



PLANNING COMMISSION

WEDNESDAY, MAY 11, 2022

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. Consideration of the April 13, 2022 PC Meeting Minutes



PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

April 13, 2022 at 6:00 PM

City Hall Council Chambers & Remote Video Conferencing

CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

A regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission was held at City Hall beginning at 6:00 p.m. on Wednesday, April 13, 2022. Chair Heberlein called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m., followed by roll call. Those present:

Planning Commission: Ron Heberlein, Jennifer Willard, Kamran Mesbah, Aaron Woods, Breanne Tusinski, Olive Gallagher, and Andrew Karr.

City Staff: Miranda Bateschell, Ryan Adams, Daniel Pauly, and Mandi Simmons.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

COMMUNITY INPUT

This is an opportunity for visitors to address the Planning Commission on items not on the agenda. There was none.

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. Consideration of the March 9, 2022 Planning Commission Minutes

The March 9, 2022 Planning Commission Minutes were accepted as presented.

WORK SESSION

2. Airport Related Comprehensive Plan Amendments (Bateschell)

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, reminded that the project aimed to add policies to the City's Comprehensive Plan, of which the primary purpose was to set the long-range vision, goals, and policies for the City and the land controlled within the city. The proximity of the Aurora Airport to the city meant that the City was an impacted jurisdiction and could participate in planning efforts at the airport, similar to other functions where the City and County participated on projects together and coordinated and collaborated in areas like the Urban and Rural Reserves to protect land or eventually bring land into the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) over a 20- to 50-year time horizon. Adopting comprehensive policies would ensure the City had clear direction when participating in the airport's planning or in ongoing regional coordination efforts and having that policy direction in the City's Comprehensive Plan would enable the City to clearly know its interests and could communicate them

at that table. The last time the airport came before the Planning Commission, the project team was about to conduct outreach, so tonight, the team would provide information from the feedback received and would get input from the Planning Commission on initial draft policies for consideration in the Comprehensive Plan.

Chris Green, Planner, HHPR, presented the Aurora Airport Good-Neighbor Policies via PowerPoint, reviewing the community engagement strategy and the primary issues identified from the feedback received; the five guiding ideas used to develop the draft policies, as well as the draft proposed policies.

- Noting the City's existing Areas of Special Concern A through N where different design guidelines or development policies applied (Slide 10), he presented the proposed new Area of Concern O, describing the four main objectives related to airport compatibility, public facilities and services, environmental resources and community design, and economic development. (Slides 11-15)
- Next steps included the project team presenting the Planning Commission's feedback at City Council's work session on May 2nd. As the draft policies were refined, hearings would also be held with the Planning Commission to review the policies in more detail.
- He reminded the project team sought feedback on the following questions in Staff's memo:
 - Do the draft Comprehensive Plan policies reflect the community input?
 - Are the draft policies consistent with existing policy direction in the Comprehensive Plan?
 - Do the draft policies miss the mark in some way?
 - Are there any key policy objectives missing?

Additional comments and feedback from the Planning Commission were as follows with responses by the project team to Commissioner questions as noted:

- Given the repeated comments from the outreach that the Aurora Airport was not the City's business, providing a brief but comprehensive presentation on why it was the City's business was suggested. Certainly, there was room for collaborative work with the airport that would benefit both parties but that required taking care of the issues that could arise if the City did not plan ahead. The benefits to the city and surrounding airport areas, and how agricultural and preservation goals could be boosted and protected needed to be shown, preferably with infographics rather than written discussions, to quickly share why this project was important, what was important to protect, how collaboration could happen, etc. The detailed analysis could still be available for those wanting to do a deeper dive.
- The public usually only got involved when they were unhappy with something that happened after a project had moved forward, so the involvement was reactive rather than participative. The public should be presented with what-if scenarios about everything that could go wrong, so they could understand that the City was trying to circumvent future problems for Wilsonville citizens by planning ahead.
- The focus should be on the responses regarding noise and potential pollution. A Part 150 Noise Study should be done as well as an environmental impact study for air quality, if one was available.
- Many good comments were provided by Charbonneau residents. Emotion was a factor, as well as actual impacts related to noise, property value concerns, etc. which took precedence.
- Residents did not believe the City was looking at the airport issue from the needs of the residents, although a couple positive comments mentioned the airport's role for emergency use.

- It was important to communicate upfront why the City was involved and that this matter was the City's business to help residents clearly understand why and what the City was doing to find solutions going forward. The Planning Commission's job was to make comprehensive recommendations.
- It was also important to voice the opposing side, the pro-airport side, in terms of what if the airport was not there, was not allowed to expand, or ceased to operate, all of which would be damaging to the community and surrounding area.
- Mr. Green confirmed the proposed draft policies did not contradict Clackamas County's airport-specific policies, adding not much in County's Comprehensive Plan directly addressed Aurora Airport because it was outside the county. Some of the County's policies dealt with airport siting, and there was a policy about coordinating with the City of Wilsonville and the Oregon Department of Aviation, among others, on the Aurora State Airport's planning process. The City's policies would be more specific as far as its interaction with the Airport is concerned.
- Mr. Green confirmed most of Area O was zoned for farmland.
- New Area of Concern O significantly larger than the other areas of concern within the city. If the airport was the concern, did such a large area of concern make sense? All of Wilsonville was impacted by the noise, but why was the area of concern larger than just the airport and the surrounding area?
 - Brad Kilby, Senior Planner, HHPR, responded the Area O would encompass the conical zone. Many conical areas were impacted that included exclusive farm use (EFU) land. Perhaps, Area O should include anything north of the airport towards Wilsonville, but within the same French Prairie area. Transportation was one reason to include the area around the airport. The route to and from I-5, the farm to market and freight routes, could extend beyond the airport. So, when talking about impacts to transportation and farming, it was important to recognize where those impacts would be. The point was well-noted and would be discussed with City Staff.
 - Mr. Green commented the smaller areas of concern were often meant to be regulatory as there were specific design standards for different parts of the city and had a heavy impact in those areas. Area O would have a lighter touch policy wise in how the impacts would be addressed. The City would not be adopting regulatory standards for anything in Area O.
 - Ms. Bateschell added that the existing areas of concern allowed and provided specific language to describe very specific considerations for that specific area and would not apply everywhere. Areas of concern were also used to call an issue to Staff's attention. When reviewing an application or a proposal for an area on the map, Staff would have to look at what was stated in the area of special concern, and whether or not the proposal was consistent, and whether the City wanted to place additional conditions or participate in a process to provide comment to the County on a proposal to ensure the proposal addressed all the items within the special area of concern. Frog Pond West and Coffee Creek used to be areas of special concern, and both have since been dropped from the map once the Zoning and Code elements were adopted. Areas of concern outlined elements the City wanted and provided direction in developing Development Code standards in the future. This explanation might help the project team develop an appropriate area of special concern.
- Mr. Green explained the airport being connected to municipal services came up in a few stakeholder interviews and in previous documents, such as the Oregon Solutions report from two or three years ago where it had been mentioned as a pretty big concern. The connection to Wilsonville was mostly because the airport was in the watershed and that area flowed into the

Willamette River, so the concern was making sure no large-scale industrial use went in without working water, sewer, and storm drainage.

- On whether Marion and Clackamas County regulations would allow development without those services, Mr. Green replied there were different ways such facilities could access services, such as being annexed into a city. The City of Wilsonville would decide whether to support such a facility.
 - Mr. Kilby added capacity was another issue. If the facility was within certain distance of a municipal water and sewer system and had a failing septic system, for example, that could not handle the affluent with no good options for replacement, such as if located on EFU-zoned land, it should be connected to urban services. The City was just supporting the connection of the airport to urban services in the future, but not from the City of Wilsonville. Portions of the airport were in Clackamas County, but he did not know if they were outside of the UGB. The City could not extend urban services outside of the UGB, and it was probably in the City's plan that Wilsonville could not extend urban services outside of the city limits.
- In Airport Compatibility Objective 2a, the phrase "*improve safety for air traffic over the city*" did not make sense as written and needing rewording. (Page 53 of 110 meeting packet) The City would not add FAA registered flight patterns in the Comprehensive Plan to improve flight patterns and aircraft safety over the city.
 - Mr. Green agreed, noting the policy had come from another city.
 - Mr. Kilby added perhaps it should not be policy, but just recognize concerns were raised about safety within the community, and then discuss how that was generally regulated by the FAA and not local government.
- Additionally, the phrase "*protect the interests of Area O residents living near airports*" should be reworded to encompass protecting the interests of the entire city. Noise-specific policies, for example, would fit as larger citywide policies.
 - A 10-degree line in both directions from the center line of the airport would be the area with the most incoming and outgoing airport traffic, especially on straight in traffic, and that area covered most of Wilsonville.
- It was important that the City recognized that Wilsonville had been built on farmland and did not take a stance that it was okay for the City to build on farmland and no one else. With regards to development and concerns about traffic, farmland mitigation, pollution, etc., the City was addressing all those things within Wilsonville, so others should not be forced to do something differently than the City.
- Mr. Green clarified the eastern boundary of Area O was jagged because it followed the river, which was the county line. Property boundaries or roads could be used to have a straighter boundary.
- There had been discussion that developing Area O would not be allowed because it was outside the UGB; however, under a different political scenario with pressure to annex the area between Aurora and Wilsonville, it would be in the City's best interest to annex and develop the area. Wilsonville already extended on the south side of the river and any growth or extension of services would be expensive and the larger the contribution from future development, the lower the cost to the community.
- Area O was in danger of future urban development. In 50 years, the area could be intense urban development with everything normally adjacent to airports and commercial/industrial development. Area O needed to be part of the City's strategic long-range development plans.

- With that in mind, the river was a logical boundary, although an urban green space buffer should be added because Pudding River flooded yearly and there would be a lot of floodplain that was undevelopable.

Responses to the project team's questions were as follows:

- Do the draft Comprehensive Plan policies reflect the community input?
 - The draft policies unequivocally reflected a broad spectrum of the community's input because all of the comments, including those that were open-ended, had been taken into consideration.
 - In looking at how the draft policies addressed the five areas of the survey, which were noise and pollution; surface transportation; fire, safety, and emergency management; environmental pollution and encroachment; and the urban growth boundary connection, not a lot was included about surface transportation, which was only mentioned in the economic development objectives. Nothing was included about congestion or the highway, so some policy additions were needed to strengthen the transportation aspect.
 - There had been talk of positive management, but there were no policies about protecting farmland. "Support mutually beneficial relationships between agricultural use in French Prairie and aviation." was cited, but strong policies were needed about protecting farmland in addition to the rural reserves.
- While the draft policies reflected the majority of the community input, the large amount of feedback from people with airport related interests was not well shown. Generally, those with the most at risk provide comments, which could be a larger overall percentage than the actual population.
 - It would be good to understand what percentage of Wilsonville residents have a direct connection to the airport to make sure the draft policies aligned with community input. The draft policies would not be aligned with the citizen input if 25 percent of the city was airport oriented.
 - Mr. Kilby sought clarification on how to gather that kind of data. He agreed most of those who would respond would be people that may or may not be negatively impacted by the airport. The stakeholder outreach included larger employers that might benefit from the airport, and the team's findings indicated that the majority of the people and businesses at the airport today were the ones that benefited most from the airport.
 - Using information gleaned from previous surveys around employment or other matters could be helpful. It seemed like 25 percent having an airport connection was higher than what was expected to be real. How high or inflated was that number? If the percentage was only 20 percent, the City would want to view the policy discussion from a different perspective.
 - Mr. Kilby added 100 people was a very small sample for a community as large as Wilsonville.

Commissioner Woods believed the draft policies were consistent with existing policy direction in the Comprehensive Plan, though some things could be missing. As far as whether the draft policies missed the mark in some way, he would want clarification about the phrase "missing the mark." Due to the in-depth nature of the topic, it was possible that some policy objectives were missing, but he believed the key policy objectives had been included.

3. Frog Pond East and South Master Plan (Pauly)

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, noted the City was working on master planning the next great neighborhoods for the city and planning for additional, much needed residential growth. The Frog Pond Area Plan was being reviewed, as well as the policies put in place when it was adopted. Also being incorporated were new policy direction that had occurred in the last few years with the City's Equitable Housing Strategic Plan, State House Bill 2001, and world changes currently affecting retail and commercial uses. The Frog Pond Master Plan project continued to make great progress and was still on schedule, and tonight's presentation would be on overall neighborhood design concepts and how that related to existing development, the new neighborhood commercial area, and options for how the neighborhoods might build out over time.

Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager, introduced the project team, noting tonight's discussion was a continuation from the February work session as the team sought decisions and directions about the neighborhood commercial center and recommended design concepts. Other project updates would also be provided.

Sam Brookham, Leland Consulting Group (LCG), presented the neighborhood commercial center via PowerPoint, reviewing the background, case studies, market factors, forecasting, and developer feedback that led to the commercial center's location and recommended development program.

Discussion and feedback from the Commission on the neighborhood commercial center, its commercial node and implementation, was as follows with responses by the project team to Commissioner questions as noted:

- Brisband St was a good location because the main street look and feel would blend from Stafford Rd into a residential area more smoothly. The idea of a high-density residential surrounding the commercial development was good as previously discussed and would be similar to the Northwest Crossing development in Bend which had apartments nearby.
- What impact would the proposed Town Center rework have on any commercial development in the Frog Pond area? Considering the potential physical road barriers, perhaps more houses, residents, and spending dollars were being included in the analysis than should be. How would that impact the total acreage and square footage needed? While the UGB could extend north of Frog Pond by 2035 and beyond, people had to be there to build the commercial node. What was the timing for constructing the commercial center?
 - Mr. Brookham replied the trade area did not include the Wilsonville Town Center as the commercial center was neighborhood-to-neighborhood serving. There would be a lot of crossover, but not necessarily cannibalization. The project team only assumed 12 to 22 percent of demand created by the 4,000 households within the one-mile trade area would make up the majority of the customer base for Frog Pond. There was a conservative level that would not be impacted by the Town Center in such a way to greatly impact what was feasible in Frog Pond.
 - There was not a lot of difference between the recommended 4-acre program and 3- or 5-acre programs. It did not take a lot of households to support 30,000 sq ft of retail. Whether a developer would take on the 30,000 sq ft program was another question, but the only change would be the timeline; it could be 2035, or 2040. Northwest Crossing was considered a successful case study now, but it was still developing decades after the residential program was built. It all came back to flexibility.
 - An interested master developer would mitigate some of the risk, and the City could mitigate some risk by planning for much more density surrounding the project as mentioned. The

customer base could be created. He had talked to a number of developers who preferred walk-to traffic than drive-by traffic because a greater percentage of spending was captured. Ultimately, there was a lot of flexibility in the recommended program and no huge impact was expected from the Town Center.

- The project size, tenant mix, and location as described felt natural and organic based on some of the more modern developments, but a smaller project size would be preferred due to the difficulties in filling spaces, which often took years to fully develop. With the COVID-19 pandemic, the commercial real estate market was changing and was very dynamic, so opting for more housing and less commercial might be the right balance. Therefore, a partnership with a master developer cohort would be ideal because they would have better insight about future forecasts.
- The commercial opportunity in the project area was good because of the types of housing that would be developed, the walkability, and the proximity to Frog Pond West, East, and South as well as existing developments like Arbor Trail, Wilsonville Meadows, etc. and potential future development.
- Initially, the Advance/Stafford Rd intersection seemed best, the team's chart stated it was the most developer-friendly option and likely to be developed the quickest, but according to the analysis, the Brisband St option was the most balanced as it was market-driven. The traffic piece was also important once the Frog Pond residential area was complete.
 - The Brisband St option would have the most parking and more walkability. There was also potential to have a community type center for meetings in that part of Wilsonville, which would be a totally new area, even though there were potential challenges with the parking configuration and the potential need of more development subsidies. Long term, there was also potential for developing the mixed-use program.
 - It was not a 'build it and they will come'; having the commercial center would give residents an opportunity to feel that they had something of their own. Uncertainties connected with the commercial center would work themselves out in time and with the developers.
- The idea of the main street off Brisband St was better than the initial corner discussed previously. Having a smaller project size was also preferred.
- Initially, the commercial center was to be more convenience-based and less of a destination, with a coffee shop, small market, or pharmacy; for example, something one could walk to or stop by going in or out of the neighborhood, not a place where one would do their big shopping.
 - Having a main street felt a lot more organic and a lot more like a neighborhood, a place someone would want to live, as opposed to right next to a big shopping center, especially if it was higher density.
 - The project was going in the right direction and partnering with a master developer would help a lot.
- The Commission/City should not lose track of the fact that this was about quality-of-life planning. Was the Commission planning a suburban community where a car was required no matter what one needed or a neighborhood to make it easy for people to converge and enjoy their own neighborhood?
- The corner idea was never liked because a shopping center would be at the corner and would not have aged well, according to the analysis. The Brisband St option was good idea, and the thorough analysis and all the comparisons were appreciated.

- Urban activity centers were not being designed as part of town centers. The commercial center in Villebois had the square in front of it, which had some activity, like a coffee cart, and the Villebois green space was adjacent to it as well.
 - Parks and green spaces were too segregated from commercial centers, and they needed to be combined when looking at the quality of life and gathering spaces. Atlanta used its green space planning as an economic development vehicle because job and business opportunities were being created around green spaces. A high-density neighborhood center should be coupled with some green space to have a commercial center and a gathering place, like a piazza in Italy; a space where people want to hang out, and consequently, the surrounding commercial uses would prosper.
 - Could a park and open space area be coupled with the new neighborhood center proposed at the end of Brisband St? In the neighborhood plan, the neighborhood park was way south of Advance Rd and not near the project area, and the project area did not have a natural connection to the Grange, which was not far. Coupling these areas would result in a more creative and critical mass of activity that would benefit the commercial while creating gathering places and improve quality of life spaces.
- The concept of aiming small in terms of the project space seemed like a safer bet. The concept and potential for tying everything together to create more of a destination was an intriguing idea, but how that could be done effectively was uncertain, especially with a busy road bisecting the area. How could it be made safe so both sides could go there?
 - Brisband St was a good location, but it was surprising that the recommendation was not at the corner given the traffic counts and the much higher visibility expected at the intersection.
 - Mr. Brookham noted at the corner, given drivers' visibility on Advance Rd, east of Stafford Rd, the average daily traffic (ADT) drops off, so visibility was not that much more. In fact, the Brisband location got more visibility and more access versus the corner with the added walkshed and potential walkability, maximizing the number of cars and drive-by traffic, and visibility from the new households in Frog Pond East.
 - The project team was asked to emphasize that information in the City Council's presentation, because intuitively, Brisband St did not seem to be the higher, more viable area.
 - The proposed area would have much better visibility, depending on how it was designed. The area could open up to Stafford Rd, as opposed to its back to Stafford Rd, and could be a gateway into the neighborhood as a town center/commercial type of attraction.
- If a master developer was better equipped to do the project, the Planning Commission should push for it, and if not, the City should do the development, which was the alternative in the report, because otherwise, this precious opportunity would probably not be realized.
- If the City did the development, this open park area could start as an open space or gathering area that would be developed in the future. If there was no master developer, it would give developers a chance to build out the other residential areas, and then 10 to 15 years later, the City could build the commercial center because the houses to warrant a commercial space would exist. The City might have more acreage to work with and the size of the commercial space could then be determined by a more accurate study of the actual surrounding homes.

Mr. Pauly said he appreciated the Planning Commission's comments, adding that the project team was contemplating the possibility of a neighborhood park as a placemaking element. It might too early to know the feasibility of the park, but the Grange might have to move because of road improvements, so

there were some possibilities to explore. He noted the remaining presentation would build on previous discussions about commercial and housing, and quickly touching on other important concepts.

Mr. Pauly and Joe Dills, Senior Project Manager, MIG | APG, continued the PowerPoint presentation reviewing the recommended community design concepts, which focused on the character of the site, not the number of units per acre. The concepts reviewed included housing variety, affordable housing, and a form-based design integrated throughout Frog Pond East and South, as well as a focus on unique elements and destinations within the site, connecting destinations, and multi-modal connectivity. Three design concept options were presented for the neighborhood commercial center, as well as design concepts regarding the BPA Easement Corridor, the Grange site, and the use of subdistricts. As the project team moved to the next phase of outreach with the community, input was sought about any areas of concern or specific comments from the Commission.

Discussion and feedback from the Planning Commission were as follows, with responses by the project team to Commissioner questions as noted:

- Andrew Parish, MIG | APG, confirmed via Zoom chat that according to Metro's maps, the Rural Edge was a combination of Rural Reserve and "Undesignated" - so, not Urban Growth Reserve. Urban reserve areas were to the north.
- The project was headed in the right direction, the areas of concern were discussed earlier, and the design concepts looked good, as well as the connectedness, walkability, and opportunities the project team had mentioned.
- Mr. Dills confirmed regional, high-powered transmission lines ran through the BPA easement. He was not the best expert to speak to any concerns or issues regarding safety, etc. when working under the high-powered lines, but over the years he had heard research about the buzzing noise, which could be heard and was a bit of a concern, but he could not comment on any electromagnetic health problems. He noted it was very common throughout the Portland region that recreational uses and trails were part of the power line corridors, and he had not yet worked on a concept plan that did not have them running through. Other more passive components, like stormwater retention, would be at the low concern end of the spectrum, relative to the power lines.
- Being able to use the easement provided flexibility for people to have community gardens, etc. and more information was requested about any safety concerns or issues when under the power lines.
 - The BPA had did not allow uncontrolled growth beneath the power lines and there were no foreseeable problems for parks and maintained spaces. The easement would be great for a park area and walking trails.
- More information was wanted about the Grange and how it would be affected.
 - If widening the road impacted the building, could the building be pushed back, but still left in the same general vicinity? If the current location was not the original, historic location, then moving the Grange to a more convenient location was not a problem.
 - Mr. Pauly confirmed the Planning Commission was open to comments from the property owner of both large properties in Frog Pond East, who was in attendance.
- Integrating walking and the park was spot on. Concerns were expressed about the power lines and cancer clusters, so any health issues around power lines should be explored before developing underneath them. Understanding the scientific consensus around any potential impacts would be good.

- The more curving road structure of Option 1 seemed to be a more efficient use of the space. Integrated that option with the commercial node in the center would be a good combination.

Sparkle Anderson, Frog Pond East property owner, stated there had been a one-room schoolhouse on the current site of Grange Hall, and the Grange met in the attic for years. When the current building was built, she believed in the 1930s, the school was moved down the road and it become an extension building, so the existing Grange was the new building at the old site. She suggested pushing the Grange building back a bit off the road.

Staff confirmed there were no further public comments and noted the project team would return before the Commission in June with more on the Frog Pond East and South Master Plan.

INFORMATIONAL

4. City Council Action Minutes (March 7 & 21, 2022) (No staff presentation)

There were no comments.

5. 2022 PC Work Program (No staff presentation)

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, introduced Mandi Simmons as the Planning Division's new administrative assistant, noting she would be supporting the Planning Division and by extension, the Planning Commission. Ms. Simmons had a great background in senior administrative work and in teamwork as a Division I athlete in Michigan.

The Commissioners welcomed Ms. Simmons.

Ms. Bateschell confirmed the May meeting would remain virtual until the lobby construction was complete. The projected completion time of early May had been delayed by supply chain issues, and the City hoped to have construction complete in early June. An in-person meeting would likely be held in July to allow for sufficient notification time.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Heberlein adjourned the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 8:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

By Paula Pinyerd of ABC Transcription Services, LLC. for
Mandi Simmons, Planning Administrative Assistant