which would take time to develop.
  - Such projects had a three- to six-year timeframe, but although identified as a mid or long-term project, it did not mean it would take that long to accomplish if someone had the energy and ingenuity to do it sooner. As such, the Implementation Strategy timeline should not be viewed as fixed.
- Some of the proposed modifications to the Town Center Plan and Development Code were outcomes based on discussions held at the last Planning Commission meeting, as well as additional input received from City Council.
  - Plan Modifications. There had been discussion at the City Council meeting about how the Urban Forestry Plan applied to Town Center, so a strategy had been added within the implementation to ensure that was organized and coordinated. This was an important piece since trees were a big part of the City and Town Center itself, especially when considering walkable urban development.
    - Discussion was added about parking structures with examples of how other communities had addressed those buildings.

- References to fiber and conduits within streets were added. While Public Works Program was already addressing this, the team wanted to ensure it was formally incorporated into the Plan for implementation when new streets were developed.
- The discussion about private versus public construction costs for infrastructure was refined.
- The Development Code modifications were similar to what was previously seen, but more language was added within the waiver discussion to provide more context.
  - One waiver option was for the provision of art within a public space. Because public art could mean different things, language and guidelines were added regarding the selection of public art, where it would be located, and scale to provide clarity.
  - Floor plate had been a big discussion item with both the Commission and Council. Based on those recommendations, and larger floor plates were provided, as well as one-story buildings, if the waiver process could be met. The waiver process and the floor plate discussion went hand-in-hand.
  - Drive-throughs would be permitted within the Mixed Use (MU) and Commercial Mixed Use (CMU) Zones provided building standards were met, which included all of the building standards within the proposed Development Code and Design Guidelines. Per a discussion with City Council, a condition was added that all of drive-through facilities be clearly demarcated marked to avoid conflicts with pedestrians. Otherwise, all of the design considerations previously discussed would apply to drive-throughs.
  - While these changes to the Code were fairly minor considering the amount of code and design in the Plan, the team wanted to be clear where those changes were made for ease of reference.
- The project team asked that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation to City Council for approval of the Town Center Plan, as well as amendments to the Wilsonville Comprehensive Plan and Development Code.

Chair Greenfield noted that the City had been at this process intensively for the last couple of years, but the idea had been pursued formally since 2014. He was excited to have reached this point.

Commissioner Springall stated he was pleased with the direction of the project. He noted the Commission had discussed the floor plate and drive-through issues during the last couple of work sessions, and he was satisfied with the outcome noted in the Plan.

Commissioner Postma asked for clarification on the waiver process and the waiver criteria that would allow the floor plate to be increased.

- Mr. Dupey responded there were two points of discussion. One regarded whether the number of stories should be required as a part of the Development Code, and the clear response from the Planning Commission was that two stories should be required. However, questions about “what if something else came in” initiated the waiver process. If a one-story building or a building in the CMU area was larger than 50,000 sq ft, should some design requirements or guidelines be put in place to help regulate the floor plate to retain an anchor tenant without the pedestrian impact that a large floor plate or its parking might generate. The waiver process would provide balance and some options to address that issue.
- Ms. Bateschell explained that at the January work session, the project team received direction to do a 30,000 sq ft max floor plate on Main Street and in Neighborhood MU, but near MU and CMU subdistricts the floor plate could exceed 30,000 sq ft on multiple floors.
  - The waiver to the development standards was outlined on Page 13 of the Development Code, which was in Appendix A, and would be reviewed by the Development Review Board (DRB). The Planning Commission had discussed a menu approach, so ten different criteria were created with the idea that the development proposal be consistent with four. She highlighted the waiver criteria described on Page 13 as follows:
    - Exceeding the building design and architectural standards by going above and beyond with innovative building techniques, including green building or getting certifications from LEED or Earth Advantage.

- Architecture that created a distinctive community landmark and exemplified the preferred building materials from the Town Center Plan.
- Public amenities, such as adding plazas and gathering spaces into the building design, addressed community interests.
- Providing public community space.
- Design and place making that went above and beyond the Plan, such as incorporating pedestrian-oriented and creative lighting into the landscape and plazas.
- Buildings with additional supporting storefronts as a part of the ground floor façade, which would provide would be allowed a bigger floor plate. This would facilitate having additional tenants along the front edge of the building.
- Providing incubator space to help support small businesses, which continued to be of interest to the community.
- Installation of public art and provisions were added to the Code regarding what plazas would look like to ensure there was some level of standard.
- Providing affordable housing on the development site as defined in Table 2, Footnote 4, which involved a building height increase.
- All ten menu options would not have to be implemented to obtain the exception, but applicants would have to go above and beyond. The team had tried to reflect the direction received at the last meeting within the options. She confirmed that only four of the options needed to be met to obtain the waiver.

Chair Greenfield noted that he saw many reflections of the intensive work sessions in the proposed Town Center Plan and he believed the Plan had been carefully cultivated and full attention had been given to the input from the Commission.

Chair Greenfield called for public testimony regarding the Town Center Plan.

Garrett H. Stephenson, Attorney, Schwabe Williamson & Wyatt, 1211 SW 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 19, Portland, OR, 97204, stated that he was representing the Doris Marjory Rose Dunn Trust. With him were John and Randall Dunn, co-trustees of the Trust and owners of the property where Shari's Restaurant was located. He wanted to address a few issues with the Plan that may or may not be problems for Shari's going forward, depending on the development timing. He thanked Miranda Bateschell and Kimberly Rybold for meeting with them for one full hour prior to tonight's meeting, adding they were very informative and had talked through some of their concerns. He encouraged the Commission to read the letter he had submitted previously into the record as he would not speak about it during his testimony.

- The biggest issue the Trust had with the Town Center Plan was the proposed transportation improvements. Access and visibility were the two main things a business like Shari's needed to survive and thrive. Overall, the Trust believed that the urban development concept for the area was good and did not object to the Plan as a general matter, but wanted to address two granular issues with the transportation elements of the Plan and how they might affect Shari's Restaurant.
  - At present, Shari's Restaurant benefited from the ability to turn left onto Town Center Lp W from Wilsonville Rd, as well as turn left out of Town Center Lp W back onto Wilsonville Rd. The Trust understood the complexities involved with signal timing and the jurisdictional sharing of control with ODOT within the Interchange Area Management Plan, but was sure the Commission could understand that losing that left turn movement could be a big deal. The proposal to cut off vehicular access on Park Place as a part of the Promenade Project IN.10 combined with the elimination of the left turn, created a problematic mix in terms of the restaurant's exposure and the ability of people to get to it.
  - As such, timing could be either the savior or the downfall of the restaurant. If the timing of those improvements was far enough out to pass the economic life of the building, which was a number of years off, but not 20 or 30 years off, it would probably not be too big of a concern. However, if the improvements were made soon, especially in terms of a new lease negotiation with the Shari's tenant, the Trust had two recommendations for the Commission and Staff to consider.

- First was to consider preserving some level of vehicular access on the portion of Park Place along the east side of Shari's. He noted the location of Shari's Restaurant on a displayed map and stated that once those left turn movements from Wilsonville Rd were eliminated, the Trust wanted to ensure people could easily access Town Center Lp W and locate and access the Shari's without too much trouble. To do so, some level of access from Park Place would be necessary. The Trust understood that would be a promenade concept and believed it was a great idea from an aesthetics standpoint; however, with the signalization that would relocate the left turn lane, drivers would have to try to get through one of the side streets to get to the restaurant. Currently, the most direct way to achieve that was to allow people to continue to turn left and to access the restaurant.
  - The Town Center Plan was forward-thinking in that there was already a concept that could provide that access, namely Local Street Concept Option 3, shown on DKS Exhibit D, which showed the profiles of some of the different local street concepts. Option 3 basically allowed a mix of pedestrian and automobile traffic at that location. He had seen this implemented in a number of other jurisdictions and was a great way to go. It would allow some level of vehicular access but at such a low speed that people could continue to walk and ride bikes without too much concern about conflicts with automobiles.
  - Secondly, if the Option 3 was not pursued, the Trust would like to explore the possibility of phasing the improvements in over time so that the build-out of the promenade and its closure to vehicular traffic was not done completely until the economic life of that Shari's Restaurant was through. That could be accomplished a number of ways, including a development agreement or some other contractual mechanism with the City that would allow the Trust to keep at least some level of vehicular access at that location.
- Having spoken with City Staff, who were very helpful, those were the two main concerns the Trust had at this point. He understood there was some transportation planning yet to be done, but the Trust wanted to get their concerns on record and before the Planning Commission tonight as it made its decision.

Commissioner Springall stated that the Park Place Promenade redesign and Town Center Lp W modifications were in the Implementation Matrix on Page 110 of 233 as Action Numbers IN.8 and IN.10 and were listed as medium and long-term, which seemed consistent to what was being requested by the Trust.

- Ms. Bateshell confirmed that was correct. Those changes, particularly for IN.10, had to occur after other investments in Town Center occurred, especially the extension of Parkway to Wilsonville Rd.
  - The design of Action Number IN.10 would be similar to the Woonerf style local street cross section, which was in Appendix D. The design still needed to be worked on and vehicle charging stations, car share, and bus stops might be incorporated.
  - She confirmed Park Place would have some limited vehicular access in terms of the main routing, but that was touched upon in the Plan/Appendix D and the Woonerf design was listed as the preferred design which left it open for the City to continue that conversation moving forward.

Rebecca Small, Regional Planner, Metro Regional Planning Agency, 600 NE Grant Ave, Portland, OR, 97232, stated that the Town Center Plan was exceptional and one that would serve the community for decades. The best plans gave a city something to be excited about, and a plan that began with a community block party was off to a good start from the beginning. Staff had put together a 20-year plan with public stakeholders and with the public at large that was highly anticipated.

- As a regional land use planning agency, Metro was particularly interested to see the transformation of the area from a more spread out commercial area with under-utilized spaces into a walkable, vibrant space that brought people together, supported the local business community, and that many people would call home. The goals of the proposed Plan were consistent with Metro's Functional Plan and supported the 2040 growth concept of active centers that brought jobs, homes, and green spaces together within areas that were walkable and that supported active transportation.

- As a grantor for the proposed project, Metro was pleased and impressed with where Wilsonville had taken this work and looked forward to working with Wilsonville again on future grants.
- She commended the Planning Staff on what was a truly exceptional public engagement plan that was extensive, creative, thoughtful, and actually fun. It brought youth and families together into the planning process, people that absolutely should be involved in long-range plans as they were the people that would benefit from them the most but were often thought of last in these projects. The team had gone out to schools and coordinated events specifically to bring families and young people together into the planning process, which was appropriate. As this was built out, they would be the ones enjoying the various amenities.
- Metro particularly appreciated the attention to bilingual engagement and the specific efforts the project team made to connect with the Spanish-speaking members of the community. She was certain the Plan represented a shared vision that had come from the people it served.
- She noted that Metro planned to borrow the Planning Staff for an afternoon so Staff could present to the regional government and other regional cities and discuss how they conducted the community engagement process to enable other grant projects overseen by Metro to learn from a very good example.

Chair Greenfield stated this was a very exciting inflection point in Wilsonville's history, one that had been anticipated from the earliest planning stages back in the 1970s. The image of Town Center as originally envisioned had certainly changed over time but many aspects remained. The community was now at a point of maturity that allowed it to think into the next half century and what residents wanted their town to look like going forward. In some ways, it was more fun to start where the city was in 1969 with non-urbanized fields and farms available for initial urban development, but that was certainly not the case today as Wilsonville was a vibrant, well-established city with residences and businesses located in the area proposed for redevelopment. He understood the concern of some as they looked at the map and saw changes that would affect them personally, but he noted Page 4 of the Town Center Plan stated that new development in Town Center would not happen immediately or all at once. Instead, when a land owner wanted to redevelop, the Town Center Plan would guide how the City, developers, land owners, and businesses could support the community's vision for the Town Center.

- Consistent with the way Wilsonville had historically done business, and was still committed to now, no decisions were made which were not sensitive to the impacts on existing properties, owners, and citizens. The City had a process for seeking community input at each step and that would continue on through the more refined planning steps ahead.

Chair Greenfield closed the public hearing at 6:59 pm.

Discussion regarding the waiver criteria referenced language in Section D Waivers to Development Standards on pages 13 & 14 of Appendix A, the Development Code Modifications.

Commissioner Postma said he was a bit confused about how the floor plate discussion turned into the list of waiver criteria, which he had not expected and was curious what other Commissioners thought. He was not opposed to waiver criteria, but in looking at the list he wondered if the possibility for anchor tenancy would be burdensome. He was struggling to wrap his head around public spaces and public amenities within those and was curious about examples as to where that would work and what might qualify. Although only four of the ten criteria needed to be implemented, it might still be difficult to achieve four unless the City was doing something like that public space-wise. He asked what the Commission thought would fulfill some of those waiver requirements.

Commissioner Springall agreed. The waiver list contained big items. Alternatively, the Frog Pond Plan, albeit residential, had very specific, detailed, objective menu options to choose from. The Town Center Plan menu criteria were much more subjective. It would be a challenge for a DRB member to determine if a specific application met one of the criteria. Perhaps some criteria on the menu were necessarily broad, such as public amenities and community meeting spaces, but they were different enough that the Commission should explore how to make it easier to judge in the quasi-judicial format of the DRB.

Commissioner Postma:

- Asked Staff for input on what some of the criteria would look like.
  - Kim Rybold, Associate Planner, stated the team had tried to list out what they had heard from the Commission, and a public meeting space was thrown out at some point. Mr. Dupey began the process of assembling the list and putting it in the Code, and then she and Ms. Bateschell and Senior Planner Daniel Pauly began combing through some of the language to try to develop clear and objective standards. She understood some criteria was broadly defined, but any narrower definition would be dependent upon the ultimate usage of the space. An example of putting in a storefront would be a Starbucks that had its own entrance but was within a Fred Meyer.
    - Staff heard discussion about building architecture but struggled with how to bring forth the idea that something distinctive must be provided to the area without saying high-quality architecture, which was more difficult to define. Staff tried to tie in the materials because there was a specific list of materials the City would like applicants to consider. Some of the ideas were bigger and they were open to suggestions as to how to narrow them down. She believed the bigger concept was to outline what could be provided and what was acceptable for Staff to look at in exchange for granting a waiver to something that was not otherwise allowed.
    - Staff understood from the Commission that an application had to really demonstrate the ability to provide something unique to the community, which was what Staff tried address.
  - Ms. Bateschell recalled discussion around both architecture and design, so the team tried to tie in some of those concepts from the place-making section as well, such as the design of the public space that would be adjacent or a part of the overall site development like the lighting concepts.
    - She also recalled hearing ideas about community benefits, in terms of community space, but also affordable housing or incubator space, so the team tried to incorporate those as options. However, the team was open to modifying those options as well as the number that must be met and sought the Commission's input on those criteria.
- Responded that he was still struggling to understand the language in Criteria 3 and 4 and how those criteria could be met. He was not concerned with the size of the list but rather the use involved. For example, would a public plaza need to be tied to restaurant usage, and what exactly was meant by public community meeting space? Was it interior seating inside and how would that look? If further details could be provided, he might be okay with the language, but currently, he was not sure what they were aiming for.
  - Mr. Dupey replied specifics could be added to the criteria on the list, although some were only broadly defined because, for an interior space, for example, it was difficult to determine a size percentage for an unknown future building. It was important to keep in mind that the waivers were a variance from the Town Center Plan. A public benefit should be derived in some fashion for getting into the waiver process.
    - The project team had heard from the community that places to gather, whether internal or external, were important. With the exception of the library, other community gathering spaces were hard to find although Whole Foods provided a good example as it had some community spaces that were used for classes or events. This menu item was not specific as to square footage, but the team was open to input.
- Clarified he was not seeking specific square footage amounts, but explained the menu criteria ran the danger of being both too vague and too specific at the same time. He did not have a problem with having waiver criteria so much as clarifying what the City was trying to achieve. He reiterated that the language might be sufficient, but first he needed further clarification to determine if the language matched what the Commission wanted to see operating there instead. He noted that class space at Whole Foods was different than the Fred Meyers with a Starbucks and a large seating area. He would feel more comfortable with the language if that were clarified, and noted having the discussion now on record stating what those things were might be sufficient. He asked what the other Commissioners wanted to see.

Chair Greenfield posited the questions regarded what the DRB was granting a waiver from and whether the specifications were clear enough that the DRB could exercise a quasi-judicial function in granting a waiver. He

did not see that yet, but understood this was a very preliminary stage of coding for the entire development. At some point, the Code would become much more specific and the DRB would have specific criteria to use to evaluate applications.

- At this point, a distinction needed to be made in the waiver criteria between the primary use of the facility and the additional public or community functions it would or could serve. Community use functions would be outside the direct business interests of the subject property and therefore, the criteria should allow the property to be larger than originally envisioned to accommodate those functions without reducing the potential of the property to generate business.
  - A business providing a community gathering space might justify additional square footage, which could be an advantage to the development and justify a waiver of the square footage requirement to preserve the ability of the property to generate business, but not preclude the benefits to the community being requested.
- He also was uneasy with the lack of clear and objective standards, but understood the Plan's objectives and general vision were determinative for future DRB review and the basis for seeking a waiver. The problem was whether there should be even more clear and objective standards than currently specified. He disliked raising the issue because he had objected in the past to being bound too closely to clear and objective standards that tied the Commission's hands and limited its ability to exercise more flexible judgment. As a past DRB member, it not having clear and objective standards was uncomfortable, but as a community member and planner, with no room for flexibility to achieve the vision that was laid out, they would have a cut-and-dried community, which he did not want.

Commissioner Hurley said he appreciated Commissioner Postma for raising the issue. As he looked at the menu items, he believed the City was stating that to gain floor area, the applicant must do something extra for the city, a quid pro quo arrangement. However, a price tag was attached to every item. For example, even if a developer were to completely build out Option 1, Innovative Building Techniques or ended up being LEED Certification Building, the materials and amenities would cost X amount more and they would still not meet four criteria, so clear and objective standards were necessary.

Commissioner Postma agreed, they were talking about waivers. He understood that some flexibility should remain for design professionals to work and create within and avoid cookie-cutter type projects, but a waiver did not fulfill that purpose in his opinion. He agreed with Commissioner Hurley that a waiver facilitated a quid pro quo of sorts that required a developer to provide additional amenities in exchange for a larger footprint, but if the Plan was too vague about those amenities were, the Commission would leave the DRB unsure about what to approve. He reiterated that he was unsure whether the menu items fulfilled that requirement or not, but since he was not sure what they were trying to create or achieve, he could not determine whether something was objective enough or not to fulfill the requirements that they were trying to provide for a waiver.

Commissioner Springall said he saw two or three categories of criteria in the list that could basically be the same thing. Criterion 1, Innovative Building Techniques and Criterion 6, regarding LEED certification were both primarily environmental benefit items and could allow a builder to get two points for essentially, one particular piece of effort, which was not necessarily bad. Four criteria of this scale was a pretty big ask. He supported all of the ideas, but requiring that a developer meet four of them was perhaps too much as they were or could be quite substantial. He did not disagree with Commissioner Postma that a meeting space could be a coffee table or a room that could seat 40 people. He imagined more meeting spaces that could seat 40 people would be great but that was not necessarily the outcome when reading the menu items. He remained optimistic that it would not be interpreted as just a coffee table, but as presented, the definitions of the menu items did not preclude that.

- Mr. Dupey replied that a square footage minimum could be added, noting he understood from the Planning Commission that requirement felt like the most nebulous of the menu items. Waiver criteria that the Commission believed were too subjective could be removed because there were clear and objective standards outside of the waiver process and as the process progressed, they became more subjective.
- Ms. Rybold stated in reflecting back on the City's existing waiver process and how it related to the Town Center Plan, she believed the existing criteria were much more nebulous. Presently, the Code section stated,

“We are better implementing the purposes and objectives of the Site Design Review Criteria” some of which were really big ideas. During a waiver request, the applicant had to demonstrate and explain why the proposal would result in a better site design or function.

- When Staff presented a Staff report, they explained what the applicant wanted to accomplish and why and then it was up to the applicant to justify the waiver request. A waiver was really an exception to what was otherwise a clear and objective standard. So in thinking about that, and how waivers were typically approached, the team was trying to be more surgical here because these waivers were being identified for very specific reasons: floor plates and building heights. While some menu items might not achieve a clear and objective dimensional standard, the team had tried to capture what would be received in return, in terms of how it could function better or add value to the project as well as how it would add value to Town Center.
- When evaluating a project,
- Perhaps the list of criteria should be considered from a perspective of what would add the most value, while at the same time being clear enough to give the DRB something to base a decision on, so the DRB could review a proposal and be able to agree that the applicant was offering something that made the project better, so the request for a particular waiver was acceptable. Although she believed a menu selection approach provided more direction than what was currently provided for waivers, she was open to suggestions, but in essence, they were trying to ask what they wanted to get out of it.

Commissioner Hurley suggested thinking of it as a price, because the City was basically saying a developer could not go above a certain height unless they were willing to pay ‘the price’ they could add more floors to their building. He believed that, effectively, a developer should have to do X, with X equaling Y number of feet that could be added. If a developer did Z, it would equal A in terms of height or square feet. X might have three options to it. Z might have three options to it. Based on the current list of criteria, a developer could come in with eight blue water recycling barrels at market cost, put some coffee tables out front, or offer their lunch room as a community meeting space, and technically meet the requirements. As it stood, a developer could scrimp and play the system with Wilsonville not receiving anything in return, or with clear and objective standards, the City could spell out that certain criteria would result in a specific number of square feet maximum added or X amount of stories added maximum. If a developer wanted to add height to a building above what was allowed in the Code, they had to give something back to the City.

Commissioner Mesbah stated that Commissioner Hurley had drawn a very helpful picture, adding that was a typical way to deal with housing height. A cost was created in the planning by limiting the density or height knowing that developers would want more and would have to give something in return to get it. He believed a cost-and-benefit approach to the Town Center Plan made more sense in that with a big floor plate, walkability and coziness was sacrificed; that was the cost. The benefit should negate that somehow. For example, Broadway Coffee in Salem had 3,000 sq ft of public space. There was a coffee shop in the corner with two floors of seating and meeting areas as a part of that highrise development. The remainder of the office building was locked off to random public access and required an access code or invitation. It was truly public space and had created a hub for neighborhood gathering.

- Town Center was not that type of neighborhood. The Task Force that outlined a list of how the Town Center should feel, function, and look like. In his opinion, that should be the criteria. If a project or modification took away from that list of what the community was looking for, then a developer needed to compensate with something else so that it was a cost-benefit approach. It was not a dollar-for-dollar exchange but rather, an amenity-for-amenity exchange. If a developer took away from the coziness in one area of the project, they should provide something that created a cozy gathering environment for the public elsewhere in the space.
- Addressing Commissioner Postma’s statement, he stated that it should not just be a coffee shop that had ten more seats, but truly be a public space that encouraged gathering and community associative kinds of functions. The question was how to word that.

Commissioner Postma noted that Criteria 3, 4, and 7 spoke to what Commissioner Mesbah had talked about. Perhaps as a proposed solution, if some coziness was taken away, those three criteria could compensate back to

reinstitute that coziness. The other criteria were building aspects, such as innovative design techniques, distinctive architectural features, or art, as well as the two outliers of affordable housing and incubator space. He would be more comfortable if developers were required to work within the categories as opposed to providing a certain number of criteria from a list. Mandating that a developer provide interior space for a community purpose but also meet LEED standards could be a large financial ask. He believed some of the architectural pieces could offer a like-for-like amenity exchange but in his opinion, those were distinctive from the other criteria.

Commissioner Mesbah replied that he had zeroed in on the cozy - the center of community gathering, the Hub and Heart of Wilsonville, as that was one of the original goals from the Task Force. Iconic had also come to mind, as Town Center needed to be attractive and bring people in. The phrase 'distinctive architectural design' should have said 'iconic architectural approach' to clarify that it was not just about the use of whatever higher materials had been used elsewhere. He wanted to see an Eiffel Tower in Town Center. As an example, Centennial Park in Chicago had a cube made of glass blocks with neon art inside that reflected different colors and patterns set to music. A piece like that on a smaller scale, in a large enough public plaza area that would attract people and allow them to gather, would be appropriate and compensate for the loss of character of the space if the City allowed a building three times the permitted floor plate size. It would become iconic and bring a sense of place to the Town Center, which was another item the Task Force had identified.

- Affordable housing had come up in early Task Force discussions and residential development in Town Center was requested because they wanted people to own part of the space so it would not become deserted at night, part of which spoke to why the area was being gentrified. There would only be high-cost housing available that not everyone would be able to afford, so part of it had to do with how to bring in affordable units as part of the overall residential development.

Commissioner Postma suggested that it would better fit his vision, and perhaps Commissioner Mesbah's, if the requirement was changed from meeting any four criteria to choosing one of Criteria 3, 4, or 7, which got back to the cozy public amenity piece, or in the alternative, either Item 8 or 10, which provided either a lower cost business opportunity or affordable housing in its place. The developer could also be required to incorporate one of the other design-oriented criteria, such as innovative building techniques or public art. This approach would get some public space back and/or a tradeoff for affordable housing or affordable business space, as well as good design.

Commissioner Mesbah replied that could be done, but he preferred having Staff analyze the adverse impacts of what was being proposed, which would determine the counterweight to what was actually being affected. The idea was to address the adverse impact as opposed to randomly picking criteria from a list.

Commissioner Posta questioned if the adverse impact for Town Center was size.

Commissioner Mesbah responded size could have environmental adverse impacts, traffic adverse impacts, visual or architectural adverse impacts, massing impacts, all of which could be impacted by size.

Commissioner Postma posited that the City would be compensating for size by making some of the large space a public space instead.

Commissioner Mesbah clarified that depending on the proposal, the adverse impact could better direct Staff and DRB to which item would best address the adverse impact resulting from the proposal.

Commissioner Hurley added that in conjunction, how much more the developer was asking for needed to be considered to make a proportionate response in terms of the benefit requested.

Ms. Bateschell clarified there was an existing floor plate size limitation and the waiver process was to request exceeding that limit.

Commissioner Postma understood that if the floor plate limit was exceeded, it needed to be multi-story.

- Ms. Bateschell clarified not in the waivers. A project could exceed 30,000 sq ft on multiple stories in CMU and MU. The waiver process was intended to provide flexibility for the square footage per floor if it was for a good anchor tenant that offered a community benefit in return. The waiver was to offer an exception to the number of floors and to the floor plate size.
  - She confirmed there would be no maximum per se if an applicant went through the waiver process which was why there were additional requirements or options.

Commissioner Mesbah believed he and Commissioner Hurley had agreed with the size beyond the maximum, so the size and scope of impact.

Commissioner Springall added and the style of impact.

Commissioner Postma stated he was on board and asked how that could be implemented.

Commissioner Greenfield asked what the metric of exchange was and how could it be made clear and objective.

Commissioner Mesbah replied the metric of exchange was always the level of impact. The impact from a bigger roof was very clear and once Staff analyzed it, they could determine how much more traffic or stormwater discharge would result from a larger floor plate. An environmental approach could be taken to capture and address that additional stormwater to negate the adverse impact. Traffic was the same. The question was how to address it. Addressing massing and design to make it not as horrendous became more difficult because of the aesthetics and such. Some ideas included breaking it up and creating spaces that allowed for visually segmenting a large block into smaller, personalizable spaces. They would not simply be spaces that were no man's lands.

Commissioner Springall understood the categories the ten criteria might be grouped into could be public space, environmental and mitigation, public or business service through the incubator site and housing. Moving forward with the idea of depending on the style of impact a project would have, by regrouping the criteria, the City could provide a menu of possible things in each of those categories that might be necessary to be waived. There would still be a waiver process but it would more targeted to that particular application commensurate scale and the way the project was exceeding the Code whether by style, massing, or community impact.

Commissioner Mesbah agreed, adding he was counting on Staff's ability to analyze those impacts and provide some measure of qualifying and quantifying it.

- Ms. Rybold believed the challenge was the degree to which these criteria would proportionally mitigate those impacts was not going to be measured the same way. One criterion might have more of a mitigating effect than another might. She did not know how to measure that or to what factor, so the project team was trying to think through that in terms of proportion and how a waiver request was weighted. With stormwater, there was an increased floor plate so more stormwater impacts would be needed, which was no different than what City standards already required, so it was difficult to call that a waiver criteria.
- Ms. Bateschell added criteria that related more on the social side, such as affordable housing and affordable business space, were difficult to measure on an individual project basis. Those were improvements that were over all in a town center, and rents going up were attributable to every development, but were the reasons for some of those benefits. In terms of proportionality and measurement, it would be very difficult to measure a project to that, which brought her back to the coziness. Perhaps, coziness should be the focus of this section of the criteria because that actually linked back to the original issue of size, scale, and its impact on the visual environment.

Commissioner Postma agreed, noting he was going to circle back and advocate for his idea again. The idea was that if a developer was going to build really big, they would need to add back the coziness, but he was willing to trade that off if the developer included either affordable housing or affordable business space. That was why he had suggested requiring a developer requesting a floor plate waiver to either add the coziness back via Criteria 3, 4, or 7 or to include some affordable uses. The developer should also be required to choose a

mitigating construction technique to address the size as well, which innovative building techniques could address. Both issues could be addressed by the City requiring a developer to implement certain criteria in order to mitigate the impact of the proposed building size.

Commissioner Mesbah said he agreed with that approach, but he was concerned that pushing either affordable or cozy would create public housing that was so impersonal due to lack of coziness that it would fail. He believed cozy and affordability must be integrated, not separated.

Commissioner Hurley added that in looping back to the Hub and Heart of Wilsonville, the City should require that affordable housing be located in a housing area and in a separate building with design elements that met the coziness factor as opposed to a floor in a quasi-oversized building with a three-block barren wall.

Mr. Dupey understood that the various buckets, Cozy, Environmental and Design, and Affordable buckets, could be organized, and rather than require that four criteria be met, perhaps one from each bucket had to be met. That would address the cozy quality, as well as the improved architectural or environmental design, while providing more clarity about what some of the criteria meant. As Ms. Rybold said, there were many different scales to menu options, and there should be a benefit if a developer was asking for a waiver process. The question was how to maintain what was in the Plan, while still getting some benefit out of it.

Commissioner Mesbah stated affordability could simply be a goal set by the City for Town Center to have X amount of affordable housing and X amount of innovative commercial units based on the size or mix. All of the variances would contribute fees in lieu that would be used to build architecturally designed affordable housing once the funds were gathered. Affordable housing did not need to be addressing an impact.

Ms. Rybold stated that in terms of buckets, she understood from the discussion that the cozy and the affordable were one or the other. She would caution against making three different buckets because the affordable aspects might be more challenging to a developer, so maybe affordable or contributing a fee in lieu of was a good suggestion. She advised that the Commission clarify if it wanted three distinct buckets or two buckets that needed to be picked from, as well as a requirement to pick something from the design bucket. The number of criteria from each bucket should also be determined.

Commissioner Postma said he believed it was still a two-bucket approach, with one bucket being the cozy and the affordable, because whenever affordable business or housing was developed, lobbies and community spaces were always incorporated into those types of projects or they would not be marketable. He suggested that a developer must provide either Criteria 3, 4, or 7, or Criteria 8 or 10, and also incorporate some mitigating design factors to address the size and scope.

Ms. Bateschell proposed that the criteria be divided into two buckets or menus and that applicants requesting waivers to the Development Standards be required to choose one item from each menu as described:

- Menu One: Addressed creating a sense of place and/or offering some type of affordability community benefit. Choose one item to provide a:
  3. Public amenity, like a plaza.
  4. Community meeting space.
  7. Provision of ground floor facades that include additional supporting storefronts.
  8. Provision of incubator space on site.
  10. Provision of affordable housing on the development site.
- Menu Two: Regarded environmental and design features. Choose one item to create:
  1. Innovative building technique related to environmental features.
  2. Architecture that creates a distinctive or iconic community landmark.
  5. Pedestrian-oriented and creative lighting incorporated into the landscape.
  6. LEED certification, Earth Advantage or another environmental certification.
  9. Install public art consistent with what was outlined.

- She noted Staff received direction from Council that the public art be highly interactive, which spoke to what Commissioner Mesbah had discussed.

The Commission agreed with the suggested language and changes.

Commissioner Mesbah added that the criteria should be thoughtfully approached and not just be a random choice. For example, if a developer proposed a public meeting space, and a public meeting space had just been approved next door for someone else, another was not needed. Perhaps another amenity, such as outside lighting, was needed instead.

Mr. Dupey asked if the Code would require a justification or an exception, such as a Planning Director exception or approval.

Commissioner Mesbah replied he would like to see some assessment by Staff of the impacts and needs; not necessarily a thorough analysis of every detail, but a more general assessment to ensure similar amenities were not too close together.

- Ms. Rybold responded that the language needed to somehow open that door. When requiring developers to pick 4 out of 10 criteria, Staff got pushback if they did not allow an amenity that was already close by because the developer would point out that they were following Code. Language was needed that clarified the developer had to consider adjacent land use, the need, and context.

Commissioner Mesbah responded that was why the Task Force used the word mitigation. Another piece of art as not needed if one was already present; that would not be mitigated.

- Ms. Rybold stated that Staff struggled with having Code that relied on Staff to defend an applicant's request for something different. Staff preferred that the developer have to demonstrate why their choice was suitable and appropriate. When a waiver was taken to the DRB, the developer needed to justify it. She was cautious about shifting the responsibility to Staff to justify what the developer was providing. She suggested adding a statement that said it must be demonstrated that the chosen criteria met an identified need within the Town Center.

Commissioner Postma agreed, noting it was still a waiver. DRB would still need to look at it objectively to determine if a need was met. That language could work well. Coupling that with looking at adjacent uses might be what was needed.

Commissioner Mesbah stated that as the only Commissioner who had not also served on DRB, he was fine with the language Ms. Bateschell had proposed. He confirmed that Staff critiqued waiver requests that went to the DRB, which was all he needed to know.

Commissioner Postma added that more importantly, the DRB critiqued it as well.

Commissioner Greenfield noted Staff certified compliance to existing Code and adopted guidelines.

- Ms. Rybold agreed. Typically with waivers, Staff was more silent about the more subjective nature of the site design review criteria, objectives, and purposes. It got back to that clear demonstration that what the developer was proposing would function better than what was in the Code.

Commissioner Mesbah clarified that as the Director of Environmental Resources, he dealt with quantifiable, not subjective items. He had an analysis of the environmental impacts of a project and that was it. Nobody could poke at that because he was the governmental expert stating the impact. If someone wanted to bring an expert witness who disagreed, that could be debated. It was not subjective, but very objective. He understood Staff did not have the same level of objectivity and he understood Ms. Rybold's discomfort with Staff taking responsibility.

Commissioner Greenfield reiterated that cozy was difficult to objectify.

Commissioner Springall believed that was the second part of the DRB's job. As a quasi-judicial body, the DRB had the ability and responsibility to do site review to assess consistency with surrounding areas and with the Plan. It was a bit more difficult. but that was also why it was a volunteer citizen review board.

Commissioner Postma:

- Contended that it still needed to be objective in that regard because one of the pushbacks he had always provided when he was on the DRB was that it was quasi-judicial, which was where the language Ms. Rybold suggested kind of circled back to the DRB. If both adjacent uses and needs of the Town Center area were being considered, the Commission was giving the DRB the tool to determine whether or not a developer wanted to add a duplicate amenity and then steer the developer to another criteria on the waiver list.
  - Ms. Rybold noted that as the City started getting applications, Staff could track waivers as projects were approved under the Town Center Code.
- Noted that with large floor plates in Town Center, with two approvals it would be too late. There was only one chance at this in Town Center before it would throw the whole project off if the City did not get it right. He would normally agree if it involved a couple of houses, but one 50,000 sq ft project could make the Commission regret what it did.

Ms. Bateschell proposed adding language to the introduction of D. Waivers to Development Standards on page 13 of the Development Code Modifications (Page 123 of 181, Appendix A) as follows:

"...within the MU and C-MU sub-districts, consistent with the provisions of Section 4.118 (.03) if ~~the four (4) of following criteria~~ **one item from each of the two following menus** are met in a manner to clearly go substantially above and beyond code requirements and typical building and site design **to create a sense of place, mitigate negative impacts of the project related to the reason for the waiver, and, based on need in the context of adjacent sites or surrounding area.**

- She confirmed the criteria would be reordered into two lists or buckets as discussed.

Ms. Rybold confirmed Staff could work within the bounds of that language.

Chair Greenfield:

- Asked when more fine-tuned Code would be developed to clarify the sense of place and coziness, which was still a very nebulous concept.
  - Ms. Rybold replied the Streetscape Design Plan was one of the implementation actions she believed spoke to the public realm in between buildings, which got to the cozy. She knew it was not in the immediate term, but perhaps the near term.
  - Ms. Bateschell confirmed it was one of the implementation items Staff wanted to do in the next fiscal year, and they were going through the budget process. The Code before the Commission tonight had a number of elements that were related to the sense of place in terms of pedestrian form, building frontage, scaling, parking location, pedestrian connectivity, the distance between intersections, etc. All of that was integrated into the Town Center Plan to help build that coziness or pedestrian realm throughout Town Center. There was quite a bit of detail in all of the Code edits that had been discussed over the last several months, and the next step was looking at the Streetscape Design Plan and integrating all of those additional elements to ensure the correct identity and feel for Town Center was achieved.
- Asked if Staff had already addressed the fine-grain items, such as façade articulation, as those were the details that would ultimately define cozy architecturally.
- Ms. Bateschell confirmed an entire section on façade treatments was included, as well as a section regarding the awnings, particularly along the Main Street.

**Commissioner Postma moved to approve Resolution LP19-0003 recommending approval of the Wilsonville Town Center Plan and associated Comprehensive Plan Text and Map, Zoning Map, and Development Code**

**Amendments, including the revision to the waiver language as read into the record by the Planning Director. Commissioner Springall seconded the motion.**

(The following revisions were made. Note: added text in bold italic text; deleted language struck through.)

- Add language to the introduction of D. Waivers to Development Standards on page 13 of the Development Code Modifications (Page 123 of 181, Appendix A) as follows:  
“...within the MU and C-MU sub-districts, consistent with the provisions of Section 4.118 (.03) if ~~the four (4) of following criteria~~ **one item from each of the two following menus** are met in a manner to clearly go substantially above and beyond code requirements and typical building and site design **to create a sense of place, mitigate negative impacts of the project related to the reason for the waiver, and, based on need in the context of adjacent sites or surrounding area. [Chair: “or taking account of”]**
- Menu One to include Criteria 3, 4, 7, 8, and 10.
- Menu Two to include Criteria 1, 2, 5, 6, and 9.

**A roll call vote was taken and the motion passed 5 to 0.**

**III. INFORMATIONAL**

A. City Council Action Minutes (February 4 & 21, 2019)

There were no comments.

B. 2019 Planning Commission Work Program

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, noted that City Council was not meeting to do goal setting until April 2019. Staff anticipated that once that process occurred and Staff had a better sense of how the budget was moving forward, some additional projects would get added to the work list and be fleshed out more. Some Town Center implementation items would be coming to the Commission, but Staff was not certain about the timeframe yet. However, the Commission would be seeing some Code work Staff was working on, as well as the Equitable Housing Strategic Plan, which Staff was very excited to be kicking off. She assured the Work Program would get full again. She confirmed the Commission should be meeting in May, but she would keep them informed.

Commissioner Springall congratulated Ms. Bateschell on being promoted to Planning Director.

**IV. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Greenfield 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  
Tami Bergeron, Administrative Assistant-Planning