



# PLANNING COMMISSION

## WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 10, 2021

### **I. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

A. Consideration of the October 13, 2021 PC Meeting Minutes

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 13, 2021  
6:00 P.M.**

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

**Minutes**

---

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

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

Planning Commission: Olive Gallagher, Jerry Greenfield, Ron Heberlein, Kamran Mesbah, Breanne Tusinski, and Jennifer Willard. Aaron Woods was absent.

City Staff: Miranda Bateschell, Daniel Pauly, Ryan Adams, Kimberly Rybold, and Kerry Rappold.

**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 September 8, 2021 Planning Commission minutes  
The September 8, 2021 Planning Commission minutes were accepted as presented.

**II. WORK SESSION**

A. Urban Forest Management Plan (Rappold)

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, noted the Urban Forest Management Plan (UFMP) was presented to the Commission in September for a work session. The project team was back this evening with a full draft of the Plan for adoption in the near future. The UFMP was important for the City which had long supported a strong urban forest and had been a Tree City for more than 26 years. The City continued to value trees in long-range planning, as well as site planning, and tried to preserve as many trees as possible and plant more where possible. With climate change and the recent ice storm in the City of Wilsonville, the urban forest was becoming increasingly more important, and the project had been extended to allow the project team to look into and provide more specific recommendations to the City for the long-term future. The team was excited to present the Plan tonight and to walk through some of its key recommendations.

Kerry Rappold, Natural Resources Manager, stated this was an opportunity to look at the updated draft UFMP following input from the September Commission work session. He reviewed the history and timeline of the project to date as follows:

- The project kicked off back in May of 2020, and one of the most important steps initially was to do the updated or additional tree inventory for Charbonneau and Town Center. Those trees were incorporated into the 2018 Street Tree Inventory and the most updated inventory from 2021.
- A lot of research and information gathered between July and September was reflected in a research summary, and much of that information was included in the draft UFMP. Two surveys and two workshops were done in the fall with specific outreach to Town Center and Charbonneau with a pretty good

attendance. About 90 people participating in the survey with others providing some input after the workshop presentation. The photo contest had good participation, and some of the photos, especially the prizewinners, had ended up in the Plan.

- The drafting of the Plan was completed in early 2021, but in February, the city had the winter storm event resulting in significant damage to the trees within the community. The City hired two interns in the Public Works Department who spent considerable time going through every street tree in the community to update and add trees to the 2018 inventory. That updated tree inventory was released at the end of August and allowed the project team the opportunity to look at and incorporate the results into the draft UFMP.
- As outlined in September, the tree equity score had also been incorporated into the Plan providing the project team an opportunity to look at what was being done nationwide with the American Forest organization. The tree equity score was considered a starting point in identifying an overall tree canopy goal and the number of trees that should be planted over the next 30 years. Updating the UFMP with a more detailed, high-resolution type of an analysis was expected, and was included as an action within the UFMP. Being able to bring all that updated information into the UFMP was important, which was why the schedule to present to the Planning Commission and ultimately, City Council, changed from spring to a fall.
- Based on the Commission's input tonight, the UFMP would be presented for a public hearing at the November Commission meeting, in hopes that the UFMP would be full adopted by the end of the year.

Chris Peiffer, Project Manager, PlanIt GEO, noted the project updates made based on the feedback and recommendations of the Planning Commission as follows:

- Neighborhood scale planning and canopy goal setting were included, which would be driven by the high resolution canopy assessment mentioned by Mr. Rappold.
- Appropriate tree species were integrated to draft Recommended Tree List allowing selections to be made in relation to diversity and climate change impacts, trees that were less of a nuisance or that had fewer recurring issues with clearance. Other strategies and guidance were also provided in the Plan.
- Funding mechanisms drafted for the Plan were also considered with regard to funding a canopy goal. Given the tree equity score, a cost would be involved with increasing the tree canopy that included the initial planting as well as maintenance. Large scale planting efforts were already underway with about 1,000 seedling plugs being planted in a park.
- Comments and concerns about permitting requirements were also addressed, as well as the outreach and education needed for multiple sectors of the city, including HOAs, developers, business owners, and residents.
- He presented the draft UFMP via PowerPoint, reviewing the project timeline, Plan highlights, the urban forest vision and goals, and the actions to support those goals, as well as next steps.

Mr. Rappold added that a notice for the public hearing in November would be sent to every address within the community. The project team would be working through any comments provided by the Commission tonight to move the project forward to the Commission's next meeting.

Discussion and feedback from the Planning Commission on the UFMP was as follows with responses by the project team to Commissioner questions as noted:

- The tree equity score for Charbonneau was surprisingly low. Did the equity score look purely at tree canopy rather than accounting for the huge green space of the golf course?
  - Mr. Peiffer noted the tree equity score consisted of a variety of criteria, which included canopy cover, population density, income, employment, surface temperature, race, age, and health. He did not know the full demographics of the area, but believed canopy cover was one of the main drivers for the lower score.
  - Health might have been a factor as well, because the population of Charbonneau was up there in age. Equity scores typically showed gaps. Charbonneau was one of the greener neighborhoods in the

city with the golf course and the relatively affluent population. It was not expected to need help to boost its equity stature. A detailed analysis would outline the proposed number of trees to be added to Charbonneau, but trees that should potentially be going to neighborhoods truly underserved with tree cover should not be put in a golf course community with plenty of green space already just because an equity score number was an anomaly. Any detailed analysis needed to zero-in on the actual need.

- Mr. Rappold noted a critical piece moving forward would be a continuation of the winter storm response team was working with Friends of Trees to look at the neighborhood data separate from the Street Tree Inventory assessment, so a number of potential resources would be considered as far as where to plant trees, and the team wanted to be cautious and make the best decisions about that. While some refinement was needed, the tree equity score was a starting point that provided an opportunity for benchmarking in something comparative across the nation. That score would be a key piece with the Urban Forestry working group in making decisions about future planting projects with the Neighborhood Street Tree Program. Work had started with the Parks Department where the department would be doing plantings into the future. One plan was for 1,000 plugs to be planted in Memorial Park. As a Staff person, he was responsible for the City's compliance with the Clean Water Act and the NPDES requirements for stormwater management. The Temperature Implementation Plan was a part of that compliance work that looked at planting trees for the shade they provided. A number of pieces could fit into the tree equity score moving forward and discussions would take place in terms of which areas to target within the community.
- Some of the trees shown for Charbonneau in the future were replacing the aging oak trees.
- Some trees had been damaged in the ice storm and needed help, but were not getting it. Was the care and condition of all trees in Wilsonville, including those on private property, the City's concern?
- Mr. Rappold noted at this point, the data being worked from was the Street Tree Inventory and the data added from the City's inventory of Charbonneau and Town Center. Clearly, a lot more trees in the community had not been inventoried, but then there were the goals and actions of the Plan, so a lot came back to educating and working with the community with regard to its knowledge and what to be aware of, which could bring the potential of creating a manual in the future. The community would still have a significant responsibility for private trees.
- Many private trees and properties were not cared for by the owners, but by maintenance crews who did not know what they were doing. Damage was being done, or things were not being done properly to protect the trees from another storm, for example, which was a grave concern.
  - Mr. Rappold agreed to have a conversation with Commissioner Gallagher to get her specific input and concerns. The Planning Division dealt with a lot of the tree issues within the community, and coordinating and working with the HOAs would be important because many of the HOAs were responsible for the landscape companies or the arborists that came through their communities. HOAs needed to be aware of what they needed to know and to convey that information for those they hired.
- Someone looking at the UFMP might conclude that the City was only concerned about the two focus areas. If read carefully, much of the Plan had to do with the city outside of the two focus areas, but the Plan should make explicit that the focus areas were pro tem and that the Plan itself was subject to ongoing updating. In future iterations of the UFMP, other areas would likely be brought into focus for attention as Wilsonville was more than the two focus areas.
  - Mr. Rappold replied he could not speak specifically to what areas those might be, but most master plans or plans with a citywide perspective got updated. The reason Charbonneau and Town Center came to the fore was due to so many issues with the Red Oak population along French Prairie Rd. A deeper dive had been needed to understand the issues and come up with some proposed actions. Town Center was driven by all the planning work that had been done, the potential for significant redevelopment, and the need to protect the best of the trees that were there. The team could make it clear in the Plan that these areas were the focus at one point in time, but that did not mean other areas in the city were not as important to consider.

- When looking at the canopy, there was no distinction in the percentages between what was city- versus private-owned.
  - Mr. Peiffer noted the finer-scale analysis with the tree canopy assessment would give that information; however that information was not available through the tree equity score tool. Generally, the assessments found that private property contained the most tree canopy, as well as the most available planting space for new trees, which emphasized the need for outreach and education.
- The relationship between private and public canopy was crucially important, and where the responsibility fell was not well-defined or understood. The City's responsibility or authority regarding the canopy that was privately owned had to do with HOAs, private property owners, and businesses, for example. The plans for developing the former Xerox property across Canyon Creek Rd were encouraging in that a great deal of mitigation would occur with a planned park, in effect, replacing both storm and non-storm damage loss of trees to make way for the landscaping plans. The area currently occupied by the Xerox campus was a major part of Wilsonville's tree canopy and it was changing. What was the City's responsibility and role in that planning and in other future developments involving the existing tree canopy?
  - Mr. Rappold noted that the Development Code and Tree Protection Code came into play with private sites like a corporate campus like Xerox, or industrial, commercial, or residential land. The threshold started with trees that had a 6-inch or greater diameter. If the trees were below 6 inches in diameter, they might be protected in other ways on the site, such as if they were already within a conservation easement or part of a natural area protected within the Significant Resource Overlay Zone (SROZ). Each development project was a balancing act between the potential to grow and develop the site, but also to protect what already existed. Every site had a specific discussion that took place as part of the land use process which involved a number of people. The City looked to preserve where possible and push back, especially with the more significant trees like oaks and pines, but other competing objectives had to be weighed. Education played an important role and he believed more needed to be done. The Plan looked to do more education in terms of working with the HOAs and individual property owners, and providing information to make their roles and responsibilities clear.
    - He confirmed any manual created would cover what people should know about their own trees and also provide greater clarification about their responsibilities, as well as what they could do to have a healthier tree population, which would benefit everyone.
  - Mr. Peiffer added that the canopy goal provided the overarching message of sustaining and enhancing tree canopy, as well as the future benefits of an increased canopy, which helped with the messaging of preserving trees. As a side study while doing the research, the team provided some recommended changes to policy guidelines and specifications due to areas of inconsistencies or places that needed strengthening to support canopy goals and tree preservation.
    - In Appendices B and C of the UFMP, more guidance was provided on how to refine the canopy goals, as well as how to refine priority planting areas. Rather than just looking at the census block groups with low or high equity scores, the Plan looked at drilling down to a land use and zoning type level because land use and zoning had different hurdles, resources, and challenges. Other criteria were also included in the prioritization.
    - The tree planting goal was a City/public partnership, and as outlined in the appendices, the initial recommendation was that the City should lead 60 percent of the tree plantings per year and for the overall planning horizon. The remaining 40 percent of tree plantings should be picked up by the partners and residents.
- Mr. Rappold confirmed that the Tree Protection Code specifically referenced the 6-inch diameter at breast height (DBH). Anything 6 inches or greater at that height required a tree removal permit from the City. Of the different types of permits, some had a simpler process and some were more involved, such as for trees within the SROZ.

- He confirmed trees in an HOA commons area would be dealt with by the HOA, but trees on private property were the responsibility of the owner.
- Community engagement and educating the public would be the key to the success of all of this effort. A new person coming into the city or even a resident of 30 years would not know City approval was needed to remove a tree with a 6-inch DBH without being educated. Many trees were probably removed improperly because people did not know about the requirement.
  - Mr. Rappold agreed. He noted one finding from the updated Street Tree Inventory was that most of the lost trees with stumps might have been related to the winter storm. Lost trees with no stumps likely came out prior to the winter storm. People needed to be educated on what was and was not allowed.
- Given the size of the UFMP, moving forward identifying the changes made from prior versions would be helpful for future reviews.

Mr. Rappold noted the team appreciated the Commission's input, which would be reflected in the final UFMP presented at the public hearing in November. He added the UFMP would go to City Council for a work session before the Planning Commission meeting, and the team would make the Commission aware of the input received from City Council.

#### B. Frog Pond East and South Master Plan (Pauly)

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, noted the Frog Pond Area Plan was very familiar for some Commissioners and a bit newer for others. The Area Plan was adopted in 2015 and consisted basically of three neighborhoods, Frog Pond West, East, and South, as one larger community and area plan. Frog Pond West was already in the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) and its Master Plan was adopted in 2017 and that was the area of Frog Pond that was developing today. In 2018, Frog Pond East and South were added to the UGB and those areas would be the focus master planning over the next year plus. A lot of conversation would occur about the prior area planning, as well as the future planning for these areas, as things had changed at both the State and City levels, which the project team would talk more about. Consistency with the Area Plan would be maintained, as well as for what was envisioned for those neighborhoods moving into the future housing growth for the city. Launching this project and coming full circle while integrating changes evolving at the State and local levels was exciting. She noted the project team was doing exciting housing work for the City, having rolled straight from Middle Housing into Frog Pond East and South, which would have more middle housing. The second reading for Middle Housing was coming up on Monday night at City Council.

Daniel Pauly, Planning Director, and project team members, Joe Dills and Andrew Parish from Angelo Planning Group (APG) presented the Frog Pond East and South Master Plan via PowerPoint, noting Metro required that the Master Plan be adopted within four years of the UGB expansion, which was 2022. The team highlighted the Frog Pond planning timeline and Frog Pond Area Plan, as well as the key regulations and trends. The components of the Frog Pond East and South Master Plan were outlined, along with the similarities and what differed from past planning efforts, which had been also been presented in various outreach meetings. The public outreach process and schedule for the master planning process were also reviewed. Key additional comments were as follows:

- A background and regulatory research memo was included in the packet that highlighted the background, context, emerging topics and research of the project. These memos were generally prepared by consultant teams to make sure the salient issues were correct. The project team sought feedback from the Commission on whether any other Wilsonville planning efforts or other emerging trends should be addressed early on.
- Public engagement would be different this time with the use of Zoom and the potential combination of online and in-person meetings. The team would update the Commission about how the public process would work.
- The topic of infrastructure funding was of statewide interest for Frog Pond East and South because it was one of the first area plans to be undertaken with the new middle housing rules. The State was interested in learning how cities needed to plan infrastructure if more middle housing was allowed, so infrastructure would be a big topic for the planning work in the next year.

Comments, as well as feedback on key discussion items, from the Commission were as follow with responses by Staff to Commissioner questions as noted:

- While the 2015 Area Plan did not have a regulatory or statutory standing, the Plan did have understandings embedded that were quite important in the community at that time. The work done was discussed in the community with a workable understanding about how the future would roll out in Frog Pond East and South, and the City had an obligation to remain true to that understanding as much as possible, given the changes in State requirements since 2015.
  - Early on, in the Area planning, a compromise was incorporated to allow for Frog Pond West to be all single-family housing and have a suitable accommodation of the community expressed need for medium and large lots along with small lots. He was very pleased with how Frog Pond West was building out and believed it satisfied the Commission's best hopes from 2015. At the same time, it might seem they were kicking the can down the road regarding density in Frog Pond East and South.
  - It was clearly expressed that higher density should be expected to have higher density in Frog Pond East, including some apartments. The community had to be prepared to accept that as a need going forward in order to meet Metro's required number of residential units and to meet the City's obligation to provide for affordable housing in Wilsonville. The affordable housing should be consistent with the quality across the road in Frog Pond West and in the older neighborhoods, but would be denser than many people had been comfortable with back in 2015. The density had been forewarned and would have to happen. The City had to embrace that fact as intelligently and sensitively as possible.
- Frog Pond West was a bit trickier since people had already purchased property and were building, it was challenging to come in and superimpose middle housing on their expectations. What obligations were already on the land of East and South; was anything under contract yet?
  - Mr. Pauly replied that developers with interest in Frog Pond East and South understood the points being made about higher density and that development would be different than Frog Pond West.
    - He confirmed no development could occur without this Master Plan, so whatever the City defined in the Plan would be the ground rules for the development moving forward, just like for Frog Pond West.
- Knowing what the planning options were for the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) land moving forward would be helpful.
  - Mr. Pauly stated some work would be needed with the BPA, as well as researching if anything else had been done with those areas across the nation besides open space or parking.
  - Perhaps the City could push the boundaries of what was acceptable. Getting creative and proposing new things for the land might be an opportunity to lead in that effort.
- When looking at the urban fabric of Wilsonville, a more formal transect concept should have been used for a small community to create density in the middle and taper it out on the edges, so that most dense commercial activities would be in the center, associated with more dense transit service availability and an end of bike trails, etc.
  - The Frog Pond neighborhood was not shaping up that way, because density was being added on the edges, and even though the edge of the neighborhood was a walkable quarter of a mile, no destination was at the edge of neighborhood. As a result, the area would be car dependent. The neighborhood center should be a new node in the city's urban fabric, balancing the Town Center as another node, and the west side as another node, but that was not the case. The Village Center would be pretty small, so it would be car dependent. Designing new, market-competitive commercial centers in the middle of a neighborhood was difficult, but did that need to be given up altogether or was there any other option?
    - Mr. Dills replied the project team had no conclusions at this point. The market assessment for the Area Plan asked how much retail, commercial and mixed use could be supported at the location and concluded it was in the small neighborhood center range. The Area Plan took that as a small, neighborhood serving node. The housing on the Area Plan was grouped around that node with the

- higher density feathering out. The transect was not a citywide type, but more of the neighborhood scale node concept, all of which was subject to updates, new ideas, and reassessment.
- He confirmed the yet-to-happen commercial center for Villebois was similar in that its neighborhood center was relatively small, and it was the last piece to develop because "rooftops before retail" was still the paradigm. Some of the more dense housing in Villebois
  - He also confirmed the Area Plan proposed a small retail center with a small market, coffee shop, and maybe a restaurant, for everyday needs, but there was not unanimous support from the community and ultimately from the City Council in the adoption, but interest was expressed to study the proposal again at this stage.
- A small retail center and the convenience it provided was almost an essential part of community living, especially when in an area not directly accessible to a Safeway or Fred Meyer, for example.
    - Mr. Pauly added that a key difference in this plan from the Charbonneau commercial center or from Villebois was its location at an existing intersection with passerby traffic, which was key to retail and had the potential to serve a broader area out into the Stafford Basin versus an area in the middle of a new neighborhood without existing passerby traffic. The entire single-family neighborhood in Charbonneau was zoned commercial, and if the area with the office building near the I-5 interchange was the commercial node of Charbonneau, would it be more today because of its location rather than being in the center of the neighborhood without passerby traffic.
  - Another considerable change since the project was visited originally was that a developed community was now right across the road. Rooftops now existed that were not there in 2015.
    - Mr. Pauly confirmed the Commission had interest in further studies being conducted for the project and noted he looked forward to continued conversation regarding the project's scope. He noted the team would have some good, quality market information, particularly with the experience from Villebois and Charbonneau, to make the best call in the Frog Pond scenario.
  - Outreach and Community Dialogue Options, involving the Commission's work as the Committee for Citizen Involvement (CCI) (Slide 15):
    - Having a design session about every three months would be helpful if doable. The meetings would not be formal Commission meetings, but would allow Commissioners to openly brainstorm and problem-solve with those present about sticky issues. A design session would be more meaningful than a listening session, which would not allow for back-and-forth dialogue or problem solving.
      - Mr. Dills agreed design sessions would be meaningful and collaborative. Two parts of the work plan itself lent themselves to a design-oriented meeting format. One was the subdistrict alternatives where different options were laid out for how housing might be arranged. Public realm proposals was another. Budget and scope would need to be considered, but he supported the design-oriented meeting idea from the perspective of good process and good product. The infrastructure funding work was more focused on particular stakeholders and some of that discussion occurred offline from the Planning Commission, but then, all of the parties could be brought to the Commission to discuss what ideas were being generated.
    - Combined listening sessions prior to the formal Planning Commission meeting allowed for a less formal conversation with the public, as opposed to the formal hearing format which listening sessions ended up being.
    - A classic public relations rule stated that when there was opportunity to engage the party that might be the most critical or doubting in any situation, bring them on early. When planning Frog Pond West, a lot of people felt that the Commission was making decisions behind closed doors before asking the public what it thought rather than asking for public input while moving along in the planning. The Commission had an opportunity to do things better.
    - Naysayers would probably not get involved and problem-solve, but when creating a community vision, it was necessary to engage with as much of the community that was willing. All of the conditions and regulations that had to be met would be constraints, but within those constraints, a collective vision could still be achieved that was best for Wilsonville.



- The middle housing forum done online a few months ago was set up well and possibly something to be used in the future. The forum was not a hybrid, but now that things were opening up more, perhaps outreach meetings could be hybrid. The middle housing forum gave a brief overview at the beginning followed by a question-and-answer format, and it was helpful to hear from a lot of the people in the community; getting their burning question answered help a lot as well.
- Having a hybrid meeting would be helpful because everybody could get out and get to a meeting. Hybrid meetings were accessible, and the doors needed to be open to the public as much as possible.
- Any of the options for community dialogue were acceptable as long as they captured the portions of the population that might not have been well represented in the past. With the development of the Frog Pond neighborhoods in the past, the Frog Pond Task Force did not receive enough input from the less vocal members of the community to help drive the development, or the decision on the density in Frog Pond West would have been different. As Frog Pond East and South were developed, getting that input and feedback was important, even if that meant different days or times for meetings.
- Output was as important as input. The Commission had a duty to inform as planning went along, because people could easily misinterpret what was being said or done. Information needed to be pushed out to the community and to those who might not necessarily know where or how to get the information. The City's information pushing apparatus had been perfected to a new level with *Let's Talk, Wilsonville!*, pamphlets, newsletters, etc.
- Including the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Committee, as suggested by Commissioner Woods, on some of the Commission's undertakings would be good. Although it was unclear how ready the new DEI Committee was to help reach those members of the community who would normally not be involved, the Committee should be invited to collaborate and be a part of the planning process.
  - Mr. Pauly said the City wanted to let the DEI Committee set its own agenda, to some level, and he was not sure if the Committee could respond to a deadline quite yet. There was engagement the City wanted to do with the Committee, and it was exploring how best to do that based on the DEI's agenda and interests. Housing was certainly a big interest item, and Staff agreed with Commissioner Woods about engaging the DEI, so his e-mail was appreciated.
    - He agreed with inviting the DEI Committee, noting a number of Committee members had attended the last middle housing community event. The Committee was interested, and the City wanted to be sensitive to fully take in the Committee's input of how to be engaged and their work program.
  - Ms. Bateschell thanked Chair Mesbah for articulating the concept of inviting the DEI Committee to participate and allowing it to frame its level of interest and impact, which was at the forefront of Staff's mind.
    - Initiating a board from scratch and giving it a mission or allowing it to set the mission took time. The Committee was hitting the ground running, but still had a lot of set-up to do in how to conduct business, how to operate, identifying its key objectives, getting to know one another, and setting the framework for its charge.
    - An added challenge was that the DEI Committee meeting would always be the night before the Planning Commission, so conversations held with the DEI Committee would be delayed month before being presented to the Planning Commission.
    - Starting in either November or December, Staff planned to have each department go before the DEI Committee to describe the different things that department handled. She planned to get the Planning before the Committee sooner than later because of the great portfolio of work underway. Mr. Pauly and Ms. Bateschell would begin by outlining what the Planning Division did and what it was currently working on as potential areas of interest and influence for the Committee, and then hearing what the Committee was interested in and where it could add value in the City's projects and work program. The Committee could then decide whether to meet in the full board/committee format or small working groups that worked on different topics.

- Setting a clear work program timeline with the Committee at this point was difficult, but more of that process and timeline would be fleshed out by the end of the year.
- The DEI Committee had been and would continue to be invited to various meetings so any members interested in the specific topics being address would continue to be aware and engaged, even before the Committee had more of a formal role in the work done by the City.
- Perhaps a DEI Committee member could attend Planning Commission meetings.
- Mr. Pauly confirmed the Commission preferred to make the outreach and community dialogue work around the schedule as best as possible and to be flexible. One or more of the options could be used, depending on the Commission's work program.
- Mr. Dills summarized the hybrid ideas identified by the Commission, included a collaborate problem-solving component, a community discussion component like the CCI forum done for middle housing, outreach to those not normally involved, focus groups, and inviting the DEI Committee into the process. He confirmed the Commission agreed with having different days and times for meetings, if necessary.
- Visioning exercise for the Commissioners to imagine and share what a photo of the successful Frog Pond East and South neighborhoods would look like by 2035. (Slide 16) Comments were as follows:
  - Visioning involved what was seen, but also what was felt, such as how walking down a street felt. Feeling was just as important as the specifics of the eaves or colors or design. The community should feel settled, peaceful, safe, and should be aesthetically pleasing with beautiful trees. The sounds and feeling should make someone want to live there.
  - The community should be beautiful, active, vibrant, and harmonious with a lot of stuff going on and people out and about. Sounds should be heard as well.
  - The people present should be diverse, including the young, old, families, and even dogs.
  - The community should not be visually unappealing with a huge density of cars or trash cans, etc.
  - What represented success was a neighborhood that felt welcoming to everybody and served a diverse population without looking any different than the rest of the neighborhoods in Wilsonville in terms of quality and aesthetics. A denser or multi-family neighborhood did not have to look worse or be less functional and should be indistinguishable from another neighborhood.
  - The community should have a good commercial center. Shops created activity, and not just coffee shops, though a grocery store, even a co-op grocery store, was probably not possible.
  - A community garden for the residents would be desirable. Locating the garden on the BPA easement was suggested.

Mr. Pauly noted a similar, but shorter work session would be held with City Council next week ~~to~~ and the project team would continue to work on other targeted listening or kick off outreach for those not represented in the outreach done so far. The next Planning Commission work session on Frog Pond would be in December and would focus on housing.

## II. INFORMATIONAL

### A. City Council Action Minutes (September 9 & 20, 2021) (No staff presentation)

There were no comments.

### B. 2021 PC Work Program (No staff presentation)

Chair Mesbah highlighted the upcoming work items.

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, confirmed the airport planning would be a work session item in November. Most cities with an airport or adjacent to an airport had elements in their comprehensive plans about that airport and coordination with the entity regarding the potential impacts and areas of influence for the community. Wilsonville historically had not had airport planning in its Comprehensive Plan, but it was intended given the proximity of the airport to the residents and community. A consultant had been brought in who had done airport planning type of work with cities before to help the City work with stakeholders, the Planning Commission, and

City Council on setting forward some policy objectives for the Comprehensive Plan around the Aurora Airport. The City wanted to coordinate with the partners at the airport to ensure that impacts to the city of Wilsonville were considered and minimized and would likely integrate a related area of special concern in the Comprehensive Plan. The City would have a seat at the table when the airport did do updates to master planning because it was a neighboring community with items within the Comprehensive Plan related to the airport. The meeting in November would be the first work session and would talk about the project scope, the City's plan for outreach and engagement, and the Commission's input on different policy objectives.

- She clarified that the airport did not currently have an expansion plan, but did update its master plan a while back that was currently being discussed in the courts in terms of whether the plan was fully adopted through the correct process. The airport was undergoing a discussion on updating its long-term master plan, and the City's Community Development Director was on that task force or committee.

Chair Mesbah:

- Understood from his work on emergency planning in Charbonneau that the long-term master planning for the Aurora Airport would be critical for Wilsonville as a potential emergency evacuation airport for Portland Metro and Wilsonville in case of the big earthquake because of the anticipated damage to Portland International Airport.
  - Ms. Bateschell said she did not know about the emergency evacuation plan, but believed more would be learned through the airport planning process that would be important to discuss and address in the City's policies.
- Noted Metro Portland's only small airports were the Aurora Airport and Hillsboro Airport.

Commissioner Heberlein believed the airport would not be a source for evacuations, but more for supply deliveries coming in rather than people going out.

Ms. Bateschell noted as a part of the response to the ice storm that heavily impacted the City of Wilsonville and its tree canopy, Staff had been working hard with the Parks and Public Works Departments to put together two events with Friends of Trees. The first replanting event was on October 23rd, and trees were would be available at a reduced cost, subsidized by the City through the Tree Mitigation Fund. A second replanting event would be held in December, and she would e-mail Commissioners the accurate date. Friends of Trees was still looking for volunteers, and she encouraged Commissioners to participate and to spread the word.

### **III. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Mesbah adjourned the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 8:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

By Paula Pinyerd of ABC Transcription Services, LLC. for  
Tami Bergeron, Administrative Assistant-Planning