ORDINANCE NO. 719

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF WILSONVILLE AMENDING THE PLANNING AND LAND DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE TO IMPLEMENT THE 2013 TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN

WHEREAS, the City of Wilsonville desires to use best professional practices to ensure land development contributes to creating a safe and attractive transportation network that supports Wilsonville’s economy and quality of life; and

WHEREAS, the City of Wilsonville is required to implement and coordinate with the State of Oregon Transportation Planning Rule and Metro Regional Transportation Functional Plan; and

WHEREAS, updating the City of Wilsonville’s Transportation System Plan (“TSP”) included an update to the Planning and Land Development Ordinance (“Development Code”) for consistency with the TSP; and

WHEREAS, the update includes TSP-related Development Code Amendments (proposed amendments); and

WHEREAS, the Wilsonville City Council held one work session on May 6, 2013 and a public hearing on June 3, 2013 to discuss and take public testimony concerning proposal; and

WHEREAS, the Wilsonville Planning Commission held two work sessions on March 13, 2013 and April 10, 2013 and a public hearing on May 8, 2013 to discuss and take public testimony on the proposed amendments; and

WHEREAS, the City provided Public Hearing Notices to 4605 property owners within the City limits, a list of interested agencies, emailed to 131 people, and posted the Notice in three locations throughout the City and on the City website; and

WHEREAS, the Wilsonville Planning Commission held a Public Hearing on May 8, 2013 on the proposed amendments and approved Resolution LP13-0004 recommending their adoption; and

WHEREAS, the City Council having conducted a public hearing on the proposed amendments on June 3, 2013, and duly considering the entire record, herein finds that the proposed Development Code amendments comply with applicable text amendment criteria and
are in the best interest of the community by providing for development to contribute to the creation of a safe and multi-modal transportation network;

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY OF WILSONVILLE ORDAINS AS FOLLOWS:

1. Findings. The Council adopts as findings and conclusions the foregoing recitals and the staff report in this matter hereto as Exhibit 1 and adopted as if set forth fully herein.

2. Amendments. The Council adopts the amendments to the Land Use and Development Code shown in Exhibit 2.

3. Directive. The City Council hereby authorizes and directs the City Recorder to make any conforming changes or formatting necessary to amend the Wilsonville Code in keeping with the adoption of these revisions.

SUBMITTED to the Wilsonville City Council and read for the first time at a regular meeting thereof on the ___ day of ___ , 2013, and scheduled for a second reading at a regular meeting of the Council on the ___ day of ___ , 2013, commencing at the hour of 7:00 P.M. at the Wilsonville City Hall.

_________________________________
Sandra C. King, MMC, City Recorder

ENACTED by the City Council on the ___ day of ___ , 2013 by the following votes:

Yes: ___ No: ___

_________________________________
Sandra C. King, MMC, City Recorder

DATED and signed by the Mayor this ___ day of ___ , 2013.

_________________________________
TIM KNAPP, Mayor
SUMMARY OF VOTES:

Mayor Knapp - Yes
Council President Starr - Yes
Councilor Goddard - Yes
Councilor Fitzgerald - Excused
Councilor Stevens - Yes

EXHIBITS:
- Exhibit 1: Findings
- Exhibit 2: Amendments (strikethrough format)
- Exhibit 3: Amendments (clean format)
Attachment A, Exhibit 1:
CONCLUSIONARY FINDINGS

In Support of Approval of Application #LP13.04
Amendments to the Wilsonville Planning and Land Development Ordinance
To Implement the 2013 Transportation System Plan

Section 4.032. Authority of the Planning Commission.

(.01) As specified in Chapter 2 of the Wilsonville Code, the Planning Commission sits as an advisory body, making recommendations to the City Council on a variety of land use and transportation policy issues. The Commission also serves as the City’s official Committee for Citizen Involvement and shall have the authority to review and make recommendations on the following types of applications or procedures:

B. Legislative changes to, or adoption of new elements or sub-elements of, the Comprehensive Plan;

Response: The Planning Commission is the appropriate review body to provide the City Council with a recommendation on this package of amendments. This criterion is met.

Section 4.033. Authority of City Council.

(.01) Upon appeal, the City Council shall have final authority to act on all applications filed pursuant to Chapter 4 of the Wilsonville Code, with the exception of applications for expedited land divisions, as specified in Section 4.232. Additionally, the Council shall have final authority to interpret and enforce the procedures and standards set forth in this Chapter and shall have final decision-making authority on the following:

B. Applications for amendments to, or adoption of new elements or sub-elements to, the maps or text of the Comprehensive Plan, as authorized in Section 4.198.

E. Consideration of the recommendations of the Planning Commission.

Response: The City Council will receive a recommendation from the Planning Commission on the Code amendments. The City Council is the final local authority regarding adoption of amendments to the Code, which will be adopted via Ordinance. These criteria are met.

(.02) When a decision or approval of the Council is required, the Planning Director shall schedule a public hearing pursuant to Section 4.013. At the public hearing the staff shall review the report of the Planning Commission or Development Review Board and provide other pertinent information, and interested persons shall be given the opportunity to present testimony and information relevant to the proposal and make final arguments why the matter shall not be approved and, if approved, the nature of the provisions to be contained in approving action.

(.03) To the extent that a finding of fact is required, the Council shall make a finding for each of the criteria applicable and in doing so may sustain or reverse a finding of the Planning Commission or Development Review Board. The Council may delete, add or modify any of the provisions pertaining to the proposal or attach certain
development or use conditions beyond those warranted for compliance with standards in granting an approval if the Council determines the conditions are appropriate to fulfill the criteria for approval.

Response: The Planning Commission held a public hearing on May 8, 2013 and made a recommendation that Council approve the proposal. City Council reviewed the proposal at a public hearing on June 3, 2013, and had the opportunity to review the findings provided by the Planning Commission and modify the proposal. At conclusion of the public hearing process, these criteria will be satisfied.

Section 4.197. Zone Changes and Amendments To This Code – Procedures.

(01) The following procedure shall be followed in applying for an amendment to the text of this Chapter:

A. The Planning Commission shall conduct a public hearing on the proposed amendment at its earliest practicable meeting after it is proposed and shall, within forty (40) days after concluding the hearing, provide a report and recommendation to the City Council regarding the proposed amendment. The findings and recommendations of the Commission shall be adopted by resolution and shall be signed by the Chair of the Commission.

The timing of the Planning Commission hearing on the proposal is coordinated with the public hearings on the draft TSP. Following public hearings before the Planning Commission, the Planning Director will schedule additional public hearings before the City Council at which time the Council can review the findings provided by the Planning Commission. At conclusion of the public hearing process, this criterion will be satisfied.

B. In recommending approval of a proposed text amendment, the Planning Commission shall, at a minimum, adopt findings relative to the following:

1. That the application was submitted in compliance with the procedures set forth in Section 4.008;

Section 4.008 references application procedures in Sections 4.008 through 4.024. Most of the procedures apply to development applications, but the following procedures apply to this application:

• Section 4.009. Who May Initiate Applications.

(02) Applications involving large areas of the community or proposed amendments to the text of this Chapter or the Comprehensive Plan may be initiated by any property owner, business proprietor, or resident of the City, as well as by the City Council, Planning Commission, or Development Review Board acting by motion.

(04) In the event that the City of Wilsonville is the applicant, the City Manager may authorize any City employee or consultant to act as the City’s agent.
The Planning Commission discussed the proposed amendments during two work sessions in 2013, and gave staff the direction to present the proposal at a public hearing. The Planning Director initiated the application for the proposed amendments on April 2, 2013. This criterion has been met.

- **Section 4.012. Public Hearing Notices.**

  (.01) **Published Notice.** The Planning Director shall have published in a newspaper of general circulation in the City of Wilsonville, prior to the date of the Planning Commission or Development Review Board meeting, a notice that the Commission or the Board will consider proposals, documents, or pending applications.

  A. If the matter will require a public hearing, the notice shall be published at least ten (10) and not more than twenty-one (21) days before the first hearing.

  B. The publication shall contain a brief description of the subject property, including either the street address or other common description of the site, and including the approximate geographic location such as a reference to nearby cross streets, the time and place that the City’s decision-making body will consider the submitted documents, and the nature of the proposal, as well as other matters required by law. Failure to advertise as specified in this Section shall not invalidate any decisions or proceedings of the City if a good faith attempt was made to comply with the notice requirements of this Code.

  (.03) **Mailed Notice for Legislative Hearings.** Where applicable, the Planning Director shall have notices of legislative hearings mailed to individual property owners as specified in State law.

  The City published a notice in the Wilsonville Spokesman on April 24, 2013. The notice described the proposal, the dates of the Planning Commission and City Council hearings, and included language required by ORS 227.186 regarding possible impacts to private property. This criterion has been met.

2. The amendment substantially complies with all applicable goals, policies and objectives set forth in the Comprehensive Plan;

   **GOAL 1.1** To encourage and provide means for interested parties to be involved in land use planning processes, on individual cases and City-wide programs and policies.

   **Policy 1.1.1** The City of Wilsonville shall provide opportunities for a wide range of public involvement in City planning programs and processes.
Response: The proposed amendments are necessary to implement the policies that are included in the proposed Transportation System Plan. During the course of the TSP update project, two public open houses and an on-line open house were held. The Planning Commission discussed the proposed amendments at two televised work sessions; the City Council discussed the proposed amendments at one work session. Interested parties also had the opportunity to view the draft proposal and provide feedback via a City-hosted project web page.

During 2012 and 2013, the City Council and Planning Commission conducted numerous work sessions on the strategies, policies, and outcomes contained in the updated TSP. These work sessions were open to the public.

The City mailed a notice of the public hearings on this proposal to all property owners in the City, as well as to agencies and interested individuals. The above criteria have been met.

Implementation Measure 1.1.1.a Provide for early public involvement to address neighborhood or community concerns regarding Comprehensive Plan and Development Code changes. Whenever practical to do so, City staff will provide information for public review while it is still in “draft” form, thereby allowing for community involvement before decisions have been made.

Response: The Planning Commission practice is to conduct a minimum of one work session per legislation agenda item allowing for early involvement into the concepts being proposed. This item has had two work sessions, and was posted on the City website for public review on April 3, 2013.

The proposed amendments are necessary to implement the proposed TSP policies, which were discussed at several Planning Commission and City Council meetings, and shared via an on-line open house. This criterion is met.

GOAL 1.2: For Wilsonville to have an interested, informed, and involved citizenry.

Policy 1.2.1 The City of Wilsonville shall provide user-friendly information to assist the public in participating in City planning programs and processes.

Response: The City has mailed a public notice to each property in the city, held televised work sessions, posted the draft proposal and Planning Commission meeting minutes on the City website. Since the hearing notice was mailed, approximately fifteen individuals have contacted Planning staff with questions about the proposal and staff has provided further information. The City has informed and encouraged the participation of a wide variety of individuals. This criterion is met.
GOAL 3.1: To assure that good quality public facilities and services are available with adequate, but not excessive, capacity to meet community needs, while also assuring that growth does not exceed the community’s commitment to provide adequate facilities and services.

Policy 3.1.1 The City of Wilsonville shall provide public facilities to enhance the health, safety, educational, and recreational aspects of urban living.

Response: The proposed amendments provide further detail on how development applications will be required to contribute to the transportation network and provide on-site access for all modes of transportation. Specifically, the proposal includes requirements for provision of pedestrian access through very large parking lots, bicycle parking, and parking lot access points that are designed for not only vehicular access but also bicycle and pedestrian movements. The proposed amendments also include new thresholds for triggering development to contribute to the improvements of transit improvements in the public right-of-way.

The proposal supports the above criteria.

Goal 3.2 To encourage and support the availability of a variety of transportation choices for moving people that balance vehicular use with other transportation modes, including walking, bicycling and transit in order to avoid principal reliance upon any one mode of transportation

Response: The proposed amendments are needed to implement the updated TSP, which describes a multi-modal system. Supplementing this Comprehensive Plan goal, the 2013 TSP has seven goals that further define an ideal transportation system as one that is safe, connected and accessible, functional and reliable, cost effective, compatible, robust, as well as one that promotes livability (TSP Chapter 2). The existing Development Code includes many standards related to how development must contribute to the creation of a multi-modal transportation system. The proposed Code amendments add greater detail to this set of policies, with new triggers for transit improvements, more specificity regarding bike rack requirements, and new requirements for designing bicycle and pedestrian access through large parking lot sites. The overall purpose of the amendments is to ensure that development applications provide appropriate infrastructure to support multiple modes of access to each site and within large sites.

This criterion is met.

3. The amendment does not materially conflict with, nor endanger, other provisions of the - text of the Code; and
Response: The proposed amendments make modifications to existing policies and add new policies, but generally follow the existing Code’s overall policy of requiring multimodal transportation concurrency. The proposal eliminates outdated placeholder sections that have been in the Code since approximately 2003. It also reorganizes existing policies related to on-site pedestrian access, so the requirements for transportation improvements are clearly defined for on-site and off-site locations. The proposed amendments do not conflict or endanger sections of the Code that are not proposed to be modified.

This criterion is met.

4. If applicable, the amendment is necessary to insure that the City's Land Use and Development Ordinance complies with mandated requirements of State or Federal laws and/or statutes.

Response: Applicable state and regional requirements are addressed below.

OREGON TRANSPORTATION PLAN

The Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP) is the state’s long-range multimodal transportation plan. The OTP is the overarching policy document among a series of plans that together form the state transportation system plan (TSP). An IAMP must be consistent with applicable OTP goals and policies. Findings of compatibility will be part of the basis for IAMP approval. The most pertinent OTP goals and policies for interchange planning are as follows:

POLICY 1.2 – Equity, Efficiency and Travel Choices
It is the policy of the State of Oregon to promote a transportation system with multiple travel choices that are easy to use, reliable, cost-effective and accessible to all potential users, including the transportation disadvantaged.

Response: The proposed code amendments implement the updated TSP and this OTP policy by such as establishing clear zones for unobstructed travel on sidewalks, strengthening access to and amenities at transit facilities, and expanding bicycle parking requirements to address long-term parking.

POLICY 4.1 - Environmentally Responsible Transportation System
It is the policy of the State of Oregon to provide a transportation system that is environmentally responsible and encourages conservation and protection of natural resources.

Response: The Wilsonville Development Code contains specific review criteria for uses within natural resource areas to ensure that identified natural resources are appropriately considered when development is proposed. The Significant Resource Overlay Zone (SROZ) Ordinance implements “the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan relating to natural resources, open space, environment, flood hazard, and the Willamette River Greenway” and is intended to “achieve compliance with the requirements of the Metro Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (UGMFP) relating to Title 3 Water Quality Resource Areas, and Title 13 Habitat Conservation Areas, and that portion of Statewide Planning Goal 5 relating to significant natural resources (Section 4.139.00).” Transportation improvements are not prohibited in the SROZ, but
would need to comply with the SROZ requirements and be constructed so as to “minimize and repair disturbance to existing vegetation and slope stability (Section 4.139.04).”

The majority of the proposed amendments are related to improving non-motorized access, connectivity, or safety. These improvements should encourage non-motorized modes of transportation and transit usage, thereby reducing pollution and negative impact to the environment. Development Code amendments that are proposed to implement the TSP update and comply with the Regional Transportation Function Plan (RTFP) include provisions to establish unobstructed paths on sidewalks, require more closely spaced pedestrian and bicycle access ways, support crossings in the vicinity of transit stops, and establish requirements for long-term bicycle parking. These amendments reinforce the pedestrian, bicycle, and transit improvements that are recommended in the 2013 TSP. The proposal is consistent with Policy 4.1.

**POLICY 7.1 – A Coordinated Transportation System**

It is the policy of the State of Oregon to work collaboratively with other jurisdictions and agencies with the objective of removing barriers so the transportation system can function as one system.

Response: Among others, staff members from Metro, Clackamas County, Washington County, City of Tualatin, City of Sherwood, and ODOT were involved in the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) for the TSP update. The updated TSP as well as these associated Code amendments have been reviewed by TAC members to ensure consistency between jurisdictions and other regional and locally adopted plans and regulations. The proposal is consistent with Policy 7.1.

**OREGON HIGHWAY PLAN**

The 1999 Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) establishes policies and investment strategies for Oregon’s state highway system over a 20-year period and refines the goals and policies found in the OTP. Policies in the OHP emphasize the efficient management of the highway system to increase safety and to extend highway capacity, partnerships with other agencies and local governments, and the use of new techniques to improve road safety and capacity. These policies also link land use and transportation, set standards for highway performance and access management, and emphasize the relationship between state highways and local road, bicycle, pedestrian, transit, rail, and air systems. The policies applicable to the proposed amendments are described below.
Policy 1B (Land Use and Transportation) is designed to clarify how ODOT will work with local governments and others to link land use and transportation in transportation plans, facility and corridor plans, plan amendments, access permitting and project development.

Response: Coordination between City and ODOT staff in developing the TSP update occurred through the project administration and Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) process. ODOT input was received on the technical memoranda that became the basis of the TSP and at various TAC meetings and public forums.

Wilsonville Development Code provisions related to notification of land use actions and traffic impact study requirements also provide the City a tool to facilitate intra-jurisdictional coordination and ensure consistency between land use actions and the planned transportation system. Traffic impact studies are required for a land use and development applications to demonstrate that level of service standards can be met, unless the traffic study requirement is waived by the Community Development Director (Development Code Section 4.008.02.E). Proposed amendments to Development Code Section 4.012, Public Hearing Notices, includes noticing governmental agencies potentially impacted by a local decision, including agencies with roadway authority. The proposal is consistent with Policy 1B.

OAR 660 DIVISION 12 TRANSPORTATION PLANNING RULE (TPR)

The Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) implements Statewide Planning Goal 12 (Transportation). The purpose of the TPR is to “direct transportation planning in coordination with land use planning” to ensure that planned land uses are supported by and consistent with planned transportation facilities and improvements. The TPR’s purpose statement includes promoting the development of transportation systems that serve the mobility needs of the transportation disadvantaged, provide a variety of transportation choices, and provide safe and convenient access and circulation for vehicles, transit, pedestrians and bicycles. The TPR also directs jurisdictions to “provide for the construction and implementation of transportation facilities, improvements and services necessary to support acknowledged comprehensive plans” and that there is “coordination among affected local governments and transportation service providers and consistency between state, regional and local transportation plans.”

Section 660-012-0060 – Plan and Land Use Regulation Amendments

Response: Proposed amendments to Development Code Section 4.197, Zone Changes and Amendments To This Code – Procedures, will require findings of compliance with applicable Statewide Land Use Planning Goals and related administrative rules, including TPR Section -0060. The City currently requires traffic impact analyses, the tool that will help determine whether or not the transportation system is “significantly affected” pursuant to the TPR (Section 4.008.02.E). The proposed procedures amendment will ensure that TPR Section -0060 is also considered as part of proposed zone changes or code amendments if applicable. The proposed TSP and associated code amendments are consistent with TPR Section -0060.
The Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP) directs how local jurisdictions should implement the RTP through the TSP and other land use regulations. The RTFP codifies existing and new requirements which local plans must comply with to be consistent with the RTP. If Code policies are consistent with the RTFP, Metro will find them to be consistent with the RTP.

**Response:** A checklist of RTFP requirements and findings of compliance with these requirements is provided in Table 1. The checklist addresses the ways that both the TSP document and existing or proposed Development Code provisions comply with RTFP requirements.

In support of the adoption of the proposed amendments to the Wilsonville Land Development Code, the following tables present findings of compliance with the Metro Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP) and the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR). As established in the RTFP, demonstrating compliance with the RTFP constitutes compliance with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

In Table 1 the left column relates to the RTFP requirements (and contains content that was prepared by Metro), and the right column documents how the City of Wilsonville meets the requirements through existing requirements, or how proposed amendments to the Land Development Ordinance (the “Development Code,” Chapter 4 of the City Code) will meet the requirement upon adoption.

Table 2 includes findings of compliance for the TPR, OAR 660-012. The findings address the relevant sections of the TPR including Section -0045 (Implementation of the TSP) and Section -0060 (Plan and Land Use Regulation Amendments). In some cases, there are cross-references in sub-sections of the TPR to requirements in the RTFP.

**Table 1: RTFP Compliance of Wilsonville Development Code**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement</th>
<th>Development Code Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allow complete street designs consistent with regional street design policies (Title 1, Street System Design Sec 3.08.110A(1))</td>
<td>Existing code requirements meet these RTFP requirements in as follows: Code Sections 4.177 (Street Improvement Standards, as revised to include requirements from 4.178 Sidewalk and Pathway Standards establish general standards for streets, sidewalks, and pathways in addition to other criteria established for streets, blocks, and pathways in land divisions in Code Sections 4.236 (General Requirements – Streets) and 4.237 (General Requirements – Other). Otherwise, existing code (Section 4.177.02) defers to the Transportation System Plan (TSP) and Public Works Standards for specific roadway cross section design and dimensions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow green street designs consistent with federal regulations for stream protection (Title 1, Street System Design Sec 3.08.110A(2))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow transit-supportive street designs that facilitate existing and planned transit service pursuant 3.08.120B (Title 1, Street System Design Sec 3.08.110A(3))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1: RTFP Compliance of Wilsonville Development Code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement</th>
<th>Development Code Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allow implementation of:</td>
<td>Existing code and the proposed code amendments meet these RTFP requirements as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• narrow streets (&lt;28 ft curb to curb);</td>
<td>Section 4.177, Street Improvement Standards, require that all street and access improvements conform to the Transportation System Plan and the Public Works Standards. <em>Note that the Public Works Standards defers to the TSP for street classification, and access and design standards (Section 201.1.03).</em> Proposed code modifications would clarify that sidewalks are required at a minimum to have a five feet wide unobstructed “through zone.” <em>(Proposed new Section 4.177.03.)</em> Existing code language in Section 4.177 requires all street improvements and intersections to conform to the Public Works Standards and to provide for “the continuation of streets through specific developments to adjoining properties or subdivisions,” unless there are substantial constraints posed by existing development or topographic or environmental conditions. Proposed code modifications would require a posted notification to indicate that a street will be extended in the future. <em>(Additions to Section 4.177.02.D and Section 4.236. General Requirements - Streets.)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• wide sidewalks (at least five feet of through zone);</td>
<td>Sections 4.177.03, .04. and .04 contain both new text that has been relocated and proposed text that address needed pedestrian and bicycle facilities within the public right-of-way, consistent with the RTFP requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• landscaped pedestrian buffer strips or paved furnishing zones of at least five feet, that include street trees;</td>
<td>Proposed new Section 4.154. On-site Pedestrian Access and Circulation includes new pedestrian access and circulation language to ensure connectivity through development sites and to community attractors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Traffic calming to discourage traffic infiltration and excessive speeds;</td>
<td>Currently, existing code requires Site Design Review for all new development in the city except single-family and two-family homes in residential zones and row houses and apartments in the Village zone. Site design review plans are required to show access to the site as well as vehicle and pedestrian circulation within the site <em>(Section 4.421).</em> Existing standards for streets, blocks, and pathways for land divisions in Sections 4.236 <em>(General Requirements – Streets)</em> and 4.237 <em>(General Requirements – Other)</em> further support circulation and connectivity in the city. Note that these requirements will serve to implement the TSP’s Safe Routes to School plan <em>(TSP Chapter 6).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• short and direct right-of-way routes and shared-use paths to connect residences with commercial services, parks, schools, hospitals, institutions, transit corridors, regional trails and other neighborhood activity centers;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• opportunities to extend streets in an incremental fashion, including posted notification on streets to be extended. <em>(Title 1, Street System Design Sec 3.08.110B)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require new residential or mixed-use development (of five or more acres) that proposes or is required to construct or extend street(s) to provide a site plan (consistent with the conceptual new streets map required by Title 1, Sec 3.08.110D) that:</td>
<td>Existing code requirements meet these RTFP requirements as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• provides full street connections with spacing of</td>
<td>Before property over 2 acres in size can be developed it must be zoned in one of the Planned Development categories <em>(PDR, PDC, PDI, etc.</em>). Standards for residential zones, the Village Zone, the Holding Zone, the Public Facility Zone, and planned development in the city include:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1: RTFP Compliance of Wilsonville Development Code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement</th>
<th>Development Code Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no more than 530 feet between connections except where prevented by barriers • Provides a crossing every 800 to 1,200 feet if streets must cross water features protected pursuant to Title 3 UGMFP (unless habitat quality or the length of the crossing prevents a full street connection) • provides bike and pedestrian accessways in lieu of streets with spacing of no more than 330 feet except where prevented by barriers • limits use of cul-de-sacs and other closed-end street systems to situations where barriers prevent full street connections • includes no closed-end street longer than 220 feet or having no more than 25 dwelling units (Title 1, Street System Design Sec 3.08.110E)</td>
<td>1. Maximum block perimeter: 1,800 feet. 2. Maximum spacing between streets or private drives for local access: 530 feet, unless waived by the Development Review Board upon finding that barriers such as railroads, freeways, existing buildings, topographic variations, or designated Significant Resource Overlay Zone areas will prevent street extensions meeting this standard. 3. Maximum block length without pedestrian and bicycle crossing: 330 feet, unless waived by the Development Review Board upon finding that barriers such as railroads, freeways, existing buildings, topographic variations, or designated Significant Resource Overlay Zone areas will prevent pedestrian and bicycle facility extensions meeting this standard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The City’s subdivision standards require that all streets shall conform to the standards in Section 4.177 and the block size requirements of the zone (Section 4.236).

Existing code Section 4.177.01.D (proposed to be renumbered to .02.D) limits dead-end streets and cul-de-sacs to 200 feet in length and restricts them to no more than 25 units, unless, respectively, there are significant constraints posed by existing development, major transportation facilities, or environmental conditions that prevent future street extension and connection, and it is determined that the traffic impacts on adjacent streets will not exceed those from a development of 25 or fewer units.

Existing code requirements meet these RTFP requirements as follows:

Section 4.177, Street Improvement Standards, requires that all street and access improvements conform to the Transportation System Plan; the draft TSP includes local street connectivity standards (TSP Chapter 3). Existing street improvement standards for general development address block size, maximum spacing, and dead-ends, and existing street improvement standards for land divisions (Section 4.236) require street plans and, in some cases, reserve strips and street plugs to preserve opportunities for good connections with potential future adjacent development.

Establish city/county standards for local street connectivity, consistent with Title 1, Sec 3.08.110E, that applies to new residential or mixed-use development (of less than five acres) that proposes or is required to construct or extend street(s). (Title 1, Street System Design Sec 3.08.110F) | Existing code meets these RTFP requirements as follows:

In addition to the standards and requirements of Section 4.237 for land divisions and street improvement standards in Section 4.177, parcels wholly or partially within the Wilsonville Road Interchange Area Management Plan (IAMP) Overlay Zone are governed by the Access Management Plan in the Wilsonville Road Interchange Area Management Plan (Section 4.133.04. Access Management). The recent Wilsonville Road IAMP and current construction project has already improved the

Applicable to both Development Code and TSP To the extent feasible, restrict driveway and street access in the vicinity of interchange ramp terminals, consistent with Oregon Highway Plan Access Management Standards, and accommodate local circulation on the local system. Public street connections, consistent with regional street design and spacing standards, shall be encouraged and shall supersede this access restriction. Multimodal street design features | Existing code meets these RTFP requirements as follows:

In addition to the standards and requirements of Section 4.237 for land divisions and street improvement standards in Section 4.177, parcels wholly or partially within the Wilsonville Road Interchange Area Management Plan (IAMP) Overlay Zone are governed by the Access Management Plan in the Wilsonville Road Interchange Area Management Plan (Section 4.133.04. Access Management). The recent Wilsonville Road IAMP and current construction project has already improved the
### Table 1: RTFP Compliance of Wilsonville Development Code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement</th>
<th>Development Code Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>including pedestrian crossings and on-street parking shall be allowed where appropriate. <em>(Title 1, Street System Design Sec 3.08.110G)</em></td>
<td>Wilsonville Road interchange. ODOT spacing standards apply to development in the Elligsen Road interchange. Additions to Section 4.177 include text to address vehicular connectivity and access requirements, including references to TSP Table 3-2 Access Spacing Standards (TSP Chapter 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include Site design standards for new retail, office, multi-family and institutional buildings located near or at major transit stops shown in Figure 2.15 in the RTP: • Provide reasonably direct pedestrian connections between transit stops and building entrances and between building entrances and streets adjoining transit stops; • Provide safe, direct and logical pedestrian crossings at all transit stops where practicable. At major transit stops, require the following: • Locate buildings within 20 feet of the transit stop, a transit street or an intersection street, or a pedestrian plaza at the stop or a street intersections; • Transit passenger landing pads accessible to disabled persons to transit agency standards; • An easement or dedication for a passenger shelter and an underground utility connection to a major transit stop if requested by the public transit provider; • Lighting to transit agency standards at the major transit stop; • Intersection and mid-block traffic management improvements as needed and practicable to enable marked crossings at major transit stops. <em>(Title 1, Transit System Design Sec 3.08.120B(2))</em></td>
<td>Proposed amendments Development Code requirements meet these RTFP requirements as follows: In Section 4.177 the proposed Transit Improvements subsection incorporates development requirements related to transit facilities; proposed code language is consistent with Implementation Measure 3.6 from Transit Master Plan and bases required transit amenities on the number of PM peak hour trips expected to be generated by the proposed development. In addition, a new definition for “major transit street” is proposed that is consistent with the definition in the Transit Master Plan. Pursuant to amended code language, improvements at mid-block may include intersection or mid-block traffic management improvements to allow for pedestrian crossings at major transit stops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Could be in Comprehensive plan or TSP as well) As an alternative to implementing site design standards at major transit stops (section 3.08.120B(2), a city or county may establish pedestrian districts with the following elements: • A connected street and pedestrian network for the district; • An inventory of existing facilities, gaps and deficiencies in the network of pedestrian routes; • Interconnection of pedestrian, transit and bicycle systems; • Parking management strategies; • Access management strategies; • Sidewalk and accessway location and width;</td>
<td>The City is proposing to adopt transit supportive code language consistent with RTFP Title 1, Transit System Design Sec 3.08.120B.2 and will not be establishing a pedestrian district as part of the TSP update.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: RTFP Compliance of Wilsonville Development Code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement</th>
<th>Development Code Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Landscaped or paved pedestrian buffer strip location and width;  
  • Street tree location and spacing;  
  • Pedestrian street crossing and intersection design;  
  • Street lighting and furniture for pedestrians;  
  • A mix of types and densities of land uses that will support a high level of pedestrian activity. (Title 1, Pedestrian System Design Sec 3.08.130B) | A proposed new code section under Section 4.154, On-site Pedestrian Access and Circulation, addresses this requirement. Propose language is adapted from the State’s Model Development Code for Small Cities. |
| Require new development to provide on-site streets and accessways that offer reasonably direct routes for pedestrian travel. (Title 1, Pedestrian System Design Sec 3.08.130C) | The City’s existing parking ratios (Section 4.155.03) comply with the minimum and maximum Zone B (for the rest of the region outside of highly transit and pedestrian accessible areas) standards established in the RTFP. Parking standards in the Village Zone (Table V-2) comply with parking ratios established in Zone A in the RTFP. |
| Establish parking ratios, consistent with the following:  
  • No minimum ratios higher than those shown on Table 3.08-3.  
  • No maximum ratios higher than those shown on Table 3.08-3 and illustrated in the Parking Maximum Map. If 20-minute peak hour transit service has become available to an area within a one-quarter mile walking distance from bus transit one-half mile walking distance from a high capacity transit station, that area shall be removed from Zone A. Cities and counties should designate Zone A parking ratios in areas with good pedestrian access to commercial or employment areas (within one-third mile walk) from adjacent residential areas.  
  Establish a process for variances from minimum and maximum parking ratios that include criteria for a variance.  
  Require that free surface parking be consistent with the regional parking maximums for Zones A and B in Table 3.08-3. Following an adopted exemption process and criteria, cities and counties may exempt parking structures; fleet parking; vehicle parking for sale, lease, or rent; employee car pool parking; dedicated valet parking; user-paid parking; market rate parking; and other high-efficiency parking management alternatives from maximum parking standards. Reductions associated with redevelopment may be done in phases. Where mixed-use development is proposed, cities and counties shall provide for | |
| Code Sections 4.155.02.D and 4.155.02.E require that parking be determined by summing the requirements for each use on a site or in a building. Only if the peak hours of the uses do not overlap and agreements are legally recorded can parking be jointly used and the required number of parking spaces be jointly determined. There is more flexibility for blending parking requirements in the Village Zone (Section 4.125.07).  
Existing code does allow for on-street parking to be credited toward parking space requirements (Section 4.155.03.B.7). Landscaping and internal circulation for large parking areas (over 200 parking spaces) is addressed in Section 4.155.03.B.3.; proposed language requires “street-like features” along principal drive isles in parking lots more than three acres in size.  
Proposed Section 4.177.09 (Approach and Driveway Development Standards, includes requiring driveways to align | |
Table 1: RTFP Compliance of Wilsonville Development Code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement</th>
<th>Development Code Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>blended parking rates. Cities and counties may count adjacent on-street parking spaces, nearby public parking and shared parking toward required parking minimum standards.</td>
<td>with existing or planned streets on adjacent sites under prescribed conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use categories or standards other than those in Table 3.08-3 upon demonstration that the effect will be substantially the same as the application of the ratios in the table.</td>
<td>Section 4.155 combines requirements for bicycle parking with requirements for motor vehicle parking. The section establishes the number of bicycle parking spaces required according to type of use (Table 5 Parking Standards). Pursuant to Table 5, a percentage of bicycle parking at park-and-ride facilities and transit stations must be enclosed. Village Zone requirements include standards for short term and long term bicycle parking (Section 4.125.07.D.3). A new proposed Section 4.155.07 addresses short term and long term bicycle parking citywide. These changes in effect expand the detailed bicycle parking standards established in the Village Zone to other zones in the city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide for the designation of residential parking districts in local comprehensive plans or implementing ordinances.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require that parking lots more than three acres in size provide street-like features along major driveways, including curbs, sidewalks and street trees or planting strips. Major driveways in new residential and mixed-use areas shall meet the connectivity standards for full street connections in section 3.08.110, and should line up with surrounding streets except where prevented by topography, rail lines, freeways, pre-existing development or leases, easements or covenants that existed prior to May 1, 1995, or the requirements of Titles 3 and 13 of the UGMFP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require on-street freight loading and unloading areas at appropriate locations in centers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish short-term and long-term bicycle parking minimums for:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New multi-family residential developments of four units or more;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New retail, office and institutional developments;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transit centers, high capacity transit stations, inter-city bus and rail passenger terminals; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bicycle facilities at transit stops and park-and-ride lots.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Title 4, Parking Management Sec 3.08.410)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement</th>
<th>Local Comprehensive Plan/other Adopted Plan Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Could be located in Development code or Comprehensive Plan)</td>
<td>The City is proposing to adopt transit supportive code language consistent with RTFP Title 1, Transit System Design Sec 3.08.120B.2 and will not be establishing a pedestrian district as part of the TSP update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As an alternative to implementing site design standards at major transit stops (section 3.08.120B(2), a city or county may establish pedestrian districts with the following elements:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement</td>
<td>Local Comprehensive Plan/other Adopted Plan Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A connected street and pedestrian network for the district;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• An inventory of existing facilities, gaps and deficiencies in the network of pedestrian routes;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interconnection of pedestrian, transit and bicycle systems;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parking management strategies;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Access management strategies;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sidewalk and accessway location and width;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Landscaped or paved pedestrian buffer strip location and width;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Street tree location and spacing;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pedestrian street crossing and intersection design;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Street lighting and furniture for pedestrians;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A mix of types and densities of land uses that will support a high level of pedestrian activity. (Title 1, Pedestrian System Design Sec 3.08.130B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When proposing an amendment to the comprehensive plan or to a zoning designation, consider the strategies in subsection 3.08.220A as part of the analysis required by OAR 660-012-0060.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a city or county adopts the actions set forth in 3.08.230E (parking ratios, designs for street, transit, bicycle, pedestrian, freight systems, TSMO projects and strategies, and land use actions) and section 3.07.630.B of Title 6 of the UGMFP, it shall be eligible for an automatic reduction of 30 percent below the vehicular trip generation rates recommended by the Institute of Transportation Engineers when analyzing the traffic impacts, pursuant to OAR 660-012-0060, of a plan amendment in a Center, Main Street, Corridor or Station Community. (Title 5, Amendments of City and County Comprehensive and Transportation System Plans Sec 3.08.510A,B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Could be located in TSP or other adopted policy document)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt parking policies, management plans and regulations for Centers and Station Communities. Plans may be adopted in TSPs or other adopted policy documents and may focus on sub-areas of Centers. Plans shall include an inventory of parking supply and usage, an evaluation of bicycle parking needs with consideration of TriMet Bicycle Parking Guidelines. Policies shall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing code refers to and requires traffic impact studies or analyses; proposed language in Section 4.197, Zone Changes and Amendments To This Code – Procedures, requires findings of compliance with applicable Statewide Land Use Planning Goals and related administrative rules.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The updated TSP addresses transportation needs and includes policies and requirements for the Town Center. Parking Management Plans are addressed in Chapter 6 of the TSP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement | Local Comprehensive Plan/other Adopted Plan Reference
--- | ---
be adopted in the TSP. Policies, plans and regulations must consider and may include the following range of strategies:
- By-right exemptions from minimum parking requirements;
- Parking districts;
- Shared parking;
- Structured parking;
- Bicycle parking;
- Timed parking;
- Differentiation between employee parking and parking for customers, visitors and patients;
- Real-time parking information;
- Priced parking;
- Parking enforcement. (Title 4, Parking Management Sec 3.08.410I)
Table 2 includes findings of compliance for the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR), OAR 660-012. The findings address the relevant sections of the TPR including Section -0045 (Implementation of the TSP) and Section -0060 (Plan and Land Use Regulation Amendments). In some cases, there are cross-references to RTFP requirements and associated findings.

Table 2: Findings of Compliance with the TPR (OAR 660-012-0045 and -0060)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OAR 660-012-0045 Implementation of the TSP</th>
<th>Findings of Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Each local government shall amend its land use regulations to implement the TSP.</td>
<td>Section 4.005, Exclusions from Development Permit Requirement identifies the types of public facilities and improvements allowed outright without a development permit. Revised text identifies transportation facilities within the public right-of-way as exempt from development permit requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) To the extent, if any, that a transportation facility, service, or improvement concerns the application of a comprehensive plan provision or land use regulation, it may be allowed without further land use review if it is permitted outright or if it is subject to standards that do not require interpretation or the exercise of factual, policy or legal judgment.</td>
<td>Proposed amendments to Section 4.012. Public Hearing Notices will ensure that governmental agencies potentially impacted by a local decision will have the opportunity to participate in the review of the proposed amendment. In addition, the following Development Code requirements help ensure a multi-jurisdictional review process as follows:  • Section 4.035.01.B calls for determination of affected agencies when reviewing site development permit applications.  • Section 4.210.01.C requires that the Development Review Board consider the reports of other agencies in reviewing land division applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Where a transportation facility, service or improvement is determined to have a significant impact on land use or requires interpretation or the exercise of factual, policy or legal judgment regarding the application of a comprehensive plan or land use regulation, the local government shall provide a review and approval process that is consistent with 660-012-0050 (Transportation Project Development). Local governments shall amend regulations to provide for consolidated review of land use decisions required to permit a transportation project.</td>
<td>The development code meets this requirement. General street requirements under Section 4.236.01 include the provision that land divisions must conform and “be in harmony” with the TSP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Local governments shall adopt land use or subdivision ordinance regulations, consistent with applicable federal and state requirements, to protect transportation facilities for their identified functions.</td>
<td>The updated TSP and supporting existing code language meet this requirement. Block lengths and spacing standards are addressed by the new street design criteria in the TSP (TSP Chapter 3). New development in the city (single-family and two family homes in residential zones and row houses and apartments in the Village zone excepted) is subject to design review pursuant to Section 4.020. Design review plans are required to show access to the site as well as vehicle and pedestrian circulation within the site (Section 4.421).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAR 660-012-0045 Implementation of the TSP</td>
<td>Findings of Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Standards to protect the future operations of roadways and transit corridors</td>
<td>Circulation and connectivity are further supported by land division standards for streets, blocks, and pathways in Sections 4.236 (General Requirements – Streets) and 4.237 (General Requirements – Other). The existing code language meets this requirement. Mobility standards for roadways in the city are established in the OHP for state roadways, in the RTP and RTFP for regional roadways, and in the City TSP for local roadways (TSP Chapter 2, Policy 5). Requirements for conditional use permits (Section 4.184(.01)(A)(3)), zone changes (Section 4.197(.02)(D)), and comprehensive plan changes (Section 4.198(.01)(C)) specify that adequate public facilities must be available, or consistency with State goals and regulations (including transportation) must be demonstrated for the proposed actions. Land division application procedures (Section 4.210(.01)(B)(26)) require that a traffic study be submitted as part of the tentative plat application. All land use and development applications are required to include a traffic study demonstrating that Level of Service standards can be met, unless the traffic study requirement is waived by the Community Development Director (Section 4.008.02.E). Final Stage Two Approval for Planned Development requires that proposed Planned Development provide a study showing that Level of Service D performance standards can be met at affected intersections (Section 4.140.09.J.2). Detailed traffic impact analysis requirements are established for the Wilsonville Road Interchange Area Management Plan Overlay Zone (Section 4.133.05.01).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Coordinated review of future land use decisions affecting transportation facilities, corridors or sites</td>
<td>See response and proposed amendments related to -0045(1)(c).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Process to apply conditions to development proposals in order to minimize impacts and protect transportation facilities</td>
<td>City code authorizes decision makers to apply conditions of approval depending on the estimated impacts of the proposed action. Applying conditions of approval is acknowledged and authorized in provisions for general administration (Section 4.015), conditional use permits (Section 4.184), zone changes (Section 4.197), comprehensive plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Findings of Compliance with the TPR (OAR 660-012-0045 and -0060)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OAR 660-012-0045</th>
<th>Findings of Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of the TSP</td>
<td>amendments (Section 4.198), and land divisions (Section 4.210 (.01)(C)(3)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Regulations to provide notice to public agencies providing transportation facilities and services, MPOs, and ODOT of: land use applications that require public hearings, subdivision and partition applications, applications which affect private access to roads, applications within airport noise corridor and imaginary surfaces which affect airport operations.</td>
<td>See response and proposed amendments related to -0045(1)(c).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Regulations assuring amendments to land use designations, densities, design standards are consistent with the function, capacities, and levels of service of facilities designated in the TSP.</td>
<td>Existing Development Code requirements meet this requirement. Zone change proposals require findings that state that “primary public facilities, i.e., roads and sidewalks, water, sewer and storm sewer are available and are of adequate size to serve the proposed development; or, that adequate facilities can be provided in conjunction with project development.” Furthermore, the Planning Commission and Development Review Board “shall utilize any and all means to insure that all primary facilities are available and are adequately sized” (Section 4.197(.02)(D)). Comprehensive plan changes must be supported by findings that the amendment supports applicable Statewide Planning Goals (Section 4.198(.01)(C)) and that the proposed change “will not result in conflicts with any portion of the Comprehensive Plan (Section 4.198(.01)(D)).”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Local governments shall adopt land use or subdivision regulations for urban areas and rural communities as set forth in 660-012-0040(3)(a-d):</td>
<td>Addressed by RTFP, Title 4: Regional Parking Management, 3.08.410.1. Section 4.155 combines requirements for bicycle parking with requirements for motor vehicle parking. The section establishes the number of bicycle parking spaces required according to type of use. A percentage of bicycle parking at park-and-ride facilities and transit stations must be enclosed. New proposed Section 4.155.07 addresses short term and long term bicycle parking citywide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Provide bicycle parking in multifamily developments of 4 units or more, new retail, office and institutional developments, transit transfer stations and park-and-ride lots</td>
<td>Addressed by RTFP, Title 1: Pedestrian System Design, 3.08.130, and Title 1: Bicycle System Design, 3.08.140.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Provide “safe and convenient” (per subsection 660-012-0045.3(d)) pedestrian and bicycle connections from new subdivisions/multifamily development to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: Findings of Compliance with the TPR (OAR 660-012-0045 and -0060)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation of the TSP</th>
<th>Findings of Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>neighborhood activity centers; bikeways are required along arterials and major collectors; sidewalks are required along arterials, collectors, and most local streets in urban areas except controlled access roadways</td>
<td>Pursuant to the draft TSP (Chapter 3.), bikeways are required along arterials and collectors and sidewalks are required along all streets. Roadway cross-sections shown in the 2013 draft TSP include bike lanes for all roads other than local streets and sidewalks for all roads. Proposed subsections under 4.177 Street Improvement Standards includes existing code language that requires that bicycle and pedestrian facilities be located “to provide a reasonably direct connection between likely destinations” and describes a “reasonably direct connection” as a route that minimizes out-of-direction travel (existing Section 4.178 Sidewalk and Pathway Standards). New subsection 4.154.01, On-site Pedestrian Access and Circulation, addresses pedestrian connectivity within developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Off-site road improvements required as a condition of development approval must accommodate bicycle and pedestrian travel, including facilities on arterials and major collectors</td>
<td>Where off-site improvements are required, the existing roadway cross-sections will govern (TSP Chapter 3). The draft TSP currently requires pedestrian and bicycle facilities on arterials and collectors. Addressed by RTFP, Title 1: Street System Design, 3.08.110E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Provide internal pedestrian circulation within new office parks and commercial developments</td>
<td>Site Design Review is required for all new development except for single- and two-family dwellings, and non-residential development in the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: Findings of Compliance with the TPR (OAR 660-012-0045 and -0060)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OAR 660-012-0045 Implementation of the TSP</th>
<th>Findings of Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Village zone; site design review plans are required to show access to the site as well as vehicle and pedestrian circulation within the site (Section 4.421). New subsection 4.154.01, On-site Pedestrian Access and Circulation, addresses pedestrian connectivity within developments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) To support transit in urban areas containing a population greater than 25,000, where the area is already served by a public transit system or where a determination has been made that a public transit system is feasible, local governments shall adopt land use and subdivision regulations as provided in (a)-(g) below:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Transit routes and transit facilities shall be designed to support transit use through provision of bus stops, pullouts and shelters, optimum road geometrics, on-road parking restrictions and similar facilities, as appropriate; Addressed by RTFP, Title 1: Transit System Design, 3.08.120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed Transit Improvement subsection under Section 4.177 Street Improvement Standards incorporates development requirements related to transit facilities, consistent with the recommendations of the Wilsonville Transit Master Plan and this TPR requirement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) New retail, office and institutional buildings at or near major transit stops shall provide for convenient pedestrian access to transit through the measures listed in (A) and (B) below. (A) Walkways shall be provided connecting building entrances and streets adjoining the site; (B) Pedestrian connections to adjoining properties shall be provided except where such a connection is impracticable as provided for in OAR 660-012-0045(3)(b)(E). Pedestrian connections shall connect the on-site circulation system to existing or proposed streets, walkways, and driveways that abut the property. Where adjacent properties are undeveloped or have potential for redevelopment, streets, accessways and walkways on site shall be laid out or stubbed to allow for extension to the adjoining property; Addressed by RTFP, Title 1: Transit System Design, 3.08.120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New subsection 4.154.01, On-site Pedestrian Access and Circulation, addresses pedestrian connectivity within developments consistent with the TPR requirement. Under Street Improvement Standards, Subsections 4.177.03, 0.04 and 0.05, includes existing and proposed text that addresses pedestrian and bicycle connectivity between and within proposed developments. Subsection 4.177.06 Transit Improvements, specifies connectivity requirements specific to transit streets and stops.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) In addition to (A) and (B) above, on sites at major transit stops provide the following: (i) Either locate buildings within 20 feet of the transit stop, a transit street or an intersecting street or provide a pedestrian plaza at the transit stop or a street intersection; (ii) A reasonably direct pedestrian connection between the transit stop and building entrances on the site; (iii) A transit passenger landing pad accessible to disabled persons; (iv) An easement or dedication for a passenger shelter if requested by the transit provider; and (v) Lighting at the transit stop. Addressed by RTFP Title 1: Pedestrian System Design, 3.08.130B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed additions to the Street Improvement Standards address transit improvements and access (Section 4.177.06), and include requirements to reasonably direct pedestrian connections between building entrances and transit facilities, as well as between buildings on the site and streets adjoining transit stops. Consistent with the Transit Master Plan, required transit amenities depend on the number of PM peak hour trips the proposed...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Findings of Compliance with the TPR (OAR 660-012-0045 and -0060)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OAR 660-012-0045 Implementation of the TSP</th>
<th>Findings of Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(c) Local governments may implement (4)(b)(A) and (B) above through the designation of pedestrian districts and adoption of appropriate implementing measures regulating development within pedestrian districts. Pedestrian districts must comply with the requirement of (4)(b)(C) above;</td>
<td>The City is not proposing to designate a pedestrian district at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Designated employee parking areas in new developments shall provide preferential parking for carpools and vanpools;</td>
<td>Proposed new Subsection 4.155.06 Carpool and Vanpool Parking Requirements satisfies this requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Existing development shall be allowed to redevelop a portion of existing parking areas for transit-oriented uses, including bus stops and pullouts, bus shelters, park and ride stations, transit-oriented developments, and similar facilities, where appropriate;</td>
<td>Proposed new Subsection 4.155 (.07 Parking Area Redevelopment satisfies this requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Road systems for new development shall be provided that can be adequately served by transit, including provision of pedestrian access to existing and identified future transit routes. This shall include, where appropriate, separate accessways to minimize travel distances;</td>
<td>Addressed by RTFP Title 1: Street System Design, 3.08.110E, and Title 1: Transit System Design, 3.08.120, and Title 1: Pedestrian System Design, 3.08.130 Proposed new language under Section 4.177 Street Improvement Standards satisfies this requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Along existing or planned transit routes, designation of types and densities of land uses adequate to support transit.</td>
<td>Zoning along transit lines in Wilsonville is generally consistent with this TPR provision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) In MPO areas, local governments shall adopt land use and subdivision regulations to reduce reliance on the automobile which:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Allow transit-oriented developments (TODs) on lands along transit routes;</td>
<td>See OAR 660-012-0045(4)(g) above. While not allowed on all land along transit routes in Wilsonville, there is a significant amount of mixed use zoning along the routes that will allow this type of development – in particular within Villebois/Village Zone and the Town Center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Implements a demand management program to meet the measurable standards set in the TSP;</td>
<td>TDM program elements are included in TSP Chapter 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Implements a parking plan which: (A) Achieves a 10% reduction in the number of parking spaces per capita in the MPO area over the planning period. This may be accomplished through a combination of restrictions on development of new parking spaces and requirements that existing parking spaces be redeveloped to other uses; (B) Aids in achieving the measurable standards set in the TSP in response to OAR 660-012-0035(4) [reducing reliance on the automobile]; (C) Includes land use and subdivision regulations setting</td>
<td>The City will prepare a parking management plan for the Town Center as a future next step after TSP adoption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Implements a parking plan which: (A) Achieves a 10% reduction in the number of parking spaces per capita in the MPO area over the planning period. This may be accomplished through a combination of restrictions on development of new parking spaces and requirements that existing parking spaces be redeveloped to other uses; (B) Aids in achieving the measurable standards set in the TSP in response to OAR 660-012-0035(4) [reducing reliance on the automobile]; (C) Includes land use and subdivision regulations setting</td>
<td>The City will prepare a parking management plan for the Town Center as a future next step after TSP adoption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Implements a parking plan which: (A) Achieves a 10% reduction in the number of parking spaces per capita in the MPO area over the planning period. This may be accomplished through a combination of restrictions on development of new parking spaces and requirements that existing parking spaces be redeveloped to other uses; (B) Aids in achieving the measurable standards set in the TSP in response to OAR 660-012-0035(4) [reducing reliance on the automobile]; (C) Includes land use and subdivision regulations setting</td>
<td>The City will prepare a parking management plan for the Town Center as a future next step after TSP adoption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Implements a parking plan which: (A) Achieves a 10% reduction in the number of parking spaces per capita in the MPO area over the planning period. This may be accomplished through a combination of restrictions on development of new parking spaces and requirements that existing parking spaces be redeveloped to other uses; (B) Aids in achieving the measurable standards set in the TSP in response to OAR 660-012-0035(4) [reducing reliance on the automobile]; (C) Includes land use and subdivision regulations setting</td>
<td>The City will prepare a parking management plan for the Town Center as a future next step after TSP adoption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Implements a parking plan which: (A) Achieves a 10% reduction in the number of parking spaces per capita in the MPO area over the planning period. This may be accomplished through a combination of restrictions on development of new parking spaces and requirements that existing parking spaces be redeveloped to other uses; (B) Aids in achieving the measurable standards set in the TSP in response to OAR 660-012-0035(4) [reducing reliance on the automobile]; (C) Includes land use and subdivision regulations setting</td>
<td>The City will prepare a parking management plan for the Town Center as a future next step after TSP adoption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Implements a parking plan which: (A) Achieves a 10% reduction in the number of parking spaces per capita in the MPO area over the planning period. This may be accomplished through a combination of restrictions on development of new parking spaces and requirements that existing parking spaces be redeveloped to other uses; (B) Aids in achieving the measurable standards set in the TSP in response to OAR 660-012-0035(4) [reducing reliance on the automobile]; (C) Includes land use and subdivision regulations setting</td>
<td>The City will prepare a parking management plan for the Town Center as a future next step after TSP adoption.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: Findings of Compliance with the TPR (OAR 660-012-0045 and -0060)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OAR 660-012-0045 Implementation of the TSP</th>
<th>Findings of Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>minimum and maximum parking requirements in appropriate locations, such as downtowns, designated regional or community centers, and transit oriented-developments; and (D) Is consistent with demand management programs, transit-oriented development requirements and planned transit service. <strong>OR</strong> (d) As an alternative to (c) above, local governments in an MPO may instead revise ordinance requirements for parking as follows: (A) Reduce minimum off-street parking requirements for all non-residential uses from 1990 levels; (B) Allow provision of on-street parking, long-term lease parking, and shared parking to meet minimum off-street parking requirements; (C) Establish off-street parking maximums in appropriate locations, such as downtowns, designated regional or community centers, and transit-oriented developments; (D) Exempt structured parking and on-street parking from parking maximums; (E) Require that parking lots over 3 acres in size provide street-like features along major driveways (including curbs, sidewalks, and street trees or planting strips); and (F) Provide for designation of residential parking districts.</td>
<td>roadway cross-sections and Subsection 4.155 (.02) General Provisions make provisions for shared parking and off-street parking. • Section 4.155 and Table 5 (Parking Standards) establish both minimum and maximum parking space requirements. • Proposed addition to Subsection 4.155(.03) exempts structured parking and on-street parking from parking maximums. • Section 4.155(.03)B sets standards for parking area landscaping; landscaping and internal circulation for large parking areas (over 200 parking spaces) is addressed in Section 4.155.03.B.3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OAR 660-012-0060 Plan and Land Use Regulation Amendments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amendments to functional plans, acknowledged comprehensive plans, and land use regulations that significantly affect an existing or planned transportation facility shall assure that allowed land uses are consistent with the identified function, capacity, and performance standards of the facility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All land use and development applications are required to include a traffic study demonstrating that Level of Service standards can be met, unless the traffic study requirement is waived by the Community Development Director (Section 4.008.02.E). Final Stage Two Approval for Planned Development requires that proposed Planned Development provide a study showing that Level of Service D performance standards can be met at applicable intersections (Section 4.140.09.J.2). Zone change proposals require findings that “primary public facilities, i.e., roads and sidewalks, water, sewer and storm sewer are available and are of adequate size to serve the proposed development; or, that adequate facilities can be provided in conjunction with project development.” Furthermore, the Planning Commission and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Findings of Compliance with the TPR (OAR 660-012-0045 and -0060)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OAR 660-012-0045</th>
<th>Findings of Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of the TSP</td>
<td>Development Review Board “shall utilize any and all means to insure that all primary facilities are available and are adequately sized” (Section 4.197(.02)(D)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed language in Section 4.197, Zone Changes and Amendments To This Code – Procedures, requires findings of compliance with applicable Statewide Land Use Planning Goals and related administrative rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The City also has specific traffic impact analysis requirements for development within the vicinity of the Wilsonville Road interchange (Section 4.133.05.01).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GENERAL CONCLUSIONARY SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

- The proposed amendments are consistent with the Wilsonville Development Code.
- The proposed amendments are consistent with the Regional Transportation Functional Plan.
- The proposed amendments are consistent with the Wilsonville Comprehensive Plan goals and policies.
- Adoption of the 2013 TSP includes modification of existing Comprehensive Plan policies to be consistent with the goals and policies in the updated TSP, and the proposed amendments are needed to implement those revised policies.
- The proposed amendments are consistent with the Oregon Highway Plan.
- The proposed amendments are consistent with the State Transportation Planning Rule.

As is evidenced by the staff report and findings contained herein, the proposal to amend the City’s Development Code to implement the revised TSP is consistent with all applicable criteria.
Proposed Amendments to the Wilsonville Development Code
Related to the 2013 Transportation System Plan

Section 4.001 Definitions.

4. Access Control Strip Restriction: A type of access restriction that involves establishing a reserve area adjacent to and paralleling a half street improvement, or across the end of a street that is to be extended in the future, to ensure proper participation by adjoining properties in completion of the required street improvements. See Street, Half.

[Bikeway: Bikeway is a general term used to describe any type of transportation facility travel way that is designated for use by bicycles in conformance with City standards. Bikeways may or may not be within a public right-of-way and include the following: Bikeways may include bike lanes, bike paths, shared roadways, shoulder bikeways and other bikeways.

A. Bike Lane: A bike lane facility is a type of bikeway where a section of the roadway is designated for exclusive bicycle use.

B. Bike/Pedestrian Path: A bike/pedestrian path facility is a type of bikeway that is entirely separate from the roadway and is designed and constructed to allow for safe use by both pedestrians and bicyclists.

BC. Recreational Trail: A recreation trail is a type of pedestrian, bicycle, or equestrian facility that is entirely separate from roadways and has unimproved, gravel, or bark dust surface.

CD. Shared Roadway: A shared roadway facility is a type of bikeway where motorists and cyclists occupy the same roadway area.

DE. Shoulder Bikeway: A shoulder bikeway facility is a type of bikeway where cyclists occupy the paved roadway shoulder. Shoulder bikeways are common in rural areas.

E. Cycle Track: A cycle track is a bike lane with a physical barrier between the bike and motor vehicle travel lanes, such as a curb or parking lanes. Cycle tracks must “rejoin” the motor vehicle travel lanes at signalized intersections. Cycle tracks may require a two stage left turn for bicyclists.

F. See also Multipurpose pathway or path.

[Driveway Approach: A driveway connection to a public street or highway where it meets a public right-of-way.

[Major transit stop: Transit stops that are located where two or more existing or planned routes intersect or where there are existing or planned transfer locations between transit systems, Park & Ride lots, and shopping centers and other major destinations.

[Major transit street: A primary corridor for transit, receiving half-hour or better service during peak traffic hours. Typically, these streets are also arterials or major collectors.]
Multiuse pathway or path: A path that is separate from the roadway either in the roadway right-of-way or in an independent right-of-way. It is designed and constructed to allow for safe walking, biking, and other human-powered travel modes.

Through zone: The width of unobstructed space on a sidewalk or pedestrian pathway.

Section 4.005  Exclusions from Development Permit Requirement.

(.05) Except as otherwise required by Sections 4.184 and 4.500 to 4.510, the establishment, construction or termination of an authorized public facility that serves development, including such facilities as a private or public street, transportation facilities within the public right-of-way, sewer, water line, electrical power or gas distribution line, or telephone or television cable system, provided said construction complies with applicable Public Works Standards. This exemption is not intended to apply to buildings used by utility providers.


(.01) Published Notice. […]

(.02) Mailed Notice for Quasi-Judicial Hearings.

A. For development projects involving Class II Administrative Reviews, or quasijudicial public hearings, the Planning Director shall ensure the following:

1. Public hearing notices shall be mailed to the owners of real property located within 250 feet of the site of the proposed development. The Planning Director shall use the property ownership lists of the County Assessor in determining the recipients of the notices.

2. Notice shall be sent to any governmental agency that is entitled to notice under an intergovernmental agreement entered into with the City and any other affected roadway authority. The failure of another agency to respond with written comments on a pending application shall not invalidate an action or permit approval made by the City under this Code.

B. Notices shall be mailed not less than twenty (20) days nor more than forty (40) days prior to the initial public hearing date. Except, however, in cases where the development proposal will require public hearings before both the City Council and Development Review Board, in which case the notices shall be mailed at least ten (10) days before the initial public hearing.

C. In any case where State law requires different timing or form of notice than that specified in this Code, the standard requiring a broader coverage or duration of notice shall be followed.

D. The City will make a good faith effort to contact property owners whose names do not appear on County ownership records and to contact others who have asked to be contacted for different types of applications.
(.03) Mailed Notice for Legislative Hearings. Where applicable, the Planning Director shall have notices of legislative hearings mailed to individual property owners as specified in State law.

Section 4.118. Standards applying to all Planned Development Zones:

(.03) Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 4.140 to the contrary, the Development Review Board, in order to implement the purposes and objectives of Section 4.140, and based on findings of fact supported by the record may:

A. Waive the following typical development standards:
   1. minimum lot area;
   2. lot width and frontage;
   3. height and yard requirements;
   4. lot coverage;
   5. lot depth;
   6. street widths;
   7. sidewalk requirements;
   8. height of buildings other than signs;
   9. parking space configuration and drive aisle design;
   10. minimum number of parking or loading spaces;
   11. shade tree islands in parking lots, provided that alternative shading is provided;
   12. fence height;
   13. architectural design standards;
   14. transit facilities;
   15. on-site pedestrian access and circulation standards; and
   16. solar access standards, as provided in Section 4.137.

Section 4.125 V-Village Zone

(.09) Street and Access Improvement Standards

A. Except as noted below, the provisions of Section 4.177 shall apply within the Village zone:

[...]

2. Intersections of streets:
   c. Offsets: Opposing intersections shall be designed so that no offset dangerous to the traveling public is created. Intersections shall be separated by at least:
      i. 1000 ft. for major arterials
      ii. 600 ft. for minor arterials
      iii. 100 ft. for major collectors
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iv. 50 ft. for minor collector local streets

(.10) Sidewalk and Pathway Improvement Standards

A. The provisions of Section 4.178 4.154 and 4.177(.03) shall apply within the Village zone.


NOTE: Completion of Section 4.154 has been postponed pending the completion of the Transportation Systems Plan.

(.01) On-site Pedestrian Access and Circulation

A. The purpose of this section is to implement the pedestrian access and connectivity policies of the Transportation System Plan. It is intended to provide for safe, reasonably direct, and convenient pedestrian access and circulation.

B. Standards. Development shall conform to all of the following standards:

1. Continuous Pathway System. A pedestrian pathway system shall extend throughout the development site and connect to adjacent sidewalks, and to all future phases of the development, as applicable.

2. Safe, Direct, and Convenient. Pathways within developments shall provide safe, reasonably direct, and convenient connections between primary building entrances and all adjacent parking areas, recreational areas/playgrounds, and public rights-of-way and crosswalks based on all of the following criteria:

   a. Pedestrian pathways are designed primarily for pedestrian safety and convenience, meaning they are free from hazards and provide a reasonably smooth and consistent surface.

   b. The pathway is reasonably direct. A pathway is reasonably direct when it follows a route between destinations that does not involve a significant amount of unnecessary out-of-direction travel.

   c. The pathway connects to all primary building entrances and is consistent with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements.

   d. All parking lots larger than three acres in size shall provide an internal bicycle and pedestrian pathway pursuant to Section 4.155(.03)(B.)(3.)(d.)

3. Vehicle/Pathway Separation.

   Except as required for crosswalks, per subsection 4, below, where a pathway abuts a driveway or street it shall be vertically or horizontally separated from the vehicular lane. For example, a pathway may be vertically raised six inches above the abutting travel lane, or horizontally separated by a row of bollards.

4. Crosswalks. Where a pathway crosses a parking area or driveway, it shall be clearly marked with contrasting paint or paving materials (e.g., pavers, light-color concrete inlay between asphalt, or similar contrast).
5. Pathway Width and Surface. Primary pathways shall be constructed of concrete, asphalt, brick/masonry pavers, or other durable surface, and not less than five (5) feet wide. Secondary pathways and pedestrian trails may have an alternative surface except as otherwise required by the ADA.

6. All pathways shall be clearly marked with appropriate standard signs.

Section 4.155. General Regulations - Parking, Loading and Bicycle Parking.

(.01) Purpose:

[...]

(.02) General Provisions:

A. The provision and maintenance of off-street parking spaces is a continuing obligation of the property owner. The standards set forth herein shall be considered by the Development Review Board as minimum criteria.

1. The Board shall have the authority to grant variances or planned development waivers to these standards in keeping with the purposes and objectives set forth in the Comprehensive Plan and this Code.

2. Waivers to the parking, loading, or bicycle parking standards shall only be issued upon a finding that the resulting development will have no significant adverse impact on the surrounding neighborhood, and the community, and that the development considered as a whole meets the purposes of this section.

[...]

(.03) Minimum and Maximum Off-Street Parking Requirements:

A. Parking and loading or delivery areas shall be designed with access and maneuvering area adequate to serve the functional needs of the site and shall:

1. Separate loading and delivery areas and circulation from customer and/or employee parking and pedestrian areas. Circulation patterns shall be clearly marked.

2. To the greatest extent possible, separate vehicle and pedestrian traffic.

B. Parking and loading or delivery areas shall be landscaped to minimize the visual dominance of the parking or loading area, as follows:

[...]

3. Due to their large amount of impervious surface, new development with parking areas of more than two hundred (200) spaces that are located in any zone, and that may be viewed from the public right of way, shall be landscaped to the following additional standards:

a. One (1) tree shall be planted per six (6) parking spaces or fraction thereof. At least twenty-five percent (25%) of the required trees must be planted in the interior of the parking area.

b. Required trees may be planted within the parking area or the perimeter, provided that a minimum of forty percent (40%) of the canopy dripline of mature perimeter trees can be expected to shade or overlap the parking
area. Shading shall be determined based on shadows cast on the summer solstice.

c. All parking lots in excess of two hundred (200) parking spaces shall provide an internal pedestrian walkway for every six (6) parking aisles. Minimum walkway clearance shall be at least five (5) feet in width. Walkways shall be designed to provide pedestrian access to parking areas in order to minimize pedestrian travel among vehicles. Walkways shall be designed to channel pedestrians to the front entrance of the building.

d. Parking lots more than three acres in size shall provide street-like features along principal drive isles, including curbs, sidewalks, street trees or planting strips, and bicycle routes.

e. All parking lots viewed from the public right of way shall have a minimum twelve (12) foot landscaped buffer…

f. Where topography and slope condition permit, the landscape buffer shall integrate parking lot storm water treatment […]

f. g. In addition to the application requirements of section 4.035(.04)(6)(d), […]

C. Off Street Parking shall be designed for safe and convenient access that meets ADA and ODOT standards. All parking areas which contain ten (10) or more parking spaces, shall for every fifty (50) standard spaces, provide one ADA-accessible parking space that is constructed to building code standards, Wilsonville Code 9.000.

D. Where possible, parking areas shall be designed to connect with parking areas on adjacent sites so as to eliminate the necessity for any mode of travel to utilize the public street for multiple accesses or cross movements. In addition, on-site parking shall be designed for efficient on-site circulation and parking.

E. In all multi-family dwelling developments, there shall be sufficient areas established to provide for parking and storage of motorcycles, mopeds and bicycles. Such areas shall be clearly defined and reserved for the exclusive use of these vehicles.

F. On-street parking spaces, directly adjoining the frontage of and on the same side of the street as the subject property, may be counted towards meeting the minimum off street parking standards.

G. Tables below shall be used to determine the minimum and maximum parking standards for various land uses. The minimum number of required parking spaces shown on Tables 5 shall be determined by rounding to the nearest whole parking space. For example, a use containing 500 square feet, in an area where the standard is one space for each 400 square feet of floor area, is required to provide one off-street parking space. If the same use contained more than 600 square feet, a second parking space would be required. [Amended by Ordinance No. 538, 2/21/02.] Structured parking and on-street parking are exempted from the parking maximums in Table 5.

H. Electrical Vehicle Charging Stations:
1. Parking spaces designed to accommodate and provide one or more electric vehicle charging stations on site may be counted towards meeting the minimum off-street parking standards.

2. Modification of existing parking spaces to accommodate electric vehicle charging stations on site is allowed outright.

I. Motorcycle Parking:

1. Motorcycle parking may substitute for up to 5 spaces or 5 percent of required automobile parking, whichever is less. For every 4 motorcycle parking spaces provided, the automobile parking requirement is reduced by one space.

2. Each motorcycle space must be at least 4 feet wide and 8 feet deep. Existing parking may be converted to take advantage of this provision.

.04) Bicycle Parking:

A. Required Bicycle Parking - General Provisions

1. The required minimum number of bicycle parking spaces for each use category is shown in Table 5, Parking Standards, below.

2. A minimum of 50% of the bicycle parking spaces shall be provided as long-term bicycle parking in any of the following situations:
   a. When 10% or more of automobile vehicle parking is covered.
   b. If more than six (6) bicycle parking spaces are required.
   c. Multifamily residential development with nine or more units.

3. Bicycle parking spaces are not required for accessory buildings. If a primary use is listed in Table 5, bicycle parking is not required for the accessory use.

4. When there are two or more primary uses on a site, the required bicycle parking for the site is the sum of the required bicycle parking for the individual primary uses.

5. Each space must be at least 2 feet by 6 feet in area, be accessible without moving another bicycle, and provide enough space between the rack and any obstructions to use the space properly.

6. An aisle at least 5 feet wide shall be maintained behind all required bicycle parking to allow room for bicycle maneuvering. Where the bicycle parking is adjacent to a sidewalk, the maneuvering area may extend into the right-of-way.

B. Short-term Bicycle Parking

1. Short-term bicycle parking encourages shoppers, customers, and other visitors to use bicycles by providing a convenient and readily accessible place to park bicycles.

2. Required short-term bicycle parking shall meet the following standards:
   a. Provide lockers or racks that meet the standards of this section.
   b. Locate within 30 feet of the main entrance to the building or inside a building, in a location that is easily accessible for bicycles.
   c. If 10 or more spaces are required, then at least 50 percent of these shall be covered.
C. Long-term Bicycle Parking

1. Long-term bicycle parking provides employees, students, residents, commuters, and others who generally stay at a site for several hours a weather-protected place to park bicycles.

2. Required long-term bicycle parking shall meet the following standards:
   a. Provide racks, storage rooms, or lockers in areas that are secure or monitored (e.g., visible to employees or monitored by security guards).
   b. Locate the space within 100 feet of the entrance that will be accessed by the intended users.
   c. At least 50 percent of the spaces shall be covered.

D. Covered Parking (Weather Protection):

1. When required, covered bicycle parking, shall be provided in one of the following ways: inside buildings, under roof overhangs or awnings, in bicycle lockers, or within or under other structures.

2. Where required covered bicycle parking is not within a building or locker, the cover must be permanent and designed to protect the bicycle from rainfall and provide seven (7) foot minimum overhead clearance.

3. Where required bicycle parking is provided in lockers, the lockers shall be securely anchored.

Note: In considering proposed waivers to the following standards, the City will consider the potential uses of the site and not just the uses that are currently proposed. For waivers to exceed the maximum standards, applicants shall bear the burden of proving that Metro, State, and federal clean air standards will not be violated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 5: PARKING STANDARDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE</th>
<th>PARKING MINIMUMS</th>
<th>PARKING MAXIMUMS</th>
<th>BICYCLE MINIMUMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Single and attached</td>
<td>1 per D.U., except</td>
<td>No Limit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>units and any apartments</td>
<td>accessory dwelling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9 or fewer units)</td>
<td>units, which have no minimum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(.045) Minimum Off-Street Loading Requirements:

A. […]

B. Exceptions and Adjustments.

1. The Planning Director or Development Review Board may approve a loading area adjacent to or within a street right-of-way where it finds that loading and unloading operations:
   a. Are short in duration (i.e., less than one hour);
   b. Are infrequent (less than three operations daily);
   c. Do not obstruct traffic during peak traffic hours;
   d. Do not interfere with emergency response services or bicycle and pedestrian facilities; and
   e. Are acceptable to the applicable roadway authority.

(.06) Carpool and Vanpool Parking Requirements:

A. Carpool and vanpool parking spaces shall be identified for the following uses:
   1. New commercial and industrial developments with seventy-five (75) or more parking spaces,
   2. New institutional or public assembly uses, and
   3. Transit park-and-ride facilities with fifty (50) or more parking spaces.

B. Of the total spaces available for employee, student, and commuter parking, at least five percent, but not fewer than two, shall be designated for exclusive carpool and vanpool parking.

BC. Carpool and vanpool parking spaces shall be located closer to the main employee, student or commuter entrance than all other parking spaces with the exception of ADA parking spaces.

CD. Required carpool/vanpool spaces shall be clearly marked "Reserved - Carpool/Vanpool Only."

(.07) Parking Area Redevelopment:

The number of parking spaces may be reduced by up to 10% of the minimum required parking spaces for that use when a portion of the existing parking area is modified to accommodate or provide transit-related amenities such as transit stops, pull-outs, shelters, and park and ride stations.

Section 4.177. Street Improvement Standards.

Note: This section is expected to be revised after the completion of the Transportation Systems Plan.

This section contains the City’s requirements and standards for pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facility improvements to public streets, or within public easements. The purpose of this section is to ensure that development, including redevelopment, provides transportation facilities that are safe, convenient, and adequate in rough proportion to their impacts.

(.01) Except as specifically approved by the Development Review Board, all street and access improvements shall conform to the Transportation Systems Plan and the Public Works Standards, together with the following standards. [Amended by Ord. 682, 9/9/10] Development and related public facility improvements shall comply with the standards in this section, the Wilsonville Public Works Standards, and the Transportation System Plan, in rough proportion to the potential impacts of the development. Such improvements shall be constructed at the time of development or as
provided by Section 4.140, except as modified or waived by the City Engineer for reasons of safety or traffic operations.

(02) Street Design Standards

A. All street improvements and intersections shall conform to the Public Works Standards and shall provide for the continuation of streets through specific developments to adjoining properties or subdivisions.

1. Development shall be required to provide existing or future connections to adjacent sites through the use of access easements where applicable. Such easements shall be required in addition to required public street dedications as required in Section 4.236(.04).

B. The City Engineer shall make the final determination regarding right-of-way and street element widths using the ranges provided in Chapter 3 of the Transportation System Plan and the additional street design standards in the Public Works Standards. All streets shall be developed with curbs, utility strips and sidewalks on both sides; or a sidewalk on one side and a bike path on the other side.

1. Within a Planned Development the Development Review Board may approve a sidewalk on only one side. If the sidewalk is permitted on just one side of the street, the owners will be required to sign an agreement to an assessment in the future to construct the other sidewalk if the City Council decides it is necessary.

C. Rights-of-way.

1. Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy Building permits or as a part of the recordation of a final plat, the City shall require dedication of rights-of-way in accordance with the Street System Master Transportation Systems Plan. All dedications shall be recorded with the County Assessor’s Office.

2. The City shall also require a waiver of remonstrance against formation of a local improvement district, and all non-remonstrances shall be recorded in the County Recorder’s Office as well as the City's Lien Docket, prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy Building Permit or as a part of the recordation of a final plat.

3. In order to allow for potential future widening, a special setback requirement shall be maintained adjacent to all arterial streets. The minimum setback shall be 55 feet from the centerline or 25 feet from the right-of-way designated on the Master Plan, whichever is greater.

D. Dead-end Streets. New dead-end streets or cul-de-sacs shall not exceed 200 feet in length, unless the adjoining land contains barriers such as existing buildings, railroads or freeways, or environmental constraints such as steep slopes, or major streams or rivers, that prevent future street extension and connection. A central landscaped island with rainwater management and infiltration are encouraged in cul-de-sac design. No more than 25 dwelling units shall take access to a new dead-end or cul-de-sac street unless it is determined that the traffic impacts on adjacent streets will not exceed those from a development of 25 or fewer units. All other dimensional standards of dead-end streets shall be governed by the Public Works Standards. Notification that the street is planned for future extension shall be posted on the dead-end street.

[Amended by Ord. # 674 11/16/09]

E. Access drives and travel lanes.
1. An access drive to any proposed development shall be designed to provide a clear travel lane free from any obstructions.

2. Access drive travel lanes shall be constructed with a hard surface capable of carrying a 23-ton load.

3. Secondary or emergency access lanes may be improved to a minimum 12 feet with an all-weather surface as approved by the Fire District. All fire lanes shall be dedicated easements.

4. Minimum access requirements shall be adjusted commensurate with the intended function of the site based on vehicle types and traffic generation.

5. Where access drives connect to the public right of way, construction within the right of way shall be in conformance to the Public Works Standards.

**EE. Corner or clear vision area.**

1. A clear vision area which meets the Public Works Standards shall be maintained on each corner of property at the intersection of any two streets, a street and a railroad or a street and a driveway. However, the following items shall be exempt from meeting this requirement:
   a. Light and utility poles with a diameter less than 12 inches.
   b. Trees less than 6” d.b.h., approved as a part of the Stage II Site Design, or administrative review.
   c. Except as allowed by b., above, an existing tree, trimmed to the trunk, 10 feet above the curb.
   d. Official warning or street sign.
   e. Natural contours where the natural elevations are such that there can be no cross-visibility at the intersection and necessary excavation would result in an unreasonable hardship on the property owner or deteriorate the quality of the site.

**GF. Vertical clearance -** a minimum clearance of 12 feet above the pavement surface shall be maintained over all streets and access drives.

**HG. Interim improvement standard.** It is anticipated that all existing streets, except those in new subdivisions, will require complete reconstruction to support urban level traffic volumes. However, in most cases, existing and short-term projected traffic volumes do not warrant improvements to full Master Plan standards. Therefore, unless otherwise specified by the Development Review Board/Planning Commission, the following interim standards shall apply.

1. Arterials - 24 foot paved, with standard sub-base. Asphalt overlays are generally considered unacceptable, but may be considered as an interim improvement based on the recommendations of the City Engineer, regarding adequate structural quality to support an overlay.

2. Half-streets are generally considered unacceptable. However, where the Development Review Board finds it essential to allow for reasonable development, a half-street may be approved. Whenever a half-street improvement is approved, it shall conform to the requirements in the Public Works Standards:

3. When considered appropriate in conjunction with other anticipated or scheduled street improvements, the City Engineer may approve street improvements with a single asphalt lift. However, adequate provision must be made for interim storm drainage, pavement transitions at seams and the scheduling of the second lift through the Capital Improvements Plan.
.03 Sidewalks. Sidewalks shall be provided on the public street frontage of all development. Sidewalks shall generally be constructed within the dedicated public right-of-way, but may be located outside of the right-of-way within a public easement with the approval of the City Engineer.

A. Sidewalk widths shall include a minimum through zone of at least five feet. The through zone may be reduced pursuant to variance procedures in Section 4.196, a waiver pursuant to Section 4.118, or by authority of the City Engineer for reasons of traffic operations, efficiency, or safety.

B. Within a Planned Development the Development Review Board may approve a sidewalk on only one side. If the sidewalk is permitted on just one side of the street, the owners will be required to sign an agreement to an assessment in the future to construct the other sidewalk if the City Council decides it is necessary.

.04 Bicycle Facilities. Bicycle facilities shall be provided to implement the Transportation System Plan, and may include on-street and off-street bike lanes, shared lanes, bike boulevards, and cycle tracks. The design of on-street bicycle facilities will vary according to the functional classification and the average daily traffic of the facility.

.05 Multiuse Pathways. Pathways may be in addition to, or in lieu of, a public street. Paths that are in addition to a public street shall generally run parallel to that street, and shall be designed in accordance with the Public Works Standards or as specified by the City Engineer. Paths that are in lieu of a public street shall be considered in areas only where no other public street connection options are feasible, and are subject to the following standards.

A. Paths shall be located to provide a reasonably direct connection between likely pedestrian and bicyclist destinations. Additional standards relating to entry points, maximum length, visibility, and path lighting are provided in the Public Works Standards.

B. To ensure ongoing access to and maintenance of pedestrian/bicycle paths, the City Engineer will require dedication of the path to the public and acceptance of the path by the City as public right-of-way; or creation of a public access easement over the path.

.06 Transit Improvements

Development on sites that are adjacent to or incorporate major transit streets shall provide improvements as described in this section to any bus stop located along the site’s frontage, unless waived by the City Engineer for reasons of safety or traffic operations. Transit facilities include bus stops, shelters, and related facilities. Required transit facility improvements may include the dedication of land or the provision of a public easement.

A. Development shall at a minimum provide:

1. Reasonably direct pedestrian connections, as defined by Section 4.154, between building entrances and the transit facility and between buildings on the site and streets adjoining transit stops.

2. Improvements at major transit stops. Improvements may include intersection or mid-block traffic management improvements to allow for pedestrian crossings at major transit stops.

B. Developments generating an average of 49 or more pm peak hour trips shall provide bus stop improvements per the Public Works Standards. Required improvements may include provision
of benches, shelters, pedestrian lighting; or provision of an easement or dedication of land for transit facilities.

C. In addition to the requirements of 4.177(.06)(A.)(2,) development generating more than 199 pm peak hour trips on major transit streets shall provide a bus pullout, curb extension, and intersection or mid-block traffic management improvements to allow for pedestrian crossings at major transit stops.

D. In addition to the requirements of 4.177(.06)(A.)and (B.), development generating more than 500 pm peak-hour trips on major transit streets shall provide on-site circulation to accommodate transit service.

(027) Residential Private Access Drives shall meet the following standards:

A. Residential Private Access Drives shall provide primary vehicular access to no more than four (4) dwelling units, excluding accessory dwelling units.

B. The design and construction of a Residential Private Access Drive shall ensure a useful lifespan and structural maintenance schedule comparable, as determined by the City Engineer or City’s Authorized Representative, to a local street constructed in conformance to current public works standards.

1. The design of residential private access drives shall be stamped by a professional engineer registered in the state of Oregon and shall be approved by the City Engineer or City’s Authorized Representative to ensure the above requirement is met.

2. Prior to issuing a certificate of occupancy for any residential dwelling unit whose primary vehicular access is from a Residential Private Access Drive the City Engineer or City’s Authorized Representative shall certify construction of the Residential Private Access Drive substantially conforms the design approved by the City Engineer or City’s Authorized Representative.

C. Residential Private Access Drives shall be named for addressing purposes. All Residential Private Access Drives shall use the suffix “Lane”, i.e. SW Oakview Lane.

D. Residential Private Access Drives shall meet or exceed the standards for access drives and travel lanes established in Subsection (.01) G. (.08) of this Section.

(.08) Access Drive and Driveway Approach Development Standards.

A. An access drive to any proposed development shall be designed to provide a clear travel lane free from any obstructions.

B. Access drive travel lanes shall be constructed with a hard surface capable of carrying a 23-ton load.

C. Where emergency vehicle access is required, approaches and driveways shall be designed and constructed to accommodate emergency vehicle apparatus and shall conform to applicable fire protection requirements. The City may restrict parking, require signage, or require other public safety improvements pursuant to the recommendations of an emergency service provider.

D. Secondary or emergency access lanes may be improved to a minimum 12 feet with an all-weather surface as approved by the Fire District. All fire lanes shall be dedicated easements.
E. Minimum access requirements shall be adjusted commensurate with the intended function of the site based on vehicle types and traffic generation.

F. The number of approaches on higher classification streets (e.g., collector and arterial streets) shall be minimized; where practicable, access shall be taken first from a lower classification street.

G. The City may limit the number or location of connections to a street, or impose access restrictions where the roadway authority requires mitigation to alleviate safety or traffic operations concerns.

H. The City may require a driveway to extend to one or more edges of a parcel and be designed to allow for future extension and inter-parcel circulation as adjacent properties develop. The City may also require the owner(s) of the subject site to record an access easement for future joint use of the approach and driveway as the adjacent property(ies) develop(s).

I. Driveways shall accommodate all projected vehicular traffic on-site without vehicles stacking or backing up onto a street.

J. Driveways shall be designed so that vehicle areas, including but not limited to drive-up and drive-through facilities and vehicle storage and service areas, do not obstruct any public right-of-way.

K. Approaches and driveways shall not be wider than necessary to safely accommodate projected peak hour trips and turning movements, and shall be designed to minimize crossing distances for pedestrians.

L. As it deems necessary for pedestrian safety, the City, in consultation with the roadway authority, may require traffic-calming features, such as speed tables, textured driveway surfaces, curb extensions, signage or traffic control devices, or other features, be installed on or in the vicinity of a site.

M. Approaches and driveways shall be located and designed to allow for safe maneuvering in and around loading areas, while avoiding conflicts with pedestrians, parking, landscaping, and buildings.

N. Where a proposed driveway crosses a culvert or drainage ditch, the City may require the developer to install a culvert extending under and beyond the edges of the driveway on both sides of it, pursuant applicable Public Works standards.

O. Except as otherwise required by the applicable roadway authority or waived by the City Engineer, temporary driveways providing access to a construction site or staging area shall be paved or graveled to prevent tracking of mud onto adjacent paved streets.

P. Unless constrained by topography, natural resources, rail lines, freeways, existing or planned or approved development, or easements or covenants, driveways proposed as part of a residential or mixed-use development shall meet local street spacing standards and shall be constructed to align with existing or planned streets, if the driveway.

1. Intersects with a public street that is controlled, or is to be controlled in the planning period, by a traffic signal;

2. Intersects with an existing arterial or collector street; or

3. Would be an extension of an existing or planned local street, or of another major driveway.
(.09) Minimum street intersection spacing standards.

A. New streets shall intersect at existing street intersections so that centerlines are not offset. Where existing streets adjacent to a proposed development do not align properly, conditions shall be imposed on the development to provide for proper alignment.

B. Minimum intersection spacing standards are provided in Transportation System Plan Table 3-2.

(.10) Exceptions and Adjustments. The City may approve adjustments to the spacing standards of subsections (.08) and (.9) above through a Class II process, or as a waiver per Section 4.118(0.3)A, where an existing connection to a City street does not meet the standards of the roadway authority, the proposed development moves in the direction of code compliance, and mitigation measures alleviate all traffic operations and safety concerns. Mitigation measures may include consolidated access (removal of one access), joint use driveways (more than one property uses same access), directional limitations (e.g., one-way), turning restrictions (e.g., right in/out only), or other mitigation.

Section 4.178. Sidewalk and Pathway Standards.

(.01) Sidewalks. All sidewalks shall be concrete and a minimum of five (5) feet in width, except where the walk is adjacent to commercial storefronts. In such cases, they shall be increased to a minimum of ten (10) feet in width. Sidewalk widths shall include a minimum through zone of at least five feet. The clear zone may be reduced pursuant to variance procedures in Section 4.196.

(.02) Pathways

A. Bicycle facilities shall be provided using a bicycle lane as the preferred facility design. Other facility designs described in the Public Works Standards shall only be used if the bike lane standard cannot be constructed due to physical or financial constraints. The order of preference for bicycle facilities is:

1. Bike lane.
2. Shoulder bikeway.
3. Shared roadway.

B. Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities located within the public right-of-way or public easement shall be constructed in conformance with the Public Works Standards.

C. To increase safety, all street crossings shall be marked and should be designed with a change of pavement such as brick or exposed aggregate. Arterial crossings may be signalized at the discretion of the City Engineer.

D. All pathways shall be clearly posted with standard bikeway signs.

E. Pedestrian and equestrian trails may have a gravel or sawdust surface if not intended for all weather use.

(.03) Bicycle and pedestrian paths shall be located to provide a reasonably direct connection between likely destinations. A reasonably direct connection is a route which minimizes out-of-direction travel considering terrain, physical barriers, and safety. The objective of this standard is to achieve the equivalent of a 1/4 mile grid of routes.
Section 4.197. Zone Changes and Amendments To This Code – Procedures.

(04) Pathway Clearance.

A. Vertical and horizontal clearance for bicycle and pedestrian paths is specified in the Public Works Standards. The clearance above equestrian trails shall be a minimum of ten feet. [Section 4.178 amended by Ord. 610, 5/1/06]

Section 4.197. Zone Changes and Amendments To This Code – Procedures.

(01) The following procedure shall be followed in applying for an amendment to the text of this Chapter:

A. The Planning Commission shall conduct a public hearing on the proposed amendment at its earliest practicable meeting after it is proposed and shall, within forty (40) days after concluding the hearing, provide a report and recommendation to the City Council regarding the proposed amendment. The findings and recommendations of the Commission shall be adopted by resolution and shall be signed by the Chair of the Commission.

B. In recommending approval of a proposed text amendment, the Planning Commission shall, at a minimum, adopt findings relative to the following:

1. That the application was submitted in compliance with the procedures set forth in Section 4.008; and

2. The amendment substantially complies with all applicable goals, policies and objectives set forth in the Comprehensive Plan; and

3. The amendment does not materially conflict with, nor endanger, other provisions of the text of the Code; and

4. If applicable, the amendment is in compliance with Statewide Land Use Planning Goals and related administrative rules; and

4.5. If applicable, the amendment is necessary to ensure that the City's Land Use and Development Ordinance complies with mandated requirements of State or Federal laws and/or statutes.

(02) In recommending approval or denial of a proposed zone map amendment, the Planning Commission or Development Review Board shall at a minimum, adopt findings addressing the following criteria:

A. That the application before the Commission or Board was submitted in accordance with the procedures set forth in Section 4.008, Section 4.125 (.18)(B)(2) or, in the case of a Planned Development, Section 4.140; and [Amended by Ord 557, adopted 9/5/03]

B. That the proposed amendment is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan map designation and substantially complies with the applicable goals, policies and objectives, set forth in the Comprehensive Plan text; and

C. In the event that the subject property, or any portion thereof, is designated as "Residential" on the City's Comprehensive Plan Map; specific findings shall be made addressing substantial compliance with Implementation Measures 4.1.4.b, d, e, q, and x of Wilsonville's Comprehensive Plan text; and [Amended by Ordinance No. 538, 2/21/02.]

D. That the existing primary public facilities, i.e., roads and sidewalks, water, sewer and storm sewer are available and are of adequate size to serve the proposed development; or, that adequate facilities can be provided in conjunction with project development. The Planning Commission
and Development Review Board shall utilize any and all means to insure that all primary
facilities are available and are adequately sized; and

E. That the proposed development does not have a significant adverse effect upon Significant
Resource Overlay Zone areas, an identified natural hazard, or an identified geologic hazard. When Significant Resource Overlay Zone areas or natural hazard, and/or geologic hazard are
located on or abut the proposed development, the Planning Commission or Development Review
Board shall use appropriate measures to mitigate and significantly reduce conflicts between the
development and identified hazard or Significant Resource Overlay Zone and

F. That the applicant is committed to a development schedule demonstrating that development of
the property is reasonably expected to commence within two (2) years of the initial approval of
the zone change; and

G. That the proposed development and use(s) can be developed in compliance with the applicable
development standards or appropriate conditions are attached that insure that the project
development substantially conforms to the applicable development standards.

H. Adequate public facilities, services, and transportation networks are in place, or are planned to be
provided concurrently with the development of the property. The applicant shall demonstrate
compliance with the Transportation Planning Rule, specifically by addressing whether the
proposed amendment has a significant effect on the transportation system pursuant to OAR 660-
012-0060. A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) shall be prepared pursuant to the requirements in
Section 4.133.05.(01).

Section 4.236. General Requirements - Streets.

(.01) Conformity to the Master Transportation System Plan or Map: Land divisions shall conform to and
be in harmony with the Transportation Master Plan (Transportation Systems Plan), the Bicycle and
Pedestrian Master Plan, and the Parks and Recreation Master Plan, the Official Plan or Map and
especially to the Master Street Plan.

(.02) Relation to Adjoining Street System.

[...]

(.03) All streets shall conform to the standards set forth in Section 4.177 and the block size requirements
of the zone.

(.04) Creation of Easements: [...]

(.05) Topography: [...]

(.06) Reserve Strips: [...]

(.07) Future Expansion of Street: When necessary to give access to, or permit a satisfactory future division
of, adjoining land, streets shall be extended to the boundary of the land division and the resulting
dead-end street may be approved without a turn-around. Reserve strips and street plugs shall be
required to preserve the objective of street extension. Notification that the street is planned for
future extension shall be posted on the stub street.
Proposed Amendments to the Wilsonville Development Code
Related to the 2013 Transportation System Plan

Section 4.001 Definitions.

4. **Access Control Restriction:** A type of access restriction that involves establishing a reserve area adjacent to and paralleling a half street improvement, or across the end of a street that is to be extended in the future, to ensure proper participation by adjoining properties in completion of the required street improvements. See Street, Half.

[##]. **Bikeway:** Bikeway is a general term used to describe any type of transportation facility that is designated for use by bicycles in conformance with City standards. Bikeways may or may not be within a public right-of-way and include the following:

A. **Bike Lane:** A bike lane facility is a type of bikeway where a section of the roadway is designated for exclusive bicycle use.

B. **Recreational Trail:** A recreation trail is a type of pedestrian, bicycle, or equestrian facility that is entirely separate from roadways and has unimproved, gravel, or bark dust surface.

C. **Shared Roadway:** A shared roadway facility is a type of bikeway where motorists and cyclists occupy the same roadway area.

D. **Shoulder Bikeway:** A shoulder bikeway facility is a type of bikeway where cyclists occupy the paved roadway shoulder. Shoulder bikeways are common in rural areas.

E. **Cycle Track:** A cycle track is a bike lane with a physical barrier between the bike and motor vehicle travel lanes, such as a curb or parking lanes. Cycle tracks must “rejoin” the motor vehicle travel lanes at signalized intersections. Cycle tracks may require a two stage left turn for bicyclists.

F. See also: Multipurpose Pathway or Path.

[##]. **Driveway Approach:** A driveway connection to a public street or highway where it meets a public right-of-way.

[##]. **Major Transit Stop:** Transit stops that are located where two or more existing or planned routes intersect or where there are existing or planned transfer locations between transit systems, Park & Ride lots, and shopping centers and other major destinations.

[##]. **Major Transit Street:** A primary corridor for transit, receiving half-hour or better service during peak traffic hours. Typically, these streets are also arterials or major collectors.

[##]. **Multiuse Pathway or Path:** A path that is separate from the roadway either in the roadway right-of-way or in an independent right-of-way. It is designed and constructed to allow for safe walking, biking, and other human-powered travel modes.

[##]. **Through Zone:** The width of unobstructed space on a sidewalk or pedestrian pathway.
Section 4.005 Exclusions from Development Permit Requirement.

(.05) Except as otherwise required by Sections 4.184 and 4.500 to 4.510, the establishment, construction or termination of an authorized public facility that serves development, including such facilities as a private street, transportation facilities within the public right-of-way, sewer, water line, electrical power or gas distribution line, or telephone or television cable system, provided said construction complies with applicable Public Works Standards. This exemption is not intended to apply to buildings used by utility providers.

Section 4.012 Public Hearing Notices.

(.01) Published Notice. […]

(.02) Mailed Notice for Quasi-Judicial Hearings.

A. For development projects involving Class II Administrative Reviews, or quasi-judicial public hearings, the Planning Director shall ensure the following:

1. Public hearing notices shall be mailed to the owners of real property located within 250 feet of the site of the proposed development. The Planning Director shall use the property ownership lists of the County Assessor in determining the recipients of the notices.

2. Notice shall be sent to any governmental agency that is entitled to notice under an intergovernmental agreement entered into with the City and any other affected roadway authority. The failure of another agency to respond with written comments on a pending application shall not invalidate an action or permit approval made by the City under this Code.

B. Notices shall be mailed not less than twenty (20) days nor more than forty (40) days prior to the initial public hearing date. Except, however, in cases where the development proposal will require public hearings before both the City Council and Development Review Board, in which case the notices shall be mailed at least ten (10) days before the initial public hearing.

C. In any case where State law requires different timing or form of notice than that specified in this Code, the standard requiring a broader coverage or duration of notice shall be followed.

D. The City will make a good faith effort to contact property owners whose names do not appear on County ownership records and to contact others who have asked to be contacted for different types of applications.

(.03) Mailed Notice for Legislative Hearings. Where applicable, the Planning Director shall have notices of legislative hearings mailed to individual property owners as specified in State law.
Section 4.118. Standards applying to all Planned Development Zones:

(.03) Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 4.140 to the contrary, the Development Review Board, in order to implement the purposes and objectives of Section 4.140, and based on findings of fact supported by the record may:

A. Waive the following typical development standards:
   1. Minimum lot area;
   2. Lot width and frontage;
   3. Height and yard requirements;
   4. Lot coverage;
   5. Lot depth;
   6. Street widths;
   7. Sidewalk requirements;
   8. Height of buildings other than signs;
   9. Parking space configuration and drive aisle design;
   10. Minimum number of parking or loading spaces;
   11. Shade tree islands in parking lots, provided that alternative shading is provided;
   12. Fence height;
   13. Architectural design standards;
   14. Transit facilities;
   15. On-site pedestrian access and circulation standards; and
   16. Solar access standards, as provided in section 4.137.

Section 4.125. V – Village Zone

(.09) Street and Access Improvement Standards

A. Except as noted below, the provisions of Section 4.177 shall apply within the Village Zone:

 […]

2. Intersections of streets:

 […]

c. Offsets: Opposing intersections shall be designed so that no offset dangerous to the traveling public is created. Intersections shall be separated by at least:

   i. 1000 ft. for major arterials
   ii. 600 ft. for minor arterials
   iii. 100 ft. for collectors
   iv. 50 ft. for local streets
Section 4.154. **On-site Pedestrian Access and Circulation.**

(01) **On-site Pedestrian Access and Circulation**

A. The purpose of this section is to implement the pedestrian access and connectivity policies of the Transportation System Plan. It is intended to provide for safe, reasonably direct, and convenient pedestrian access and circulation.

B. Standards. Development shall conform to all of the following standards:

1. Continuous Pathway System. A pedestrian pathway system shall extend throughout the development site and connect to adjacent sidewalks, and to all future phases of the development, as applicable.

2. Safe, Direct, and Convenient. Pathways within developments shall provide safe, reasonably direct, and convenient connections between primary building entrances and all adjacent parking areas, recreational areas/playgrounds, and public rights-of-way and crosswalks based on all of the following criteria:
   a. Pedestrian pathways are designed primarily for pedestrian safety and convenience, meaning they are free from hazards and provide a reasonably smooth and consistent surface.
   b. The pathway is reasonably direct. A pathway is reasonably direct when it follows a route between destinations that does not involve a significant amount of unnecessary out-of-direction travel.
   c. The pathway connects to all primary building entrances and is consistent with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements.
   d. All parking lots larger than three acres in size shall provide an internal bicycle and pedestrian pathway pursuant to Section 4.155(.03)(B.)(3.)(d.).

3. Vehicle/Pathway Separation. Except as required for crosswalks, per subsection 4, below, where a pathway abuts a driveway or street it shall be vertically or horizontally separated from the vehicular lane. For example, a pathway may be vertically raised six inches above the abutting travel lane, or horizontally separated by a row of bollards.

4. Crosswalks. Where a pathway crosses a parking area or driveway, it shall be clearly marked with contrasting paint or paving materials (e.g., pavers, light-color concrete inlay between asphalt, or similar contrast).

5. Pathway Width and Surface. Primary pathways shall be constructed of concrete, asphalt, brick/masonry pavers, or other durable surface, and not less than five (5) feet wide. Secondary pathways and pedestrian trails may have an alternative surface except as otherwise required by the ADA.

6. All pathways shall be clearly marked with appropriate standard signs.

Section 4.155. **General Regulations - Parking, Loading and Bicycle Parking.**

(01) **Purpose:**

[...]
(.02) General Provisions:

A. The provision and maintenance of off-street parking spaces is a continuing obligation of the property owner. The standards set forth herein shall be considered by the Development Review Board as minimum criteria.

1. The Board shall have the authority to grant variances or planned development waivers to these standards in keeping with the purposes and objectives set forth in the Comprehensive Plan and this Code.

2. Waivers to the parking, loading, or bicycle parking standards shall only be issued upon a findings that the resulting development will have no significant adverse impact on the surrounding neighborhood, and the community, and that the development considered as a whole meets the purposes of this section.

[...]

(.03) Minimum and Maximum Off-Street Parking Requirements:

A. Parking and loading or delivery areas shall be designed with access and maneuvering area adequate to serve the functional needs of the site and shall:

1. Separate loading and delivery areas and circulation from customer and/or employee parking and pedestrian areas. Circulation patterns shall be clearly marked.

2. To the greatest extent possible, separate vehicle and pedestrian traffic.

B. Parking and loading or delivery areas shall be landscaped to minimize the visual dominance of the parking or loading area, as follows:

[...]

3. Due to their large amount of impervious surface, new development with parking areas of more than two hundred (200) spaces that are located in any zone, and that may be viewed from the public right of way, shall be landscaped to the following additional standards:

a. One (1) tree shall be planted per six (6) parking spaces or fraction thereof. At least twenty-five percent (25%) of the required trees must be planted in the interior of the parking area.

b. Required trees may be planted within the parking area or the perimeter, provided that a minimum of forty percent (40%) of the canopy dripline of mature perimeter trees can be expected to shade or overlap the parking area. Shading shall be determined based on shadows cast on the summer solstice.

c. All parking lots in excess of two hundred (200) parking spaces shall provide an internal pedestrian walkway for every six (6) parking aisles. Minimum walkway clearance shall be at least five (5) feet in width. Walkways shall be designed to provide pedestrian access to parking areas in order to minimize pedestrian travel among vehicles. Walkways shall be designed to channel pedestrians to the front entrance of the building.
d. Parking lots more than three acres in size shall provide street-like features along principal drive isles, including curbs, sidewalks, street trees or planting strips, and bicycle routes.

e. All parking lots viewed from the public right-of-way shall have a minimum twelve (12) foot landscaped buffer ...

f. Where topography and slope condition permit, the landscape buffer shall integrate parking lot storm water treatment ...

g. In addition to the application requirements of Section 4.035(.04)(6)(d), ...

C. Off Street Parking shall be designed for safe and convenient access that meets ADA and ODOT standards.

D. Where possible, parking areas shall be designed to connect with parking areas on adjacent sites so as to eliminate the necessity for any mode of travel to utilize the public street for multiple accesses or cross movements. In addition, on-site parking shall be designed for efficient on-site circulation and parking.

E. In all multi-family dwelling developments, there shall be sufficient areas established to provide for parking and storage of motorcycles, mopeds and bicycles. Such areas shall be clearly defined and reserved for the exclusive use of these vehicles.

F. On-street parking spaces, directly adjoining the frontage of and on the same side of the street as the subject property, may be counted towards meeting the minimum off street parking standards.

G. Table 5 shall be used to determine the minimum and maximum parking standards for various land uses. The minimum number of required parking spaces shown on Table 5 shall be determined by rounding to the nearest whole parking space. For example, a use containing 500 square feet, in an area where the standard is one space for each 400 square feet of floor area, is required to provide one off-street parking space. If the same use contained more than 600 square feet, a second parking space would be required. [Amended by Ordinance No. 538, 2/21/02.] Structured parking and on-street parking are exempted from the parking maximums in Table 5.

H. Electrical Vehicle Charging Stations:
1. Parking spaces designed to accommodate and provide one or more electric vehicle charging stations on site may be counted towards meeting the minimum off-street parking standards.

2. Modification of existing parking spaces to accommodate electric vehicle charging stations on site is allowed outright.

I. Motorcycle parking:
1. Motorcycle parking may substitute for up to 5 spaces or 5 percent of required automobile parking, whichever is less. For every 4 motorcycle parking spaces provided, the automobile parking requirement is reduced by one space.
2. Each motorcycle space must be at least 4 feet wide and 8 feet deep. Existing parking may be converted to take advantage of this provision.

(.04) Bicycle Parking:

A. Required Bicycle Parking - General Provisions

1. The required minimum number of bicycle parking spaces for each use category is shown in Table 5, Parking Standards, below.

2. A minimum of 50% of the bicycle parking spaces shall be provided as long-term bicycle parking in any of the following situations:
   a. When 10% or more of automobile vehicle parking is covered.
   b. If more than six (6) bicycle parking spaces are required.
   c. Multifamily residential development with nine or more units.

3. Bicycle parking spaces are not required for accessory buildings. If a primary use is listed in Table 5, bicycle parking is not required for the accessory use.

4. When there are two or more primary uses on a site, the required bicycle parking for the site is the sum of the required bicycle parking for the individual primary uses.

5. Each space must be at least 2 feet by 6 feet in area, be accessible without moving another bicycle, and provide enough space between the rack and any obstructions to use the space properly.

6. An aisle at least 5 feet wide shall be maintained behind all required bicycle parking to allow room for bicycle maneuvering. Where the bicycle parking is adjacent to a sidewalk, the maneuvering area may extend into the right-of-way.

B. Short-term Bicycle Parking

1. Short-term bicycle parking encourages shoppers, customers, and other visitors to use bicycles by providing a convenient and readily accessible place to park bicycles.

2. Required short-term bicycle parking shall meet the following standards:
   a. Provide lockers or racks that meet the standards of this section.
   b. Locate within 30 feet of the main entrance to the building or inside a building, in a location that is easily accessible for bicycles.
   c. If 10 or more spaces are required, then at least 50 percent of these shall be covered.

C. Long-term Bicycle Parking

1. Long-term bicycle parking provides employees, students, residents, commuters, and others who generally stay at a site for several hours a weather-protected place to park bicycles.

2. Required long-term bicycle parking shall meet the following standards:
   a. Provide racks, storage rooms, or lockers in areas that are secure or monitored (e.g., visible to employees or monitored by security guards).
b. Locate the space within 100 feet of the entrance that will be accessed by the intended users.
c. At least 50 percent of the spaces shall be covered.

D. Covered Parking (Weather Protection):
   1. When required, covered bicycle parking, shall be provided in one of the following ways: inside buildings, under roof overhangs or awnings, in bicycle lockers, or within or under other structures.
   2. Where required covered bicycle parking is not within a building or locker, the cover must be permanent and designed to protect the bicycle from rainfall and provide seven (7) foot minimum overhead clearance.
   3. Where required bicycle parking is provided in lockers, the lockers shall be securely anchored.
### TABLE 5: PARKING STANDARDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE</th>
<th>PARKING MINIMUMS</th>
<th>PARKING MAXIMUMS</th>
<th>BICYCLE MINIMUMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a. Residential</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Single and attached units and any apartments (9 or fewer units)</td>
<td>1 per D.U., except accessory dwelling units, which have no minimum.</td>
<td>No Limit</td>
<td>Apartments – Min. of 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In considering proposed waivers to the following standards, the City will consider the potential uses of the site and not just the uses that are currently proposed. For waivers to exceed the maximum standards, applicants shall bear the burden of proving that Metro, State, and federal clean air standards will not be violated.
(.05) **Minimum Off-Street Loading Requirements:**

A. [...] 

B. Exceptions and Adjustments.

1. The Planning Director or Development Review Board may approve a loading area adjacent to or within a street right-of-way where it finds that loading and unloading operations:
   a. Are short in duration (i.e., less than one hour);
   b. Are infrequent (less than three operations daily);
   c. Do not obstruct traffic during peak traffic hours;
   d. Do not interfere with emergency response services or bicycle and pedestrian facilities; and
   e. Are acceptable to the applicable roadway authority.

(.06) **Carpool and Vanpool Parking Requirements:**

A. Carpool and vanpool parking spaces shall be identified for the following uses:

1. New commercial and industrial developments with seventy-five (75) or more parking spaces,
2. New institutional or public assembly uses, and
3. Transit park-and-ride facilities with fifty (50) or more parking spaces.

B. Of the total spaces available for employee, student, and commuter parking, at least five percent, but not fewer than two, shall be designated for exclusive carpool and vanpool parking.

C. Carpool and vanpool parking spaces shall be located closer to the main employee, student or commuter entrance than all other parking spaces with the exception of ADA parking spaces.

D. Required carpool/vanpool spaces shall be clearly marked "Reserved - Carpool/Vanpool Only."

(.07) **Parking Area Redevelopment.** The number of parking spaces may be reduced by up to 10% of the minimum required parking spaces for that use when a portion of the existing parking area is modified to accommodate or provide transit-related amenities such as transit stops, pull-outs, shelters, and park and ride stations.

**Section 4.177. Street Improvement Standards.**

This section contains the City’s requirements and standards for pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facility improvements to public streets, or within public easements. The purpose of this section is to ensure that development, including redevelopment, provides transportation facilities that are safe, convenient, and adequate in rough proportion to their impacts.

(.01) Development and related public facility improvements shall comply with the standards in this section, the Wilsonville Public Works Standards, and the
Transportation System Plan, in rough proportion to the potential impacts of the development. Such improvements shall be constructed at the time of development or as provided by Section 4.140, except as modified or waived by the City Engineer for reasons of safety or traffic operations.

(.02) **Street Design Standards**

A. All street improvements and intersections shall provide for the continuation of streets through specific developments to adjoining properties or subdivisions.
   1. Development shall be required to provide existing or future connections to adjacent sites through the use of access easements where applicable. Such easements shall be required in addition to required public street dedications as required in Section 4.236(.04).

B. The City Engineer shall make the final determination regarding right-of-way and street element widths using the ranges provided in Chapter 3 of the Transportation System Plan and the additional street design standards in the Public Works Standards.

C. Rights-of-way.
   1. Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy Building permits or as a part of the recordation of a final plat, the City shall require dedication of rights-of-way in accordance with the Transportation System Plan. All dedications shall be recorded with the County Assessor's Office.

   2. The City shall also require a waiver of remonstrance against formation of a local improvement district, and all non-remonstrances shall be recorded in the County Recorder's Office as well as the City's Lien Docket, prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy Building Permit or as a part of the recordation of a final plat.

   3. In order to allow for potential future widening, a special setback requirement shall be maintained adjacent to all arterial streets. The minimum setback shall be 55 feet from the centerline or 25 feet from the right-of-way designated on the Master Plan, whichever is greater.

D. Dead-end Streets. New dead-end streets or cul-de-sacs shall not exceed 200 feet in length, unless the adjoining land contains barriers such as existing buildings, railroads or freeways, or environmental constraints such as steep slopes, or major streams or rivers, that prevent future street extension and connection. A central landscaped island with rainwater management and infiltration are encouraged in cul-de-sac design. No more than 25 dwelling units shall take access to a new dead-end or cul-de-sac street unless it is determined that the traffic impacts on adjacent streets will not exceed those from a development of 25 or fewer units. All other dimensional standards of dead-end streets shall be governed by the Public Works Standards. Notification that the street is planned for future extension shall be posted on the dead-end street. [Amended by Ord. # 674 11/16/09]

E. Corner or clear vision area.
1. A clear vision area which meets the Public Works Standards shall be maintained on each corner of property at the intersection of any two streets, a street and a railroad or a street and a driveway. However, the following items shall be exempt from meeting this requirement:
   a. Light and utility poles with a diameter less than 12 inches.
   b. Trees less than 6” d.b.h., approved as a part of the Stage II Site Design, or administrative review.
   c. Except as allowed by b., above, an existing tree, trimmed to the trunk, 10 feet above the curb.
   d. Official warning or street sign.
   e. Natural contours where the natural elevations are such that there can be no cross-visibility at the intersection and necessary excavation would result in an unreasonable hardship on the property owner or deteriorate the quality of the site.

F. Vertical clearance - a minimum clearance of 12 feet above the pavement surface shall be maintained over all streets and access drives.

G. Interim improvement standard. It is anticipated that all existing streets, except those in new subdivisions, will require complete reconstruction to support urban level traffic volumes. However, in most cases, existing and short-term projected traffic volumes do not warrant improvements to full Master Plan standards. Therefore, unless otherwise specified by the Development Review Board, the following interim standards shall apply.

1. Arterials - 24 foot paved, with standard sub-base. Asphalt overlays are generally considered unacceptable, but may be considered as an interim improvement based on the recommendations of the City Engineer, regarding adequate structural quality to support an overlay.

2. Half-streets are generally considered unacceptable. However, where the Development Review Board finds it essential to allow for reasonable development, a half-street may be approved. Whenever a half-street improvement is approved, it shall conform to the requirements in the Public Works Standards:
   a. When considered appropriate in conjunction with other anticipated or scheduled street improvements, the City Engineer may approve street improvements with a single asphalt lift. However, adequate provision must be made for interim storm drainage, pavement transitions at seams and the scheduling of the second lift through the Capital Improvements Plan.

   [.03] Sidewalks. Sidewalks shall be provided on the public street frontage of all development. Sidewalks shall generally be constructed within the dedicated public right-of-way, but may be located outside of the right-of-way within a public easement with the approval of the City Engineer.
A. Sidewalk widths shall include a minimum through zone of at least five feet. The through zone may be reduced pursuant to variance procedures in Section 4.196, a waiver pursuant to Section 4.118, or by authority of the City Engineer for reasons of traffic operations, efficiency, or safety.

B. Within a Planned Development, the Development Review Board may approve a sidewalk on only one side. If the sidewalk is permitted on just one side of the street, the owners will be required to sign an agreement to an assessment in the future to construct the other sidewalk if the City Council decides it is necessary.

(.04) Bicycle Facilities. Bicycle facilities shall be provided to implement the Transportation System Plan, and may include on-street and off-street bike lanes, shared lanes, bike boulevards, and cycle tracks. The design of on-street bicycle facilities will vary according to the functional classification and the average daily traffic of the facility.

(.05) Multiuse Pathways. Pathways may be in addition to, or in lieu of, a public street. Paths that are in addition to a public street shall generally run parallel to that street, and shall be designed in accordance with the Public Works Standards or as specified by the City Engineer. Paths that are in lieu of a public street shall be considered in areas only where no other public street connection options are feasible, and are subject to the following standards.

A. Paths shall be located to provide a reasonably direct connection between likely pedestrian and bicyclist destinations. Additional standards relating to entry points, maximum length, visibility, and path lighting are provided in the Public Works Standards.

B. To ensure ongoing access to and maintenance of pedestrian/bicycle paths, the City Engineer will require dedication of the path to the public and acceptance of the path by the City as public right-of-way; or creation of a public access easement over the path.

(.06) Transit Improvements

Development on sites that are adjacent to or incorporate major transit streets shall provide improvements as described in this section to any bus stop located along the site’s frontage, unless waived by the City Engineer for reasons of safety or traffic operations. Transit facilities include bus stops, shelters, and related facilities. Required transit facility improvements may include the dedication of land or the provision of a public easement.

A. Development shall at a minimum provide:

1. Reasonably direct pedestrian connections, as defined by Section 4.154, between building entrances and the transit facility and between buildings on the site and streets adjoining transit stops.

2. Improvements at major transit stops. Improvements may include intersection or mid-block traffic management improvements to allow for pedestrian crossings at major transit stops.
B. Developments generating an average of 49 or more pm peak hour trips shall provide bus stop improvements per the Public Works Standards. Required improvements may include provision of benches, shelters, pedestrian lighting; or provision of an easement or dedication of land for transit facilities.

C. In addition to the requirements of 4.177(.06)(A.)(2.), development generating more than 199 pm peak hour trips on major transit streets shall provide a bus pullout, curb extension, and intersection or mid-block traffic management improvements to allow for pedestrian crossings at major transit stops.

D. In addition to the requirements of 4.177(.06)(A.) and (B.), development generating more than 500 pm peak-hour trips on major transit streets shall provide on-site circulation to accommodate transit service.

(.07) Residential Private Access Drives. Residential Private Access Drives shall meet the following standards:

A. Residential Private Access Drives shall provide primary vehicular access to no more than four (4) dwelling units, excluding accessory dwelling units.

B. The design and construction of a Residential Private Access Drive shall ensure a useful lifespan and structural maintenance schedule comparable, as determined by the City Engineer or City’s Authorized Representative, to a local street constructed in conformance to current public works standards.

1. The design of residential private access drives shall be stamped by a professional engineer registered in the state of Oregon and shall be approved by the City Engineer or City’s Authorized Representative to ensure the above requirement is met.

2. Prior to issuing a certificate of occupancy for any residential dwelling unit whose primary vehicular access is from a Residential Private Access Drive the City Engineer or City’s Authorized Representative shall certify construction of the Residential Private Access Drive substantially conforms the design approved by the City Engineer or City’s Authorized Representative.

C. Residential Private Access Drives shall be named for addressing purposes. All Residential Private Access Drives shall use the suffix “Lane”, i.e. SW Oakview Lane.

D. Residential Private Access Drives shall meet or exceed the standards for access drives and travel lanes established in Subsection (.08) of this Section.

[Section 4.177(.02) added by Ord. 682, 9/1/10]

(.08) Access Drive and Driveway Approach Development Standards.

A. An access drive to any proposed development shall be designed to provide a clear travel lane free from any obstructions.

B. Access drive travel lanes shall be constructed with a hard surface capable of carrying a 23-ton load.
C. Where emergency vehicle access is required, approaches and driveways shall be
designed and constructed to accommodate emergency vehicle apparatus and shall
conform to applicable fire protection requirements. The City may restrict parking,
require signage, or require other public safety improvements pursuant to the
recommendations of an emergency service provider.

D. Secondary or emergency access lanes may be improved to a minimum 12 feet
with an all-weather surface as approved by the Fire District. All fire lanes shall
be dedicated easements.

E. Minimum access requirements shall be adjusted commensurate with the intended
function of the site based on vehicle types and traffic generation.

F. The number of approaches on higher classification streets (e.g., collector and
arterial streets) shall be minimized; where practicable, access shall be taken first
from a lower classification street.

G. The City may limit the number or location of connections to a street, or impose
access restrictions where the roadway authority requires mitigation to alleviate
safety or traffic operations concerns.

H. The City may require a driveway to extend to one or more edges of a parcel and
be designed to allow for future extension and inter-parcel circulation as adjacent
properties develop. The City may also require the owner(s) of the subject site to
record an access easement for future joint use of the approach and driveway as the
adjacent property(ies) develop(s).

I. Driveways shall accommodate all projected vehicular traffic on-site without
vehicles stacking or backing up onto a street.

J. Driveways shall be designed so that vehicle areas, including but not limited to
drive-up and drive-through facilities and vehicle storage and service areas, do not
obstruct any public right-of-way.

K. Approaches and driveways shall not be wider than necessary to safely
accommodate projected peak hour trips and turning movements, and shall be
designed to minimize crossing distances for pedestrians.

L. As it deems necessary for pedestrian safety, the City, in consultation with the
roadway authority, may require traffic-calming features, such as speed tables,
textured driveway surfaces, curb extensions, signage or traffic control devices, or
other features, be installed on or in the vicinity of a site.

M. Approaches and driveways shall be located and designed to allow for safe
maneuvering in and around loading areas, while avoiding conflicts with
pedestrians, parking, landscaping, and buildings.

N. Where a proposed driveway crosses a culvert or drainage ditch, the City may
require the developer to install a culvert extending under and beyond the edges of
the driveway on both sides of it, pursuant applicable Public Works standards.

O. Except as otherwise required by the applicable roadway authority or waived by
the City Engineer, temporary driveways providing access to a construction site or
staging area shall be paved or graveled to prevent tracking of mud onto adjacent paved streets.

P. Unless constrained by topography, natural resources, rail lines, freeways, existing or planned or approved development, or easements or covenants, driveways proposed as part of a residential or mixed-use development shall meet local street spacing standards and shall be constructed to align with existing or planned streets, if the driveway.

1. Intersects with a public street that is controlled, or is to be controlled in the planning period, by a traffic signal;

2. Intersects with an existing or planned arterial or collector street; or

3. Would be an extension of an existing or planned local street, or of another major driveway.

(.09) Minimum street intersection spacing standards.

A. New streets shall intersect at existing street intersections so that centerlines are not offset. Where existing streets adjacent to a proposed development do not align properly, conditions shall be imposed on the development to provide for proper alignment.

B. Minimum intersection spacing standards are provided in Transportation System Plan Table 3-2.

(.10) Exceptions and Adjustments. The City may approve adjustments to the spacing standards of subsections (.08) and (.09) above through a Class II process, or as a waiver per Section 4.118(.03)(A.), where an existing connection to a City street does not meet the standards of the roadway authority, the proposed development moves in the direction of code compliance, and mitigation measures alleviate all traffic operations and safety concerns. Mitigation measures may include consolidated access (removal of one access), joint use driveways (more than one property uses same access), directional limitations (e.g., one-way), turning restrictions (e.g., right in/out only), or other mitigation.

Section 4.197. Zone Changes and Amendments To This Code – Procedures.

(.01) The following procedure shall be followed in applying for an amendment to the text of this Chapter:

A. The Planning Commission shall conduct a public hearing on the proposed amendment at its earliest practicable meeting after it is proposed and shall, within forty (40) days after concluding the hearing, provide a report and recommendation to the City Council regarding the proposed amendment. The findings and recommendations of the Commission shall be adopted by resolution and shall be signed by the Chair of the Commission.

B. In recommending approval of a proposed text amendment, the Planning Commission shall, at a minimum, adopt findings relative to the following:
1. That the application was submitted in compliance with the procedures set forth in Section 4.008; and
2. The amendment substantially complies with all applicable goals, policies and objectives set forth in the Comprehensive Plan; and
3. The amendment does not materially conflict with, nor endanger, other provisions of the text of the Code; and
4. If applicable, the amendment is in compliance with Statewide Land Use Planning Goals and related administrative rules; and
5. If applicable, the amendment is necessary to ensure that the City's Land Use and Development Ordinance complies with mandated requirements of State or Federal laws and/or statutes.

(.02) In recommending approval or denial of a proposed zone map amendment, the Planning Commission or Development Review Board shall at a minimum, adopt findings addressing the following criteria:

A. That the application before the Commission or Board was submitted in accordance with the procedures set forth in Section 4.008, Section 4.125 (.18)(B)(2) or, in the case of a Planned Development, Section 4.140; and

B. That the proposed amendment is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan map designation and substantially complies with the applicable goals, policies and objectives, set forth in the Comprehensive Plan text; and

C. In the event that the subject property, or any portion thereof, is designated as "Residential" on the City's Comprehensive Plan Map; specific findings shall be made addressing substantial compliance with Implementation Measures 4.1.4.b, d, e, q, and x of Wilsonville's Comprehensive Plan text; and

D. That the existing primary public facilities, i.e., roads and sidewalks, water, sewer and storm sewer are available and are of adequate size to serve the proposed development; or, that adequate facilities can be provided in conjunction with project development. The Planning Commission and Development Review Board shall utilize any and all means to insure that all primary facilities are available and are adequately sized; and

E. That the proposed development does not have a significant adverse effect upon Significant Resource Overlay Zone areas, an identified natural hazard, or an identified geologic hazard. When Significant Resource Overlay Zone areas or natural hazard, and/or geologic hazard are located on or abut the proposed development, the Planning Commission or Development Review Board shall use appropriate measures to mitigate and significantly reduce conflicts between the development and identified hazard or Significant Resource Overlay Zone and

F. That the applicant is committed to a development schedule demonstrating that development of the property is reasonably expected to commence within two (2) years of the initial approval of the zone change; and
G. That the proposed development and use(s) can be developed in compliance with the applicable development standards or appropriate conditions are attached that insure that the project development substantially conforms to the applicable development standards.

H. Adequate public facilities, services, and transportation networks are in place, or are planned to be provided concurrently with the development of the property. The applicant shall demonstrate compliance with the Transportation Planning Rule, specifically by addressing whether the proposed amendment has a significant effect on the transportation system pursuant to OAR 660-012-0060. A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) shall be prepared pursuant to the requirements in Section 4.133.05.(01).

Section 4.236. General Requirements - Streets.

(.01) Conformity to the Transportation System Plan. Land divisions shall conform to and be in harmony with the Transportation Systems Plan, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, and the Parks and Recreation Master Plan.

(.02) Relation to Adjoining Street System.

[...]

(.03) All streets shall conform to the standards set forth in Section 4.177 and the block size requirements of the zone.

(.04) Creation of Easements. [...]

(.05) Topography. [...]

(.06) Reserve Strips. [...]

(.07) Future Expansion of Street. When necessary to give access to, or permit a satisfactory future division of, adjoining land, streets shall be extended to the boundary of the land division and the resulting dead-end street may be approved without a turn-around. Reserve strips and street plugs shall be required to preserve the objective of street extension. Notification that the street is planned for future extension shall be posted on the stub street.
Proposed Amendments to the Wilsonville Development Code
Related to the 2013 Transportation System Plan

Section 4.001 Definitions.

4. **Access Control Strip Restriction**: A type of access restriction that involves establishing a reserve area adjacent to and paralleling a half street improvement, or across the end of a street that is to be extended in the future, to ensure proper participation by adjoining properties in completion of the required street improvements. See Street, Half.

[New number/renumbering needed.] 32. **Bikeway**: Bikeway is a general term used to describe any type of transportation facility that is designated for use by bicycles in conformance with City standards. Bikeways may or may not be within a public right-of-way and include the following: Bikeways may include bike lanes, bike paths, shared roadways, shoulder bikeways and other bikeways.

**A. Bike Lane**: A bike lane facility is a type of bikeway where a section of the roadway is designated for exclusive bicycle use.

**B. Bike/Pedestrian Path**: A bike/pedestrian path facility is a type of bikeway that is entirely separate from the roadway and is designed and constructed to allow for safe use by both pedestrians and bicyclists.

**BC. Recreational Trail**: A recreational trail is a type of pedestrian, bicycle, or equestrian facility that is entirely separate from roadways and has unimproved, gravel, or bark dust surface.

**CD. Shared Roadway**: A shared roadway facility is a type of bikeway where motorists and cyclists occupy the same roadway area.

**DE. Shoulder Bikeway**: A shoulder bikeway facility is a type of bikeway where cyclists occupy the paved roadway shoulder. Shoulder bikeways are common in rural areas.

**E. Cycle Track**: A cycle track is a bike lane with a physical barrier between the bike and motor vehicle travel lanes, such as a curb or parking lanes. Cycle tracks must “rejoin” the motor vehicle travel lanes at signalized intersections. Cycle tracks may require a two stage left turn for bicyclists.

**F. Driveway Approach**: A driveway connection to a public street or highway where it meets a public right-of-way.

---

Note: Commentary is included in text boxes to explain the intent, effect of, or need for the amendments.
[New number/renumbering needed.] Major transit stop: Transit stops that are located where two or more existing or planned routes intersect or where there are existing or planned transfer locations between transit systems, Park & Ride lots, and shopping centers and other major destinations.

[New number/renumbering needed.] Major transit street: A primary corridor for transit, receiving half-hour or better service during peak traffic hours. Typically, these streets are also arterials or major collectors.

[New number/renumbering needed.] Multiuse pathway or path: A path that is separate from the roadway either in the roadway right-of-way or in an independent right-of-way. It is designed and constructed to allow for safe walking, biking, and other human-powered travel modes.

[New number/renumbering needed.] Through zone: The width of unobstructed space on a sidewalk or pedestrian pathway.

Section 4.005 Exclusions from Development Permit Requirement.

(.05) Except as otherwise required by Sections 4.184 and 4.500 to 4.510, the establishment, construction or termination of an authorized public facility that serves development, including such facilities as a private or public street, transportation facilities within the public right-of-way, sewer, water line, electrical power or gas distribution line, or telephone or television cable system, provided said construction complies with applicable Public Works Standards. This exemption is not intended to apply to buildings used by utility providers.

Section 4.012 Public Hearing Notices.

(.01) Published Notice. […]

(.02) Mailed Notice for Quasi-Judicial Hearings.

A. For development projects involving Class II Administrative Reviews, or quasijudicial public hearings, the Planning Director shall ensure the following: have

1. Public hearing notices shall be mailed to the owners of real property located within 250 feet of the site of the proposed development. The Planning Director shall use the property ownership lists of the County Assessor in determining the recipients of the notices.

2. Notice shall be sent to any governmental agency that is entitled to notice under an intergovernmental agreement entered into with the City and any other affected roadway authority. The failure of another agency to respond with written comments on
b pending application shall not invalidate an action or permit approval made by the City under this Code.

B. Notices shall be mailed not less than twenty (20) days nor more than forty (40) days prior to the initial public hearing date. Except, however, in cases where the development proposal will require public hearings before both the City Council and Development Review Board, in which case the notices shall be mailed at least ten (10) days before the initial public hearing.

C. In any case where State law requires different timing or form of notice than that specified in this Code, the standard requiring a broader coverage or duration of notice shall be followed.

D. The City will make a good faith effort to contact property owners whose names do not appear on County ownership records and to contact others who have asked to be contacted for different types of applications.

(.03) Mailed Notice for Legislative Hearings. Where applicable, the Planning Director shall have notices of legislative hearings mailed to individual property owners as specified in State law.

Section 4.118. Standards applying to all Planned Development Zones:

(.03) Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 4.140 to the contrary, the Development Review Board, in order to implement the purposes and objectives of Section 4.140, and based on findings of fact supported by the record may:

A. Waive the following typical development standards:

1. minimum lot area;
2. lot width and frontage;
3. height and yard requirements;
4. lot coverage;
5. lot depth;
6. street widths;
7. sidewalk requirements;
8. height of buildings other than signs;
9. parking space configuration and drive aisle design;
10. minimum number of parking or loading spaces;
11. shade tree islands in parking lots, provided that alternative shading is provided;
12. fence height;
13. architectural design standards;
14. transit facilities;
15. on-site pedestrian access and circulation standards; and
16. solar access standards, as provided in Section 4.137.

Section 4.125  V-Village Zone

(.09) Street and Access Improvement Standards
A. Except as noted below, the provisions of Section 4.177 shall apply within the Village zone:

2. Intersections of streets:
   c. Offsets: Opposing intersections shall be designed so that no offset dangerous to the traveling public is created. Intersections shall be separated by at least:
      i. 1000 ft. for major arterials
      ii. 600 ft. for minor arterials
      iii. 100 ft. for major collectors
      iv. 50 ft. for minor collectors

(.10) Sidewalk and Pathway Improvement Standards
A. The provisions of Section 4.177 shall apply within the Village zone.


NOTE: Completion of Section 4.154 has been postponed pending the completion of the Transportation Systems Plan.

(.01) On-site Pedestrian Access and Circulation
A. The purpose of this section is to implement the pedestrian access and connectivity policies of the Transportation System Plan. It is intended to provide for safe, reasonably direct, and convenient pedestrian access and circulation.

B. Standards. Development shall conform to all of the following standards:

1. Continuous Pathway System. A pedestrian pathway system shall extend throughout the development site and connect to adjacent sidewalks, and to all future phases of the development, as applicable.
2. Safe, Direct, and Convenient. Pathways within developments shall provide safe, reasonably direct, and convenient connections between primary building entrances and all adjacent parking areas, recreational areas/playgrounds, and public rights-of-way and crosswalks based on all of the following criteria:
   a. Pedestrian pathways are designed primarily for pedestrian safety and convenience, meaning they are free from hazards and provide a reasonably smooth and consistent surface.
   b. The pathway is reasonably direct. A pathway is reasonably direct when it follows a route between destinations that does not involve a significant amount of unnecessary out-of-direction travel.
   c. The pathway connects to all primary building entrances and is consistent with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements.
   d. All parking lots larger than three acres in size shall provide an internal bicycle and pedestrian pathway pursuant to Section 4.155(.03)(B)(3)(d.)

3. Vehicle/Pathway Separation. Except as required for crosswalks, per subsection 4, below, where a pathway abuts a driveway or street it shall be vertically or horizontally separated from the vehicular lane. For example, a pathway may be vertically raised six inches above the abutting travel lane, or horizontally separated by a row of bollards.

4. Crosswalks. Where a pathway crosses a parking area or driveway, it shall be clearly marked with contrasting paint or paving materials (e.g., pavers, light-color concrete inlay between asphalt, or similar contrast).

5. Pathway Width and Surface. Primary pathways shall be constructed of concrete, asphalt, brick/masonry pavers, or other durable surface, and not less than five (5) feet wide. Secondary pathways and pedestrian trails may have an alternative surface except as otherwise required by the ADA.

6. All pathways shall be clearly marked with appropriate standard signs.
Section 4.155. General Regulations - Parking, Loading and Bicycle Parking.

(.01) Purpose:

[...]

(.02) General Provisions:
A. The provision and maintenance of off-street parking spaces is a continuing obligation of the property owner. The standards set forth herein shall be considered by the Development Review Board as minimum criteria.
   1. The Board shall have the authority to grant variances or planned development waivers to these standards in keeping with the purposes and objectives set forth in the Comprehensive Plan and this Code.
   2. Waivers to the parking, loading, or bicycle parking standards shall only be issued upon a findings that the resulting development will have no significant adverse impact on the surrounding neighborhood, and the community, and that the development considered as a whole meets the purposes of this section.

[...]

(.03) Minimum and Maximum Off-Street Parking Requirements:
A. Parking and loading or delivery areas shall be designed with access and maneuvering area adequate to serve the functional needs of the site and shall:
   1. Separate loading and delivery areas and circulation from customer and/or employee parking and pedestrian areas. Circulation patterns shall be clearly marked.
   2. To the greatest extent possible, separate vehicle and pedestrian traffic.

B. Parking and loading or delivery areas shall be landscaped to minimize the visual dominance of the parking or loading area, as follows:

[...]

3. Due to their large amount of impervious surface, new development with parking areas of more than two hundred (200) spaces that are located in any zone, and that may be viewed from the public right of way, shall be landscaped to the following additional standards:
a. One (1) tree shall be planted per six (6) parking spaces or fraction thereof. At least twenty-five percent (25%) of the required trees must be planted in the interior of the parking area.

b. Required trees may be planted within the parking area or the perimeter, provided that a minimum of forty percent (40%) of the canopy dripline of mature perimeter trees can be expected to shade or overlap the parking area. Shading shall be determined based on shadows cast on the summer solstice.

c. All parking lots in excess of two hundred (200) parking spaces shall provide an internal pedestrian walkway for every six (6) parking aisles. Minimum walkway clearance shall be at least five (5) feet in width. Walkways shall be designed to provide pedestrian access to parking areas in order to minimize pedestrian travel among vehicles. Walkways shall be designed to channel pedestrians to the front entrance of the building.

d. Parking lots more than three acres in size shall provide street-like features along principal drive isles, including curbs, sidewalks, street trees or planting strips, and bicycle routes.

d. e. All parking lots viewed from the public right of way shall have a minimum twelve (12) foot landscaped buffer…

e. f. Where topography and slope condition permit, the landscape buffer shall integrate parking lot storm water treatment […]

f. g. In addition to the application requirements of section 4.035(.04)(6)(d), […]

C. 4. Off Street Parking shall be designed for safe and convenient access that meets ADA and ODOT standards. All parking areas which contain ten (10) or more parking spaces, shall for every fifty (50) standard spaces, provide one ADA-accessible parking space that is constructed to building code standards, Wilsonville Code 9.000.

D. 5. Where possible, parking areas shall be designed to connect with parking areas on adjacent sites so as to eliminate the necessity for any mode of travel to utilize the public street for multiple accesses or cross movements. In addition, on-site parking shall be designed for efficient on-site circulation and parking.

E. 6. In all multi-family dwelling developments, there shall be sufficient areas established to provide for parking and storage of
motorcycles, mopeds and bicycles. Such areas shall be clearly defined and reserved for the exclusive use of these vehicles.

F. 7. On-street parking spaces, directly adjoining the frontage of and on the same side of the street as the subject property, may be counted towards meeting the minimum off-street parking standards.

G. 8. Tables 5, below, shall be used to determine the minimum and maximum parking standards for various land uses. The minimum number of required parking spaces shown on Tables 5 shall be determined by rounding to the nearest whole parking space. For example, a use containing 500 square feet, in an area where the standard is one space for each 400 square feet of floor area, is required to provide one off-street parking space. If the same use contained more than 600 square feet, a second parking space would be required. [Amended by Ordinance No. 538, 2/21/02.] Structured parking and on-street parking are exempted from the parking maximums in Table 5.

H. Electrical Vehicle Charging Stations:

1. Parking spaces designed to accommodate and provide one or more electric vehicle charging stations on site may be counted towards meeting the minimum off-street parking standards.

2. Modification of existing parking spaces to accommodate electric vehicle charging stations on site is allowed outright.

I. Motorcycle parking:

1. Motorcycle parking may substitute for up to 5 spaces or 5 percent of required automobile parking, whichever is less. For every 4 motorcycle parking spaces provided, the automobile parking requirement is reduced by one space.

2. Each motorcycle space must be at least 4 feet wide and 8 feet deep. Existing parking may be converted to take advantage of this provision.
(.04) Bicycle Parking:

A. Required Bicycle Parking - General Provisions

1. The required minimum number of bicycle parking spaces for each use category is shown in Table 5, Parking Standards, below.

2. A minimum of 50% of the bicycle parking spaces shall be provided as long-term bicycle parking in any of the following situations:
   a. When 10% or more of automobile vehicle parking is covered.
   b. If more than six (6) bicycle parking spaces are required.
   c. Multifamily residential development with nine or more units.

3. Bicycle parking spaces are not required for accessory buildings. If a primary use is listed in Table 5, bicycle parking is not required for the accessory use.

4. When there are two or more primary uses on a site, the required bicycle parking for the site is the sum of the required bicycle parking for the individual primary uses.

5. Each space must be at least 2 feet by 6 feet in area, be accessible without moving another bicycle, and provide enough space between the rack and any obstructions to use the space properly.

6. An aisle at least 5 feet wide shall be maintained behind all required bicycle parking to allow room for bicycle maneuvering. Where the bicycle parking is adjacent to a sidewalk, the maneuvering area may extend into the right-of-way.

B. Short-term Bicycle Parking

1. Short-term bicycle parking encourages shoppers, customers, and other visitors to use bicycles by providing a convenient and readily accessible place to park bicycles.

2. Required short-term bicycle parking shall meet the following standards:
   a. Provide lockers or racks that meet the standards of this section.
   b. Locate within 30 feet of the main entrance to the building or inside a building, in a location that is easily accessible for bicycles.
c. If 10 or more spaces are required, then at least 50 percent of these shall be covered.

C. Long-term Bicycle Parking

1. Long-term bicycle parking provides employees, students, residents, commuters, and others who generally stay at a site for several hours a weather-protected place to park bicycles.

2. Required long-term bicycle parking shall meet the following standards:
   a. Provide racks, storage rooms, or lockers in areas that are secure or monitored (e.g., visible to employees or monitored by security guards).
   b. Locate the space within 100 feet of the entrance that will be accessed by the intended users.
   c. At least 50 percent of the spaces shall be covered.

D. Covered Parking (Weather Protection):

1. When required, covered bicycle parking, shall be provided in one of the following ways: inside buildings, under roof overhangs or awnings, in bicycle lockers, or within or under other structures.

2. Where required covered bicycle parking is not within a building or locker, the cover must be permanent and designed to protect the bicycle from rainfall and provide seven (7) foot minimum overhead clearance.

3. Where required bicycle parking is provided in lockers, the lockers shall be securely anchored.

Long-term bicycle parking is targeted for users such as employees and students, and designed to be secure, weather-protected, and located within a reasonable distance of the proposed users' destination. (For example, bicycle parking for employees may be more appropriately located near a back door close to the shower room, instead of near the front door.)

- 50% of the total required bicycle parking spaces would be for "long-term" use under specified conditions: when 10% of the auto parking is covered, for multifamily dwellings with more than 9 units, and when more than 6 bike parking spaces are required. The latter trigger will capture larger uses, such as a 24,000 sf retail or restaurant use, schools, and a 30,000 sf office.

- Of the required long-term parking, 50% must be covered but there are many ways to meet this standard (e.g., within a building, under an awning, in bike lockers, etc.).
Note: In considering proposed waivers to the following standards, the City will consider the potential uses of the site and not just the uses that are currently proposed. For waivers to exceed the maximum standards, applicants shall bear the burden of proving that Metro, State, and federal clean air standards will not be violated.

TABLE 5: PARKING STANDARDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE</th>
<th>PARKING MINIMUMS</th>
<th>PARKING MAXIMUMS</th>
<th>BICYCLE MINIMUMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Single and attached units and any apartments (9 or fewer units)</td>
<td>1 per D.U., except accessory dwelling units, which have no minimum.</td>
<td>No Limit</td>
<td>0 (Apartments – Min. of 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[...]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The current parking standards in Table 5 require bicycle parking be provided for nearly every use. Increasing the minimum number of bicycle parking spaces required for multifamily developments is the only change to Table 5 that is needed to comply with the Regional Transportation Functional Plan Title 4, Parking Management Sec 3.08.410.
(.045) Minimum Off-Street Loading Requirements:

A. [...] 

B. Exceptions and Adjustments.

1. The Planning Director or Development Review Board may approve a loading area adjacent to or within a street right-of-way where it finds that loading and unloading operations:
   a. Are short in duration (i.e., less than one hour);
   b. Are infrequent (less than three operations daily);
   c. Do not obstruct traffic during peak traffic hours;
   d. Do not interfere with emergency response services or bicycle and pedestrian facilities; and
   e. Are acceptable to the applicable roadway authority.

(.06) Carpool and Vanpool Parking Requirements:

A. Carpool and vanpool parking spaces shall be identified for the following uses:
   1. New commercial and industrial developments with seventy-five (75) or more parking spaces,
   2. New institutional or public assembly uses, and
   3. Transit park-and-ride facilities with fifty (50) or more parking spaces.

B. Of the total spaces available for employee, student, and commuter parking, at least five percent, but not fewer than two, shall be designated for exclusive carpool and vanpool parking.

BC. Carpool and vanpool parking spaces shall be located closer to the main employee, student or commuter entrance than all other parking spaces with the exception of ADA parking spaces.

CD. Required carpool/vanpool spaces shall be clearly marked "Reserved - Carpool/Vanpool Only."

(.05) Minimum Off-Street Loading Requirements. The current policy (existing Section (.04), renumbered to (.05)) is revised to add a new process for allowing the Planning Director or Development Review Board to approve on-street loading and unloading operations under certain circumstances. This adds some flexibility to the requirements and could allow approval of a proposal where the future use has limited needs for loading/unloading and where such activity in the public right-of-way would not interfere with the operations of the roadway. This allowance will likely be most relevant and useful in Town Center and other mixed-use areas.

(.06) Carpool and Vanpool Parking Requirements. This new section is needed to comply with state Transportation Planning Rule Section 0045(4). It would require that parking spaces be reserved for employee, student, and commuter use for new large commercial and industrial developments (those with 75 or more parking spaces), new institutional or public assembly uses, and transit park-and-ride facilities (those with 50 or more parking spaces). A percentage of those parking spaces (no less than 2) should be reserved for exclusive carpool and vanpool parking.

This "preferential parking" is designed to more strongly support and promote carpooling and vanpooling. Note that the requirements only apply to larger employers or public assembly uses. The assumption is that the relatively small amount of vanpool or carpool spaces required could be accommodated without negatively impacting the number of spaces available for visitor parking. The language of this section is from model code for complying with state Transportation Planning Rule Section 0045(4).
(.07) Parking Area Redevelopment:
The number of parking spaces may be reduced by up to 10% of the minimum required parking spaces for that use when a portion of the existing parking area is modified to accommodate or provide transit-related amenities such as transit stops, pull-outs, shelters, and park and ride stations.

Section 4.177. Street Improvement Standards.
Note: This section is expected to be revised after the completion of the Transportation Systems Plan.
This section contains the City’s requirements and standards for pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facility improvements to public streets, or within public easements. The purpose of this section is to ensure that development, including redevelopment, provides transportation facilities that are safe, convenient, and adequate in rough proportion to their impacts.

(.01) Except as specifically approved by the Development Review Board, all street and access improvements shall conform to the Transportation Systems Plan and the Public Works Standards, together with the following standards:[Amended by Ord. 682, 9/9/10] Development and related public facility improvements shall comply with the standards in this section, the Wilsonville Public Works Standards, and the Transportation System Plan, in rough proportion to the potential impacts of the development. Such improvements shall be constructed at the time of development or as provided by Section 4.140, except as modified or waived by the City Engineer for reasons of safety or traffic operations.

(.02) Street Design Standards
A. All street improvements and intersections shall conform to the Public Works Standards and shall provide for the continuation of streets through specific developments to adjoining properties or subdivisions.

1. Development shall be required to provide existing or future connections to adjacent sites through the use of access easements where applicable. Such easements shall be required in addition to required public street dedications as required in Section 4.236(.04).

B. The City Engineer shall make the final determination regarding right-of-way and street element widths using the ranges provided in Chapter 3 of the Transportation System Plan and the additional street design standards in the Public Works Standards. All streets...
shall be developed with curbs, utility strips and sidewalks on both sides; or a sidewalk on one side and a bike path on the other side.

1. Within a Planned Development the Development Review Board may approve a sidewalk on only one side. If the sidewalk is permitted on just one side of the street, the owners will be required to sign an agreement to an assessment in the future to construct the other sidewalk if the City Council decides it is necessary.

C. Rights-of-way.

1. Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy Building permits or as a part of the recordation of a final plat, the City shall require dedication of rights-of-way in accordance with the Street System Master Transportation Systems Plan. All dedications shall be recorded with the County Assessor's Office.

2. The City shall also require a waiver of remonstrance against formation of a local improvement district, and all non-remonstrances shall be recorded in the County Recorder’s Office as well as the City's Lien Docket, prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy Building Permit or as a part of the recordation of a final plat.

3. In order to allow for potential future widening, a special setback requirement shall be maintained adjacent to all arterial streets. The minimum setback shall be 55 feet from the centerline or 25 feet from the right-of-way designated on the Master Plan, whichever is greater.

D. Dead-end Streets. New dead-end streets or cul-de-sacs shall not exceed 200 feet in length, unless the adjoining land contains barriers such as existing buildings, railroads or freeways, or environmental constraints such as steep slopes, or major streams or rivers, that prevent future street extension and connection. A central landscaped island with rainwater management and infiltration are encouraged in cul-de-sac design. No more than 25 dwelling units shall take access to a new dead-end or cul-de-sac street unless it is determined that the traffic impacts on adjacent streets will not exceed those from a development of 25 or fewer units. All other dimensional standards of dead-end streets shall be governed by the Public Works Standards. Notification that the street is planned for future extension shall be posted on the dead-end street. [Amended by Ord. # 674 11/16/09]

E. Access drives and travel lanes.

1. An access drive to any proposed development shall be designed to provide a clear travel lane free from any obstructions.
2. Access drive travel lanes shall be constructed with a hard surface capable of carrying a 23-ton load.

3. Secondary or emergency access lanes may be improved to a minimum 12 feet with an all-weather surface as approved by the Fire District. All fire lanes shall be dedicated easements.

4. Minimum access requirements shall be adjusted commensurate with the intended function of the site based on vehicle types and traffic generation.

5. Where access drives connect to the public right-of-way, construction within the right-of-way shall be in conformance to the Public Works Standards.

**FE.** Corner or clear vision area.

1. A clear vision area which meets the Public Works Standards shall be maintained on each corner of property at the intersection of any two streets, a street and a railroad or a street and a driveway. However, the following items shall be exempt from meeting this requirement:
   a. Light and utility poles with a diameter less than 12 inches.
   b. Trees less than 6” d.b.h., approved as a part of the Stage II Site Design, or administrative review.
   c. Except as allowed by b., above, an existing tree, trimmed to the trunk, 10 feet above the curb.
   d. Official warning or street sign.
   e. Natural contours where the natural elevations are such that there can be no cross-visibility at the intersection and necessary excavation would result in an unreasonable hardship on the property owner or deteriorate the quality of the site.

**GF.** Vertical clearance - a minimum clearance of 12 feet above the pavement surface shall be maintained over all streets and access drives.

**HG.** Interim improvement standard. It is anticipated that all existing streets, except those in new subdivisions, will require complete reconstruction to support urban level traffic volumes. However, in most cases, existing and short-term projected traffic volumes do not warrant improvements to full Master Plan standards. Therefore, unless otherwise specified by the Development Review Board Planning Commission, the following interim standards shall apply.

1. Arterials - 24 foot paved, with standard sub-base. Asphalt overlays are generally considered unacceptable, but may be considered as an interim improvement based on the
recommendations of the City Engineer, regarding adequate structural quality to support an overlay.

2. Half-streets are generally considered unacceptable. However, where the Development Review Board finds it essential to allow for reasonable development, a half-street may be approved. Whenever a half-street improvement is approved, it shall conform to the requirements in the Public Works Standards:

3. When considered appropriate in conjunction with other anticipated or scheduled street improvements, the City Engineer may approve street improvements with a single asphalt lift. However, adequate provision must be made for interim storm drainage, pavement transitions at seams and the scheduling of the second lift through the Capital Improvements Plan.

[Section 4.177(.01) amended by Ord. 610, 5/1/06]

(.03) Sidewalks. Sidewalks shall be provided on the public street frontage of all development. Sidewalks shall generally be constructed within the dedicated public right-of-way, but may be located outside of the right-of-way within a public easement with the approval of the City Engineer.

A. Sidewalk widths shall include a minimum through zone of at least five feet. The through zone may be reduced pursuant to variance procedures in Section 4.196, a waiver pursuant to Section 4.118, or by authority of the City Engineer for reasons of traffic operations, efficiency, or safety.

B. Within a Planned Development the Development Review Board may approve a sidewalk on only one side. If the sidewalk is permitted on just one side of the street, the owners will be required to sign an agreement to an assessment in the future to construct the other sidewalk if the City Council decides it is necessary.

(.04) Bicycle Facilities. Bicycle facilities shall be provided to implement the Transportation System Plan, and may include on-street and off-street bike lanes, shared lanes, bike boulevards, and cycle tracks. The design of on-street bicycle facilities will vary according to the functional classification and the average daily traffic of the facility.

(.05) Multiuse Pathways. Pathways may be in addition to, or in lieu of, a public street. Paths that are in addition to a public street shall generally run parallel to that street, and shall be designed in accordance with the Public Works Standards or as specified by the City Engineer. Paths that are in lieu of a public street shall be considered in areas only where no other public street connection options are feasible, and are subject to the following standards.

New Sections 4.177(.03), (.04), and (.05) consist of existing requirements for sidewalks and pathways moved from Section 4.178. Modifications made for clarity, consistency; to allow the City Engineer to make design decisions for reasons of safety, traffic operations, or safety; and to remove details that are more appropriately addressed in the Public Works Standards.
A. Paths shall be located to provide a reasonably direct connection between likely pedestrian and bicyclist destinations. Additional standards relating to entry points, maximum length, visibility, and path lighting are provided in the Public Works Standards.

B. To ensure ongoing access to and maintenance of pedestrian/bicycle paths, the City Engineer will require dedication of the path to the public and acceptance of the path by the City as public right-of-way; or creation of a public access easement over the path.

(.06) Transit Improvements

Development on sites that are adjacent to or incorporate major transit streets shall provide improvements as described in this section to any bus stop located along the site’s frontage, unless waived by the City Engineer for reasons of safety or traffic operations. Transit facilities include bus stops, shelters, and related facilities. Required transit facility improvements may include the dedication of land or the provision of a public easement.

A. Development shall at a minimum provide:

1. Reasonably direct pedestrian connections, as defined by Section 4.154, between building entrances and the transit facility and between buildings on the site and streets adjoining transit stops.

2. Improvements at major transit stops. Improvements may include intersection or mid-block traffic management improvements to allow for pedestrian crossings at major transit stops.

B. Developments generating an average of 49 or more pm peak hour trips shall provide bus stop improvements per the Public Works Standards. Required improvements may include provision of benches, shelters, pedestrian lighting; or provision of an easement or dedication of land for transit facilities.

C. In addition to the requirements of 4.177(.06)(A.)(2,) development generating more than 199 pm peak hour trips on major transit streets shall provide a bus pullout, curb extension, and intersection or mid-block traffic management improvements to allow for pedestrian crossings at major transit stops.

D. In addition to the requirements of 4.177(.06)(A.)(2,) development generating more than 500 pm peak-hour trips on major transit streets shall provide on-site circulation to accommodate transit service.

(.027) Residential Private Access Drives shall meet the following standards:
A. Residential Private Access Drives shall provide primary vehicular access to no more than four (4) dwelling units, excluding accessory dwelling units.

B. The design and construction of a Residential Private Access Drive shall ensure a useful lifespan and structural maintenance schedule comparable, as determined by the City Engineer or City’s Authorized Representative, to a local street constructed in conformance to current public works standards.
   1. The design of residential private access drives shall be stamped by a professional engineer registered in the state of Oregon and shall be approved by the City Engineer or City’s Authorized Representative to ensure the above requirement is met.
   2. Prior to issuing a certificate of occupancy for any residential dwelling unit whose primary vehicular access is from a Residential Private Access Drive the City Engineer or City’s Authorized Representative shall certify construction of the Residential Private Access Drive substantially conforms the design approved by the City Engineer or City’s Authorized Representative.

C. Residential Private Access Drives shall be named for addressing purposes. All Residential Private Access Drives shall use the suffix “Lane”, i.e. SW Oakview Lane.

D. Residential Private Access Drives shall meet or exceed the standards for access drives and travel lanes established in Subsection (.01) G. (.08) of this Section.

[Section 4.177(.02) added by Ord. 682, 9/1/10]
(08). Access Drive and Driveway Approach Development Standards.

A. An access drive to any proposed development shall be designed to provide a clear travel lane free from any obstructions.

B. Access drive travel lanes shall be constructed with a hard surface capable of carrying a 23-ton load.

C. Where emergency vehicle access is required, approaches and driveways shall be designed and constructed to accommodate emergency vehicle apparatus and shall conform to applicable fire protection requirements. The City may restrict parking, require signage, or require other public safety improvements pursuant to the recommendations of an emergency service provider.

D. Secondary or emergency access lanes may be improved to a minimum 12 feet with an all-weather surface as approved by the Fire District. All fire lanes shall be dedicated easements.

E. Minimum access requirements shall be adjusted commensurate with the intended function of the site based on vehicle types and traffic generation.

F. The number of approaches on higher classification streets (e.g., collector and arterial streets) shall be minimized; where practicable, access shall be taken first from a lower classification street.

G. The City may limit the number or location of connections to a street, or impose access restrictions where the roadway authority requires mitigation to alleviate safety or traffic operations concerns.

H. The City may require a driveway to extend to one or more edges of a parcel and be designed to allow for future extension and inter-parcel circulation as adjacent properties develop. The City may also require the owner(s) of the subject site to record an access easement for future joint use of the approach and driveway as the adjacent property(ies) develop(s).

I. Driveways shall accommodate all projected vehicular traffic on-site without vehicles stacking or backing up onto a street.

J. Driveways shall be designed so that vehicle areas, including but not limited to drive-up and drive-through facilities and vehicle storage and service areas, do not obstruct any public right-of-way.
K. Approaches and driveways shall not be wider than necessary to safely accommodate projected peak hour trips and turning movements, and shall be designed to minimize crossing distances for pedestrians.

L. As it deems necessary for pedestrian safety, the City, in consultation with the roadway authority, may require traffic-calming features, such as speed tables, textured driveway surfaces, curb extensions, signage or traffic control devices, or other features, be installed on or in the vicinity of a site.

M. Approaches and driveways shall be located and designed to allow for safe maneuvering in and around loading areas, while avoiding conflicts with pedestrians, parking, landscaping, and buildings.

N. Where a proposed driveway crosses a culvert or drainage ditch, the City may require the developer to install a culvert extending under and beyond the edges of the driveway on both sides of it, pursuant applicable Public Works standards.

O. Except as otherwise required by the applicable roadway authority or waived by the City Engineer, temporary driveways providing access to a construction site or staging area shall be paved or graveled to prevent tracking of mud onto adjacent paved streets.

P. Unless constrained by topography, natural resources, rail lines, freeways, existing or planned or approved development, or easements or covenants, driveways proposed as part of a residential or mixed-use development shall meet local street spacing standards and shall be constructed to align with existing or planned streets, if the driveway.

1. Intersects with a public street that is controlled, or is to be controlled in the planning period, by a traffic signal;

2. Intersects with an existing or planned arterial or collector street; or

3. Would be an extension of an existing or planned local street, or of another major driveway.

(.09) Minimum street intersection spacing standards.

A. New streets shall intersect at existing street intersections so that centerlines are not offset. Where existing streets adjacent to a proposed development do not align properly, conditions shall be imposed on the development to provide for proper alignment.

B. Minimum intersection spacing standards are provided in Transportation System Plan Table 3-2.

(.10) Exceptions and Adjustments. The City may approve adjustments to the spacing standards of subsections (.08) and (.9) above through a Class
II process, or as a waiver per Section 4.118(0.3)A, where an existing connection to a City street does not meet the standards of the roadway authority, the proposed development moves in the direction of code compliance, and mitigation measures alleviate all traffic operations and safety concerns. Mitigation measures may include consolidated access (removal of one access), joint use driveways (more than one property uses same access), directional limitations (e.g., one-way), turning restrictions (e.g., right in/out only), or other mitigation.

Section 4.178. Sidewalk and Pathway Standards.

(01) Sidewalks. All sidewalks shall be concrete and a minimum of five (5) feet in width, except where the walk is adjacent to commercial storefronts. In such cases, they shall be increased to a minimum of ten (10) feet in width. Sidewalk widths shall include a minimum through zone of at least five feet. The clear zone may be reduced pursuant to variance procedures in Section 4.196.

(02) Pathways

A. Bicycle facilities shall be provided using a bicycle lane as the preferred facility design. Other facility designs described in the Public Works Standards shall only be used if the bike lane standard cannot be constructed due to physical or financial constraints. The order of preference for bicycle facilities is:
   1. Bike lane.
   2. Shoulder bikeway.
   3. Shared roadway.

B. Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities located within the public right-of-way or public easement shall be constructed in conformance with the Public Works Standards.

C. To increase safety, all street crossings shall be marked and should be designed with a change of pavement such as brick or exposed aggregate. Arterial crossings may be signalized at the discretion of the City Engineer.

D. All pathways shall be clearly posted with standard bikeway signs.

E. Pedestrian and equestrian trails may have a gravel or sawdust surface if not intended for all weather use.

(03) Bicycle and pedestrian paths shall be located to provide a reasonably direct connection between likely destinations. A reasonably direct connection is a route which minimizes out-of-direction travel considering terrain, physical barriers, and safety. The objective of this standard is to achieve the equivalent of a 1/4 mile grid of routes.

(04) Pathway Clearance.
A. Vertical and horizontal clearance for bicycle and pedestrian paths is specified in the Public Works Standards. The clearance above equestrian trails shall be a minimum of ten feet. [Section 4.178 amended by Ord. 610, 5/1/06]

Section 4.197. Zone Changes and Amendments To This Code – Procedures.

(.01) The following procedure shall be followed in applying for an amendment to the text of this Chapter:

A. The Planning Commission shall conduct a public hearing on the proposed amendment at its earliest practicable meeting after it is proposed and shall, within forty (40) days after concluding the hearing, provide a report and recommendation to the City Council regarding the proposed amendment. The findings and recommendations of the Commission shall be adopted by resolution and shall be signed by the Chair of the Commission.

B. In recommending approval of a proposed text amendment, the Planning Commission shall, at a minimum, adopt findings relative to the following:

1. That the application was submitted in compliance with the procedures set forth in Section 4.008; and

2. The amendment substantially complies with all applicable goals, policies and objectives set forth in the Comprehensive Plan; and

3. The amendment does not materially conflict with, nor endanger, other provisions of the text of the Code; and

4. If applicable, the amendment is in compliance with Statewide Land Use Planning Goals and related administrative rules; and

4.5 If applicable, the amendment is necessary to ensure that the City's Land Use and Development Ordinance complies with mandated requirements of State or Federal laws and/or statutes.

(.02) In recommending approval or denial of a proposed zone map amendment, the Planning Commission or Development Review Board shall at a minimum, adopt findings addressing the following criteria:

A. That the application before the Commission or Board was submitted in accordance with the procedures set forth in Section 4.008, Section 4.125 (.18)(B)(2) or, in the case of a Planned Development, Section 4.140; and [Amended by Ord 557, adopted 9/5/03]

B. That the proposed amendment is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan map designation and substantially complies
with the applicable goals, policies and objectives, set forth in the Comprehensive Plan text; and

C. In the event that the subject property, or any portion thereof, is designated as "Residential" on the City's Comprehensive Plan Map; specific findings shall be made addressing substantial compliance with Implementation Measures 4.1.4.b, d, e, q, and x of Wilsonville's Comprehensive Plan text; and [Amended by Ordinance No. 538, 2/21/02.]

D. That the existing primary public facilities, i.e., roads and sidewalks, water, sewer and storm sewer are available and of adequate size to serve the proposed development; or, that adequate facilities can be provided in conjunction with project development. The Planning Commission and Development Review Board shall utilize any and all means to insure that all primary facilities are available and are adequately sized; and

E. That the proposed development does not have a significant adverse effect upon Significant Resource Overlay Zone areas, an identified natural hazard, or an identified geologic hazard. When Significant Resource Overlay Zone areas or natural hazard, and/or geologic hazard are located on or abut the proposed development, the Planning Commission or Development Review Board shall use appropriate measures to mitigate and significantly reduce conflicts between the development and identified hazard or Significant Resource Overlay Zone and

F. That the applicant is committed to a development schedule demonstrating that development of the property is reasonably expected to commence within two (2) years of the initial approval of the zone change; and

G. That the proposed development and use(s) can be developed in compliance with the applicable development standards or appropriate conditions are attached that insure that the project development substantially conforms to the applicable development standards.

H. Adequate public facilities, services, and transportation networks are in place, or are planned to be provided concurrently with the development of the property. The applicant shall demonstrate compliance with the Transportation Planning Rule, specifically by addressing whether the proposed amendment has a significant effect on the transportation system pursuant to OAR 660-012-0060. A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) shall be prepared pursuant to the requirements in Section 4.133.05.(01).
Section 4.236. General Requirements - Streets.

(.01) Conformity to the Master Transportation System Plan or Map: Land divisions shall conform to and be in harmony with the Transportation Master Plan (Transportation Systems Plan), the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, and the Parks and Recreation Master Plan, the Official Plan or Map and especially to the Master Street Plan.

(.02) Relation to Adjoining Street System.

[(...)]

(.03) All streets shall conform to the standards set forth in Section 4.177 and the block size requirements of the zone.

(.04) Creation of Easements: [(...)]

(.05) Topography: [(...)]

(.06) Reserve Strips: [(...)]

(.07) Future Expansion of Street: When necessary to give access to, or permit a satisfactory future division of, adjoining land, streets shall be extended to the boundary of the land division and the resulting dead-end street may be approved without a turn-around. Reserve strips and street plugs shall be required to preserve the objective of street extension. Notification that the street is planned for future extension shall be posted on the stub street.
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NOTICE OF DECISION

PLANNING COMMISSION

RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL TO
CITY COUNCIL

FILE NO.: LP13-0004

APPLICANT: City of Wilsonville

REQUEST: Amendments to the Planning and Land Development Ordinance (Wilsonville's Development Code) to implement the 2013 Transportation System Plan (TSP).

After conducting two work sessions on March 13, 2013 and April 10, 2013, and a public hearing on May 8, 2013, to discuss and take public testimony concerning proposed revisions to the Wilsonville Development Code, the Planning Commission voted to recommend this action to the City Council by passing Resolution No. LP13-0004.

The City Council is scheduled to conduct a Public Hearing on this matter on Monday, June 3, 2013, at 7:00 p.m., at the Wilsonville City Hall, 29799 SW Town Center Loop East.

For further information, please contact the Wilsonville Planning Division, 29799 SW Town Center Loop East, or telephone (503) 682-4960.
A WILSONVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL ADOPT AMENDMENTS TO THE PLANNING AND LAND DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE (WILSONVILLE’S DEVELOPMENT CODE) TO IMPLEMENT THE 2013 TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN (TSP).

WHEREAS, the City of Wilsonville desires to use best professional practices to ensure land development contributes to creating a safe and attractive transportation network that supports Wilsonville’s economy and quality of life; and

WHEREAS, the City of Wilsonville is required to coordinate with and implement the State of Oregon Transportation Planning Rule and Metro Regional Transportation Functional Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Wilsonville Planning Commission held two work sessions on March 13, 2013 and April 10, 2013 to discuss and take public testimony concerning proposed revisions to the Wilsonville Development Code; and

WHEREAS, the Wilsonville Planning Director, taking into consideration input and suggested revisions provided by the Planning Commission members and the public, submitted the proposed 2013 TSP-related Development Code text amendments, and to gather additional testimony and evidence regarding the proposals; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission, after Public Hearing Notices were provided to 4605 property owners within the City limits, a list of interested agencies, emailed to 131 people, and were posted in three locations throughout the City and on the City website held a Public Hearing on May 8, 2013 to review the proposed TSP-related Development Code Amendments and to gather additional testimony and evidence regarding the Code Amendments; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has afforded all interested parties an opportunity to be heard on this subject and has entered all available evidence and testimony into the public record of their proceeding; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has duly considered the subject, including the staff recommendations and all the exhibits and testimony introduced and offered by all interested parties; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Wilsonville Planning Commission does hereby adopt all Planning Staff Reports along with the findings and recommendations contained therein and, further, recommends that the Wilsonville City Council approve and adopt the Development Code Amendments to implement the 2013 TSP, as reviewed and amended by the Planning Commission; and

BE IT RESOLVED that this Resolution shall be effective upon adoption.
ADOPTED by the Planning Commission of the City of Wilsonville at a regular meeting thereof this 8th day of May and filed with the Planning Administrative Assistant on May 9, 2013.

[Signature]
Wilsonville Planning Commission

Attest:

[Signature]
Linda Straessle, Planning Administrative Assistant

SUMMARY of Votes:

Chair Ben Altman: Nay
Commissioner Eric Postma: Aye
Commissioner Peter Hurley: Absent
Commissioner Al Levit: Aye
Commissioner Marta McGuire: Absent
Commissioner Phyllis Millan: Aye
Commissioner Ray Phelps: Aye
PLANNING COMMISSION  
WEDNESDAY, MAY 8, 2013  
6:00 P.M.

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

MOTIONS

VI PUBLIC HEARINGS

B. LP13-0004 – Adoption of amendments to the Planning and Land Development Ordinance (various sections) to implement the 2013 Transportation System Plan. (Mangle)

The following exhibits were entered into the record:

Exhibit 1: Addendum dated May 8, 2013 prepared by Staff in response to issues raised by City Council during work session and indicating changes to the Sections 4.155(.04) Bicycle Parking and Section 4.177 Street Improvement Standards.

Exhibit 2: Email thread from Ben Altman dated May 3, 2013 and response from Planning Director Chris Neamtu.

Commissioner Postma moved to amend the Staff report as follows:

• Include the changes specified in Exhibit 1, excluding the Note indicated on Page 1, the Commentary included on page 4, and the table on the final page.

• Revise the end of Section 4.154(.01)B.2 on page 18 of 71 of the Staff report to include, “public rights-of-way and crosswalks”.

• Include the content of Section 4.177(.06)A on Page 26 of 71 immediately after (.06) Transit Improvements as one paragraph and renumber Subsections B, C, D, and E accordingly.

Commissioner Millan seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Commissioner Postma moved to adopt Resolution LP13-0004 as amended. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Millan and passed 4 to 1 with Chair Altman opposed.

Respectfully submitted,

By Paula Pinyerd of ABC Transcription Services, Inc. for Linda Straessle, Planning Administrative Assistant
I. CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL
Chair Altman called the meeting to order at 6:07 p.m. Those present:

Planning Commission: Ben Altman, Ray Phelps, Al Levit, Phyllis Millan, and City Councilor Julie Fitzgerald. Peter Hurley and Marta McGuire were absent. Eric Postma arrived after roll call.

City Staff: Chris Neamtzu, Barbara Jacobson, Katie Mangle and Steve Adams

VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS

B. LP13-0004 – Adoption of amendments to the Planning and Land Development Ordinance (various sections) to implement the 2013 Transportation System Plan. (Mangle)

The following exhibit was entered into the record and distributed to the Commission.
Exhibit 1: Addendum dated May 8, 2013 prepared by Staff in response to issues raised by City Council during work session and indicating changes to the Sections 4.155(.04) Bicycle Parking and Section 4.177 Street Improvement Standards.

Chair Altman reviewed the Legislative Hearing Procedure and called the public hearing for LP13-0003 to order at 8:45 p.m.

Katie Mangle, Manager, Long Range Planning, stated she had been working with Darcy Rudzinski of the Angelo Planning Group to present the set of Development Code amendments that were intended to implement many of the policies in Chapter 2 of the draft TSP that would be going to Council for adoption.

- Many of the TSP policies would be implemented either in the Development Code, through the Public Work Standards, or directly through the City in its Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). Updating the Code to do this was one big step forward in starting to implement some of the TSP policies and setting the intent in motion. In fact, the 2003 TSP had been such a long process after seven years that the Development Code amendments to support some of it were never adopted. Placeholder language still existed within the Code that said “This Section to be updated when the TSP was adopted.”
- Staff wanted to be sure to follow up on that and not lose momentum on the project. It was not urgent that it be adopted that night, but keeping the momentum going was important. There had been two or three work sessions with the Planning Commission on the amendments, and a lot of the Planning Commission's comments had been incorporated into the draft TSP.
A brief presentation would be given to explain what the amendments were about and what impact they might have. Generally, the reason for these types of amendments was, in addition to implementing the TSP, to comply with some regional and state requirements that the City was obligated to fulfill. Most of the amendments built on really good policy the City had had for a very long time to ensure that development contributed to improving the pedestrian, bicycle and streetscape improvements and making sure development did that along the way. There were also specific things the City was being asked to comply with, which the amendments would help the City to do.

There were some areas where housekeeping and organizational improvements had been done to make the TSP easier to use and make sure that as Staff spoke with developers, the City's onsite requirements were clear. For example, the City cared about the design for getting pedestrians from the parking lot to the headquarters of a corporation. Making sure the objectives were clear regarding on-street or in the right-of-way improvements and organizing those so it was clear which is which.

Darcy Rudzinski, Angelo Planning Group, reviewed the proposed Code language, referring to the examples of the key changes on Page 4 of 71. She characterized the changes made, mostly for the benefit of the record and to provide a higher level overview of the types of changes being considered for adoption in Wilsonville with these comments:

The City should make sure its development standards reflect the standards and functional classifications in the TSP. Therefore, a few modifications were made to the existing requirements to ensure consistency between the TSP and the Development Code.

Current practice also needed to be codified. The public hearing notice requirements was one example of where the City already notified roadway providers with potential authority over roadways within the city of potential development activities that might impact those facilities. The Code language had simply been modified to clarify that it was an expectation of the City.

Other amendments increased safety, accessibility and connectivity for all modes. So, there was a new section focused on on-site, bicycle and pedestrian connectivity. Another new section also stated the standards for vehicular access and circulation.

The last category of amendments focused on increasing the opportunity for multimodal travel.

Bicycle parking standards had been modified. Transit related requirements took a lot of the policy level recommendations from the Transit Master Plan and implemented it into the Development Code so that it actually became a requirement that transit amenities and facilities be provided with some level of development.

She agreed with what Mr. Knapp had said about the TSP supporting the qualities they wanted to see in Wilsonville. The TSP should enable the type of community they desired to be. As Ms. Mangle stated, the TSP policies in Chapter 2 were implemented in part through the Development Code.

Attachment C was a commentary sheet that described the changes to the ordinance and why they had been made. Attachment C had been updated as different versions of the proposed Code language were presented.

She also agreed with Mr. Mansur's statement about the TSP capturing the latest and best practices and she believed the Code language should be viewed the same way. They had drawn upon model Code language developed and used by the State and modified for each jurisdiction's needs. They had also drawn on examples from other jurisdictions in the region, who were trying to enhance and clarify requirements, particularly around multimodal transportation.

She briefly reviewed how the current version of the Code Amendment packet had changed since being presented in April. Staff had mostly made the amendments but the consultants had helped respond to the Commission's comments and suggested amendments from April.

One of the biggest changes had been to the access drive and driveway approach standards on Page 27 of 71 under Street Improvement Standards, which had previously been two separate sections. One had discussed driveway approach, where the driveway connects into the system. The other was access drives, which regarded the length of access drive connecting the property to the system. There were subtle differences between them. Because the two requirements were so
similar, they combined the requirements under one heading and added a definition for driveway approach to clarify what they were.

• Related to that, Section 4.118(.03) on Page 17 of 71 allowed waivers to the drive aisle design and on-site pedestrian access and circulation standards.

Ms. Mangle explained there had been several times where the Commission had discussed the need for some flexibility, and ensuring people could get waivers was the best way to allow flexibility. She clarified edits had been made to items 9 and 15.

• She noted Exhibit 1, which was distributed to the Commission, was prepared in response to Monday night’s work session with City Council, addressing items raised by Council and indicating changes to the Sections 4.155(.04) Bicycle Parking and Section 4.177 Street Improvement Standards with regard to proportionality. She described the changes made to these two sections for the Commission to consider. She noted the changes were indicated in green and red in the packet. Her comments were as follows:

  • The only real policy change with regard to bicycle parking involved the threshold at which long-term bicycle parking is triggered. The current proposal stated if more than four bicycle parking spaces were required by Table 5. Council had questioned if that threshold was too low; if it would capture too small of the proposed development.

    • She directed the Commission to the table on the last page of Exhibit 1, which was not proposed to be in the Code but was provided as background information. She considered the bicycle parking ratios in Table 5 and asked, for example, if the threshold was four, what kind of businesses or uses would be captured and the table in Exhibit 1 showed these results. A hotel, for example, with 20 or more rooms would be required to have four bicycle parking spaces; therefore, that use would trigger the need to meet the long-term bicycle parking standard. Less than four would be the size of uses that would trigger the bicycle parking standard. If the threshold were six, in the next column to the right, the table indicated the sizes of uses that would trigger the long term biking standard.

  • One question from the work session on Monday was where the bicycle parking standards had originated. Staff had erroneously answered that some of the standards were from Portland and Milwaukie, but they had actually come from Villebois. The difference between the two was that in Villebois the numbers for short-term and long-term bicycle parking spaces were listed. However, that approach was not being taken for the rest of the city, therefore a threshold needed to be defined. Staff recommended increasing the threshold to six, which would be for Planning Commission's discussion.

  • The other changes to the Bicycle Parking standards were basically structural, ensuring that bicycle parking spaces required general provisions; Section 4.155(.04) numbers 5 and 6 were moved up from the short term bicycle parking standards section because they describe how a bicycle parking space needed be designed and used, which is something that should apply to all bike parking spaces, not just short term spaces.

  • The covered parking section had also been moved and that section had been edited for clarity.

Commissioner Levit:

• Questioned how many dentist offices were 20,000 sq ft and suggested decreasing the sizes.

• Asked why there would never be a bicycle rack at a bowling alley.

• Ms. Mangle responded the number of parking spaces were by lane. According to the table, it would have to be 100 lanes before bicycle parking would be triggered. It could not be changed because they were not reevaluating the entire parking table, but it could be noted as a deficiency.

• Stated although patrons may not be coming by bicycle, employees and visitors could.

• Ms. Mangle believed there was a minimum of two bicycle parking requirements, but she would have to go back and review the table. Because no 100 lane bowling alleys would be built, the parking would never be triggered. She reiterated that reevaluating the entire table and parking
ratios would be a different project. More involved discussions and research were necessary for many of the parking standards for both bicycle and auto; though it might be good to note.

Commissioner Millan confirmed the table in Exhibit 1 would not be included in the adopted standards.
• Ms. Mangle responded the table was created as background for the Commission’s consideration, if they wanted to change the threshold from four to six.

Commissioner Phelps confirmed the table was provided for informational purposes. He suggested inserting a column for minimum number of bicycle parking spaces, otherwise it was suggesting that some uses would never have bicycle parking capability, although two was the requirement.
• Ms. Mangle explained the purpose of the table was to evaluate if there was a threshold at which long-term bicycle parking would be required and what would be captured at that threshold. The question posed at Council was if the right things were being captured. The table was designed to be informational for the Commission. She believed four was a perfectly defensible answer and six would be a little bit of a higher threshold.

Ms. Mangle addressed another Council question about proportionality and whether too small of sites would trigger expensive improvements, specifically for transit stops. She believed it was not just a fair question for transit improvements but for any of them. She had discussed it with the City Attorney's office and the last line of the first paragraph of Section 4.177 stated, "The purpose of this section is to ensure that development, including redevelopment, provides transportation facilities that are safe, convenient, and adequate in rough proportion to that impact," which was already included in the proposal and addressed all of that. The City Attorney believed that was enough and that any case law related to Nolan and Dolan overrode all of the City’s responsibilities. However, he noted that Section 4.177(.01) had stated, "Such improvements shall be provided at the time of development," which was actually not the way it was done in Wilsonville. Developments in Wilsonville were allowed to make improvements within two years of the time of development, so that was the reference in Section 4.140 to clarify that.

Commissioner Levit:
• Asked about Table 5 in Attachment A and whether everything was a minimum of two bike parking spaces.
  • Ms. Mangle clarified that most of Table 5 was not included in the draft because it was not being changed. She would need a copy of the table before she was able to answer the question.
• Had requested, on a couple of occasions, that language be included to require public access at corner lots from the corner and he did not see that language in the draft.
  • Ms. Mangle replied it had not been inserted because Staff had not been sure how to achieve that objective, where to insert it or how it would relate to the ability to place buildings on the corner in terms of how pedestrian access related to building placement and site design. The requirement that the pedestrian route be safe, direct and convenient had been included.
  • Ms. Rudzinski noted that would not preclude what he was discussing; it just did not dictate how it would happen.
• Knew of no place in Wilsonville with pedestrian access from the corner, which meant pedestrians were inconvenienced, especially when it was a parking lot. It was understandable if it was a building and a pedestrian was not going to walk into the building. However, if it was a parking lot with internal circulation for pedestrians, it should connect to a crosswalk.
  • Ms. Rudzinski noted they struggled with making the language too prescriptive.
• Stated it was either there or it was inconvenient. People would either cut through the shrubbery, which happens almost everywhere, or the City should make a path there.
  • Ms. Mangle responded if the language stated, “reasonably direct” that would be one of the routes that would be evaluated when looking at a site plan.
• Replied that although he and Staff agreed on that, it might never be done unless it was specifically written. However, if it was logical, he questioned why it was not being done already.
• Chair Altman stated he works with that end of it a lot and explained that the parking lot is designed first and then pedestrian lengths are added, which is why they usually end up with them wherever access points are located. Perhaps pedestrian circulation should be designed first.
• Replied an internal pedestrian plan had to be done in conjunction, but currently, if people walk in any parking lot they walked in the middle of traffic because the parking lots were not designed safely for pedestrians.
• Ms. Rudzinski believed the language provided the City with some tools to request that information be taken into consideration and to have modifications made in a site plan review if pedestrian access was indirect and did not make sense. She was leery of trying to anticipate all of the possible site design aspects because when referring to transit, that was a traction point they would want to have safe.
• Doubted it would happen.
• Ms. Mangle suggested adding some language on Page 18 of 71 in Section 4.154(.01)B.2.b. "The pathway is reasonably direct. A pathway is reasonably direct when it follows a route between destinations" could be modified to say "destinations including..."
• Responded that although it named public rights-of-way, that could be 50 ft down the street.
• Ms. Mangle replied that could say including the nearest public crosswalk or something similar, which would guide Staff during implementation; not just from the car to the building, or from building to building but also from the building to the nearest crosswalk or something like that to ensure that it was considered.
• She clarified that in Table 5, there was a minimum of two bicycle spaces for every use and a minimum of six or four for certain uses. She confirmed the table purely regarded the threshold for long-term parking.
• Said the first time a copy of Table 5 had been provided, there had been something that struck him as being odd but could not recall what it was.
• Ms. Mangle confirmed Table 5 would not be changed, however there was one change that was needed for regional compliance.

Chair Altman:
• Inquired about Section 4.155(.03)(E.) on page 20 of 71, the 12-ft landscape buffer being a new standard for buffering a parking lot.
• Ms. Rudzinski believed that was made for consistency with what the City currently required.
• Did not recall a 12-ft buffer, adding there was always a buffer, but he did not recall it being that wide. He was concerned that as the City had more intense urban development, giving up 12-ft buffer for parking at the edge might be overkill. He agreed with Section 4.155(.03)(F.), which said if it works appropriately it would be included in storm treatment elements. He believed setting a standard of a 12-ft buffer for all parking lots was too wide. For example, Town Center would have a 12-ft wide buffer along its entire length on Wilsonville Road. The existing buffer was only about five or six ft, not 12 ft.
• Was also concerned with Section 4.177(.06)(C.) on Page 27 of 71, which assumed there was a bus stop anywhere near the project. He suggested including an alternative location or a contribution toward stops elsewhere. If there was no bus stop nearby, there was nothing to improve.
• Ms. Mangle noted that Section 4.177(.06)(A.) stated it was triggered if on a major transit street to any bus stop located along the site’s frontage, so it was only applicable if a bus stop was located there. The City could not require going offsite to improve a bus stop down the block.
• Responded it was done with trees, requiring developers to mitigate, paying into a tree fund and planting them elsewhere if they could not be planted on site. However, as long as it was related to an actual bus stop, he was okay with it.
Commissioner Phelps said he wanted to know what he was agreeing to when voting for this and all it said was "Shall be designed in accordance with the Public Works Standard". This language was used on Page 26 of 71 and several other places in the draft. He was concerned that the Public Works Standards might change and the language would not.

- Ms. Mangle clarified the Public Works Standards were the City's street design standards and should be included in the Public Works Standards instead of the Code. Therefore, items that stated things like, "The sidewalk should be brown concrete" had been extracted from the Code. That did not belong in the Zoning Code but in the Public Works Standards. For example, there was a part of the TSP with street cross sections and at the policy level of the TSP, the Planning Commission was approving design of what collector streets should look like. Having some flexibility had been discussed and the Public Works Standards might discuss four different kinds of collectors. The Public Works Standards provided another way of implementing some of that policy. Some of the other things in the Public Works Standards involved more details about the types of surfaces allowed, such as what a sidewalk could be built out of, such as asphalt or concrete. The Public Works Standards were easier to amend and update than the Code. The Public Works Standards are updated via a public Council discussion, but did not involve the whole land use process. The Staff could not make administrative changes to the Standards.

- Ms. Jacobson noted the last update to the Public Works Standards occurred in 2006. Provisions within the Standards allow the Planning Director to have some discretion, but the overall standards are adopted by Council.

- Ms. Mangle noted the Engineering Department was working on an update that would go to Council to update the TSP. She confirmed that some of the Standards were based on national engineering standards and often come from ODOT and other sources.

Commissioner Levit inquired about the transit improvements that began in (.06)(A.) on Pages 26 and 27 clearly stating that the sites are adjacent to a transit street, but (A.), (B.), (C.), (D.) and (E.) were all at the same structural level. He suggested making (B.), (C.) and possibly the others subsections of (A.).

Chair Altman suggested eliminating (A.) and making it a paragraph, so that everything under it would be a subcategory.

Commissioner Levit agreed that would work because in (C.), it was uncertain whether it was a transit street or not.

Ms. Mangle agreed. She clarified the 12-ft setback for the parking buffer was an existing standard, but only for parking lots in excess of 200 parking spaces.

Chair Altman expressed frustration that the Development Code still referred back to the Comprehensive Plan. He had been coordinating with Mr. Neamtzu and Ms. Mangle on the issue and it did not look like it would be resolved immediately because it was more complicated than imagined. He would like to see something eventually done where the TSP would be actually implemented through the Code, instead of constantly referring back to the Comprehensive Plan. He was concerned that they would now be bouncing between three documents, the Code, the Comprehensive Plan and the TSP, to make sure all the bases were covered, which was a structure he was not at all satisfied with.

Commissioner Postma entered the email thread from Ben Altman dated May 3, 2013 and response from Planning Director Chris Neamtzu into the record as Exhibit 2.

Chair Altman called for public testimony regarding LP13-0004. There was none.
Commissioner Postma noted Page 18 of 71 was where there had been a discussion about Commissioner Levit’s concern regarding internal pathways. He suggested adding “and crosswalks” after "public rights-of-way" at the end of the Section 4.154(.01)(B.)2., to provide an additional potential indication that the City intended to get people to the corner crosswalks.

Commissioner Levit agreed the crosswalk was a good idea in the odd situation it could possibly be located in the middle of the block.

Commissioner Postma responded the advantage was that there would not be a “shall” so much as "please try to do this," which provided some design flexibility. The difficulty with removing the prior "and" was that a "shall" was still included at the beginning of that.

Commissioner Levit:
• Questioned what was wrong with that as they were trying to make Wilsonville a pedestrian-friendly community.
  • Ms. Rudzinski stated an alternate suggestion was that the pathway be reasonably direct, which meant it followed a route between destinations including nearest crosswalks or from destinations to nearest crosswalks.
  • Responded it would still be a "shall" because it is subsection 2.

Chair Altman noted it was still a matter of defining reasonably direct as a "shall."
• Ms. Mangle noted "shall" was a way to get things done and an important word in code writing. She, Ms. Rudzinski and Mr. Neamtzu had thoroughly discussed the concern and concluded that the section had a lot of flexibility on how the requirement was met and how it was implemented and applied to specific sites. Without a "shall," it would not belong in the Code.

Commissioner Postma confirmed, “and crosswalks” would be inserted at the end of Section 4.154(.01)(B.)2. on page 18 of 71 of the Staff report after “public rights-of-way”.
• In Section 4.177(.06)(A.) on Page 26 of 71, he noted the Commission discussed removing subsection (A.) and inserting that paragraph immediately after "transit improvements," and then renumbering (B.), (C.), (D.) and (E.) to (A.), (B.), (C.), and (D.). He believed that would provide clarity and go back to the notion of paying attention to transit improvements and adjacent developments.

Chair Altman closed the public hearing for LP13-0004 at 9:32 p.m.

Commissioner Postma moved to amend the Staff report as follows:
• Include the changes specified in Exhibit 1, excluding the Note indicated on Page 1 and the table on the final page.
• Revise the end of Section 4.154(.01) (B.)(2.) on page 18 of 71 of the Staff report to include, “public rights-of-way and crosswalks”.
• Include the content of Section 4.177(.06)(A.) on Page 26 of 71 immediately after (.06) Transit Improvements as one paragraph and renumber Subsections (B.), (C.), (D.) and (E.) accordingly.

Commissioner Millan seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Commissioner Postma moved to adopt Resolution LP13-0004 as amended. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Millan and passed 4 to 1 with Chair Altman opposed.
Distributed at the May 8, 2013 Planning Commission Hearing
Exhibit 1: May 8, 2013 Addendum to the Proposed Amendments to the Wilsonville Development Code Related to the 2013 Transportation System Plan.
Exhibit 2: An email string between Ben Altman and Chris Neamtzu ending May 7, 2013 regarding TSP-Code Amendments
Proposed Amendments to the Wilsonville Development Code
Related to the 2013 Transportation System Plan

May 8, 2013 Addendum

Suggested revisions to the proposal

Section 4.155. General Regulations - Parking, Loading and Bicycle Parking.

(04) Bicycle Parking:

A. Required Bicycle Parking - General Provisions
   1. The required minimum number of bicycle parking spaces for each use category is shown in Table 5, Parking Standards, below.
   2. A minimum of 50% of the bicycle parking spaces shall be provided as long-term bicycle parking in any of the following situations:
      a. When 10% or more of automobile vehicle parking is covered.
      b. If more than four (4) bicycle parking spaces are required.
      c. Multifamily residential development with nine or more units.
   3. Bicycle parking spaces are not required for accessory buildings. If a primary use is listed in Table 5, bicycle parking is not required for the accessory use.
   4. When there are two or more primary uses on a site, the required bicycle parking for the site is the sum of the required bicycle parking for the individual primary uses.
   5. Each space must be at least 2 feet by 6 feet in area, be accessible without moving another bicycle, and provide enough space between the rack and any obstructions to use the space properly.
   6. There must be an aisle at least 5 feet wide shall be maintained behind all required bicycle parking to allow room for bicycle maneuvering. Where the bicycle parking is adjacent to a sidewalk, the maneuvering area may extend into the right-of-way.

B. Short-term Bicycle Parking
   1. Short-term bicycle parking encourages shoppers, customers, and other visitors to use bicycles by providing a convenient and readily accessible place to park bicycles.
   2. Required short-term bicycle parking shall meet the following standards:
      a. Provide lockers or racks that meet the standards of this section.
      b. Locate within 30 feet of the main entrance to the building or inside a building, in a location that is easily accessible for bicycles.
c. If 10 or more spaces are required, then at least 50 percent of these shall be covered.

d. Each space must be at least 2 feet by 6 feet in area and be accessible without moving another bicycle and must provide enough space between the rack and a building or other obstructions to use the rack properly.

e. There must be an aisle at least 5 feet wide behind all required bicycle parking to allow room for bicycle maneuvering. Where the bicycle parking is adjacent to a sidewalk, the maneuvering area may extend into the right-of-way.

C. Long-term Bicycle Parking

1. Long-term bicycle parking provides employees, students, residents, commuters, and others who generally stay at a site for several hours a weather-protected place to park bicycles.

2. Required long-term bicycle parking shall meet the following standards:
   a. Provide racks, storage rooms, or lockers in areas that are secure or monitored (e.g., visible to employees or monitored by security guards).
   b. Locate the space within 100 feet of the entrance that will be used accessed by the intended users.
   c. At least 50 percent of the spaces shall be covered.

3. Bicycle Lockers, Racks and Cover

D. Covered Parking (Weather Protection):

a. Where required, covered bicycle parking is, shall be provided in lockers, one of the lockers shall be securely anchored.

b. Covered bicycle parking, as required by this section, shall be provided following ways: inside buildings, under roof overhangs or awnings, in bicycle lockers, or within or under other structures.

2. Where required covered bicycle parking is not within a building or locker, the cover must be permanent and designed to protect the bicycle from rainfall and provide seven (7) foot minimum overhead clearance.

3. Where required bicycle parking is provided in lockers, the lockers shall be securely anchored.
Section 4.177. Street Improvement Standards.

Note: This section is expected to be revised after the completion of the Transportation Systems Plan.

This section contains the City’s requirements and standards for pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facility improvements to public streets, or within public easements. The purpose of this section is to ensure that development, including redevelopment, provides transportation facilities that are safe, convenient, and adequate in rough proportion to their impacts.

(.01) Except as specifically approved by the Development Review Board, all street and access improvements shall conform to the Transportation Systems Plan and the Public Works Standards, together with the following standards: [Amended by Ord. 682, 9/9/10] Development and related public facility improvements shall comply with the standards in this section, the Wilsonville Public Works Standards, and the Transportation System Plan, in rough proportion to the potential impacts of the development. Such improvements shall be provided constructed at the time of development or as provided by Section 4.140, except as modified or waived by the City Engineer for reasons of safety or traffic operations.
Section (.04) Bicycle Parking is a new section that borrows its purpose statement and bicycle parking standards from existing Village Zone requirements in the City code (Section 4.125.07.D). The current code includes requirements for bicycle parking, but no standards regarding placement or design. Long-term parking standards are new, in response to a regional requirement.

- Short-term bicycle parking must be located within 30 feet of the main building entrance, and if over 10 spaces are required, 50% of them must be covered.

- Long-term bicycle parking is targeted for users such as employees and students, and designed to be secure, weather-protected, and located within a reasonable distance of the proposed users’ destination. (For example, bicycle parking for employees may be more appropriately located near a back door close to the shower room, instead of near the front door.)
  
  o 50% of the total required bicycle parking spaces would be for “long-term” use under specified conditions: when 10% of the auto parking is covered, for multifamily dwellings with more than 9 units, and when more than 6 bike parking spaces are required.

  o Of the required long-term parking, 50% must be covered but there are many ways to meet this standard (e.g., within a building, under an awning, in bike lockers, etc.).

The new bicycle parking facility standards in this section are industry standard, but absent in current City policy. In the past staff has been able to require that minimum number of bicycle parking spaces be provided, but unable to enforce if the racks are placed too close to a building or blocked by shopping cart storage.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Min. bike parking spaces required (x)</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hotel</td>
<td>20+ rooms</td>
<td>30+ rooms</td>
<td>always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nursing home</td>
<td>24000 sf</td>
<td>36000 sf</td>
<td>always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hospital</td>
<td>80 auto pkg spaces</td>
<td>120 auto pkg spaces</td>
<td>always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>church</td>
<td>200 seats</td>
<td>300 seats</td>
<td>always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>museum</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preschool</td>
<td>14000 sf</td>
<td>21000</td>
<td>always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elementary</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high school</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theater</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>240 seats</td>
<td>always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bowling alley</td>
<td>never</td>
<td>never</td>
<td>never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gym</td>
<td>16000 sf</td>
<td>24000 sf</td>
<td>always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retail</td>
<td>16000 sf</td>
<td>24000 sf</td>
<td>always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>large product retail</td>
<td>32000 sf</td>
<td>48000 sf</td>
<td>always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>office</td>
<td>20000 sf</td>
<td>30000 sf</td>
<td>always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dental office</td>
<td>20000 sf</td>
<td>30000 sf</td>
<td>always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restaurant or bar</td>
<td>16000 sf</td>
<td>24000 sf</td>
<td>always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fast food</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>never</td>
<td>never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manufacturing</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warehouse</td>
<td>80000 sf</td>
<td>120000 sf</td>
<td>always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subject: RE: TSP - Code Amendments

From: Neamtu, Chris
Sent: Tuesday, May 07, 2013 2:14 PM
To: Ben Altman
Cc: Mangle, Katie; Kohlhoff, Mike; Jacobson, Barbara
Subject: RE: TSP - Code Amendments

Good Afternoon Ben,

I thought about this over the weekend, and wanted to offer a couple of items. In a perfect world, we all recognize that the importance and appropriateness of the Code implementing the Plan. Staff has been working on tightening this up quite a bit over the years, and will continue to do so with each project. However, it is my feeling that we are not yet quite to the point where we can rely solely on the Code to implement all provisions of the Plan. The IM for increased density for special needs housing is one area that immediately comes to mind as not having code to back it up. There are other areas as well. The City would need a detailed code audit performed before we could rely solely on the Code to ensure the community doesn’t lose the ability to implement important policies in the Comp Plan. I did correspond with Barbara and Mike on this and there was general discomfort for the reasons stated above, (i.e. the city would need to invest considerable time consuming work on the Code to make sure it accurately and completely tracked the Comp Plan in all respects). I have not had a chance to talk to Blaise or other current planners.

I understand that for applicants, writing findings on both documents has proven to be awkward at times, and I completely understand applicants’ desire to not have to write findings in a circular manner or to perform work that is not necessary or helpful to the reviewer or the public. Perhaps this can be better addressed as an administrative issue, where the reviewing planners are more mindful of what it is they are asking for as part of completeness and there is a conversation around what sections are being asked for as it relates to what sections we know the code implements avoiding un-necessary findings. For example, if there are transportation findings that are needed for a case file, since we are going through a detailed process to write code to support the TSP, providing findings on the TSP would be un-necessary. I am always happy to assist in this conversation where I can be helpful.

Thanks, Ben.

Chris Neamtu, AICP
Planning Director
City of Wilsonville
29799 SW Town Center Loop E
Wilsonville, OR 97070
503.570.1574
neamtu@ci.wilsonville.or.us

Disclosure Notice: Messages to and from this email address may be subject to the Oregon Public Records Law.

From: Ben Altman [mailto:baltman@sfadg.com]
Sent: Friday, May 03, 2013 11:43 AM
Thanks Chris.

Ben Altman  
Senior Planner/Project Manager  
SFA DESIGN GROUP, LLC  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRUCTURAL</th>
<th>CIVIL</th>
<th>LAND USE PLANNING</th>
<th>SURVEYING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9020 SW Washington Square Dr., Suite 505 Portland, OR 97223  
P (503) 641-8311  
F (503) 643-7905  
E baltman@sfadg.com  
www.sfadesigngroup.com

From: Neamtzu, Chris  
Sent: Friday, May 03, 2013 11:08 AM  
To: Ben Altman  
Cc: Mangle, Katie  
Subject: RE: TSP - Code Amendments

Thanks, Ben – Katie is out of town, we will chat next week about this and get back to you.

Have a great weekend,

Chris Neamtzu, AICP  
Planning Director  
City of Wilsonville  
29799 SW Town Center Loop E  
Wilsonville, OR  97070  
503.570.1574  
neamtzu@ci.wilsonville.or.us

Disclosure Notice: Messages to and from this email address may be subject to the Oregon Public Records Law.

From: Ben Altman  
Sent: Friday, May 03, 2013 8:25 AM  
To: Neamtzu, Chris; Mangle, Katie  
Subject: TSP - Code Amendments

Chris & Katie:

As you know I have been concerned about the general structure of the Code, which tends to refer back to the Comprehensive Plan, thus requiring applicants to address Comp Plan elements, rather than just Code provisions.

I would like to suggest one addition to the Code Amendment package as follows:

Section 4.000. Administration - Purpose and Title.
Add: (.03)  The provisions specified within this Code including Zoning, Design Review, Land Division, Development Standard, and Approval Criteria, have been designed to implement the Comprehensive Plan, including the Transportation System Plan and other implementing Master Plans. Therefore findings of compliance with this Code for a proposed development represents compliance with the Comprehensive Plan, without need to specifically address elements of the Comprehensive Plan, except is the case of an application including a Comprehensive Plan amendment, zone change, or Variance.

If we can add this, or something similar, as approved by legal, I would be very pleased.

Ben Altman
Senior Planner/Project Manager

SFA DESIGN GROUP, LLC

STRUCTURAL | CIVIL | LAND USE PLANNING | SURVEYING

9020 SW Washington Square Dr., Suite 505 Portland, OR 97223
P (503) 641-8311
F (503) 643-7905
E baltman@sfadg.com
www.sfadesigngroup.com

Disclaimer:
This e-mail may contain proprietary, confidential, and/or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient (or have received this e-mail in error), please notify the sender immediately by email or telephone (503-641-8311) and delete this message along with any attachments without copying or disclosing the contents. Any unauthorized copying, disclosure or distribution of the material in this e-mail is strictly forbidden. SFA Design Group, LLC (SFA) shall not be liable for any changes made to the electronic data transferred. Distribution of electronic data to others is prohibited without the express written consent of SFA.
May 8, 2013 Planning Commission Public Hearing:

- Draft Resolution No. LP13-0004
- Staff Report for Meeting Date May 8, 2013, for the Transportation System Plan Development Code Amendments, with the following Attachments:
  - Attachment A. Draft TSP-related Development Code amendments (strikeout)
  - Attachment B. Draft TSP-related Development Code amendments (clean)
  - Attachment C. Commentary on proposed Code amendments
  - Attachment D. Findings of Compliance with the Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP) and Transportation Planning Rule (TPR)
  - Attachment E. Case File #LP13.04 Index of Complete Record
VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS

B. LP13-0004 - Amendments to the Planning and Land Development Ordinance (Wilsonville's Development Code) to implement the 2013 Transportation System Plan. (Mangle)
PLANNING COMMISSION
RESOLUTION NO. LP13-0004

A WILSONVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL ADOPT AMENDMENTS TO THE PLANNING AND LAND DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE (WILSONVILLE’S DEVELOPMENT CODE) TO IMPLEMENT THE 2013 TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN (TSP).

WHEREAS, the City of Wilsonville desires to use best professional practices to ensure land development contributes to creating a safe and attractive transportation network that supports Wilsonville’s economy and quality of life; and

WHEREAS, the City of Wilsonville is required to coordinate with and implement the State of Oregon Transportation Planning Rule and Metro Regional Transportation Functional Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Wilsonville Planning Commission held two work sessions on March 13, 2013 and April 10, 2013 to discuss and take public testimony concerning proposed revisions to the Wilsonville Development Code; and

WHEREAS, the Wilsonville Planning Director, taking into consideration input and suggested revisions provided by the Planning Commission members and the public, submitted the proposed 2013 TSP-related Development Code text amendments, and to gather additional testimony and evidence regarding the proposals; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission, after Public Hearing Notices were provided to 4605 property owners within the City limits, a list of interested agencies, emailed to 131 people, and were posted in three locations throughout the City and on the City website held a Public Hearing on May 8, 2013 to review the proposed TSP-related Development Code Amendments and to gather additional testimony and evidence regarding the Code Amendments; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has afforded all interested parties an opportunity to be heard on this subject and has entered all available evidence and testimony into the public record of their proceeding; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has duly considered the subject, including the staff recommendations and all the exhibits and testimony introduced and offered by all interested parties; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Wilsonville Planning Commission does hereby adopt all Planning Staff Reports along with the findings and recommendations contained therein and, further, recommends that the Wilsonville City Council approve and adopt the Development Code Amendments to implement the 2013 TSP, as reviewed and amended by the Planning Commission; and

BE IT RESOLVED that this Resolution shall be effective upon adoption.
ADOPTED by the Planning Commission of the City of Wilsonville at a regular meeting thereof this 8th day of May and filed with the Planning Administrative Assistant on May 9, 2013.

Wilsonville Planning Commission

Attest:

__________________________
Linda Straessle, Planning Administrative Assistant

SUMMARY of Votes:

Chair Ben Altman: ______
Commissioner Eric Postma: ______
Commissioner Peter Hurley: ______
Commissioner Al Levit ______
Commissioner Marta McGuire: ______
Commissioner Phyllis Millan: ______
Commissioner Ray Phelps: ______
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
STAFF REPORT

Meeting Date: May 8, 2013

Subject: Transportation System Plan Development Code Amendments

Staff Member: Katie Mangle
Department: Planning

Action Required
☐ Motion
☒ Public Hearing Date: 5/08/13
☐ Ordinance 1st Reading Date:
☐ Ordinance 2nd Reading Date:
☐ Resolution
☐ Information or Direction
☐ Information Only
☐ Council Direction
☐ Consent Agenda

Advisory Board/Commission Recommendation
☐ Approval
☐ Denial
☐ None Forwarded
☒ Not Applicable

Comments: The Planning Commission action is in the form of a recommendation to the City Council.

Staff Recommendation: Conduct a public hearing on the proposed amendments to the Development Code to implement the proposed 2013 Transportation System Plan.

Recommended Language for Motion: The Planning Commission recommends approval of LP13.04, proposed amendments to the Wilsonville Development Code, to the City Council (with or without specific changes).

PROJECT / ISSUE RELATES TO: [Identify which goal(s), master plans(s) issue relates to.]
☒ Council Goals/Priorities
Ensure efficient, cost effective and sustainable development and infrastructure.
☒ Adopted Master Plan(s)
Update to the 2003 Transportation System Plan
☐ Not Applicable
ISSUE BEFORE THE COMMISSION:
The proposing to adopt an update to its Transportation System Plan (TSP) in 2013. Amendments to the Development Code are needed to implement the revised policies of the TSP and to comply with state and regional requirements.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
The TSP is the City’s long-term policy and planning document for transportation improvements. The TSP identifies the City’s transportation system goals and objectives, projects needed to provide efficient transportation choices for all users, design standards for a system that operates reliably and safely, and is complementary to surrounding land uses. In addition, having a TSP in place is essential for the City to compete for regional, state, and federal funding for transportation projects. The Planning Commission will open public hearings on the proposed TSP May 8th, and the first public hearing before Council is scheduled for June.

Wilsonville, like most other cities in the region, needs to update its TSP to keep current with changes in regional transportation policy. Chapter 2 of the draft TSP lists updated goals, policies, and implementation measures. The transportation policies will be implemented through development review, capital projects, and SMART and public works operations. Amendments to the Development Code are necessary to affect City decisions on private development applications.

Development Code Amendments
The proposed amendments to the City of Wilsonville Development Code would update City requirements to be consistent with the new policies in Chapter 2 of the draft TSP, and to be consistent with the Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP) and State Transportation Planning Rule (TPR). See Attachment A for an underline/ strikethrough version of the draft amendments; a “clean” version is included in Attachment B.

Key changes include the following:

- On-site pedestrian access and circulation standards, needed to ensure safe and convenient walkability of development.
- New on-site parking design standards to include parking location and street features for lots over three acres in size.
- Exemption from parking maximum allowance for structured parking and on-street parking.
- New standards for the quantity, location, and design of short term and long term bicycle parking.
- Consolidation of all street design standards that apply when private development is required to construct frontage and street improvements. Some existing standards have been moved. Some new standards have been added to be consistent with proposed TSP chapter 5 Standards.
- A new section outlining when development may be required to construct SMART bus stop improvements. The City is able to exact such improvements now, but adding the
triggers and possible requirements into the Code will make the process more predictable for applicants and staff.

- New section to address property access and driveway development standards, and intersection spacing standards.

The draft amendments contained in Attachments A (showing edits to existing Code) and B ("clean" version showing the policy upon adoption) reflect direction provided by the Planning Commission during worksession discussions of the proposal. Draft findings in support of approval are included at the end of this report. A commentary document explaining the purpose and effect of the amendments is included as Attachment C.

**EXPECTED RESULTS:**
Amendments to the Development Code are needed to coordinate with the TSP and comply with state and regional policy. Attachment D summarizes how the proposed amendments will help the City comply with state or regional requirements.

**TIMELINE:**
The hearing on the Code amendments may be continued to a date certain, after the City Council conducts a hearing and makes a decision on the TSP itself in June 2013. The state grant that is funding the consultant work on this project will expire June 30, 2013. The City’s deadline for adopting a TSP and code amendments that comply with the Regional Transportation Plan is December 31, 2013.

**COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT PROCESS:**
The Planning Commission has held two worksessions on the Code amendments, the City Council will hold one on May 6, 2013. The draft amendments were posted on the project website on April 3, 2013. On April 10, 2013, the City mailed a notification of the upcoming hearings, with a link to the project website, to every property in the city. The full record for this application is included in Attachment E.

**ATTACHMENTS**

A. Draft TSP-related Development Code amendments (strikeout)
B. Draft TSP-related Development Code amendments (clean)
C. Commentary on proposed Code amendments
D. Findings of Compliance with the Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP) and Transportation Planning Rule (TPR)
E. Casefile #LP13.04 Index of Complete Record
CONCLUSIONARY FINDINGS

Section 4.032. Authority of the Planning Commission.

(.01) As specified in Chapter 2 of the Wilsonville Code, the Planning Commission sits as an advisory body, making recommendations to the City Council on a variety of land use and transportation policy issues. The Commission also serves as the City’s official Committee for Citizen Involvement and shall have the authority to review and make recommendations on the following types of applications or procedures:

B. Legislative changes to, or adoption of new elements or sub-elements of, the Comprehensive Plan;

Response: The Planning Commission is the appropriate review body to provide the City Council with a recommendation on this package of amendments. This criterion is met.

Section 4.033. Authority of City Council.

(.01) Upon appeal, the City Council shall have final authority to act on all applications filed pursuant to Chapter 4 of the Wilsonville Code, with the exception of applications for expedited land divisions, as specified in Section 4.232. Additionally, the Council shall have final authority to interpret and enforce the procedures and standards set forth in this Chapter and shall have final decision-making authority on the following:

B. Applications for amendments to, or adoption of new elements or sub-elements to, the maps or text of the Comprehensive Plan, as authorized in Section 4.198.

E. Consideration of the recommendations of the Planning Commission.

Response: The City Council will receive a recommendation from the Planning Commission on the Code amendments. The City Council is the final local authority regarding adoption of amendments to the Code, which will be adopted via Ordinance. These criteria are met.

(.02) When a decision or approval of the Council is required, the Planning Director shall schedule a public hearing pursuant to Section 4.013. At the public hearing the staff shall review the report of the Planning Commission or Development Review Board and provide other pertinent information, and interested persons shall be given the opportunity to present testimony and information relevant to the proposal and make final arguments why the matter shall not be approved and, if approved, the nature of the provisions to be contained in approving action.

(.03) To the extent that a finding of fact is required, the Council shall make a finding for each of the criteria applicable and in doing so may sustain or reverse a finding of the Planning Commission or Development Review Board. The Council may delete, add or modify any of the provisions pertaining to the proposal or attach certain development or use conditions beyond those warranted for compliance with standards in granting an approval if the Council determines the conditions are appropriate to fulfill the criteria for approval.

Response: Following public hearings before the Planning Commission, the Planning Director
will schedule additional public hearings before the City Council at which time the Council can review the findings provided by the Planning Commission. **At conclusion of the public hearing process, these criteria will be satisfied.**

Section 4.197. **Zone Changes and Amendments To This Code – Procedures.**

(.01) The following procedure shall be followed in applying for an amendment to the text of this Chapter:

A. The Planning Commission shall conduct a public hearing on the proposed amendment at its earliest practicable meeting after it is proposed and shall, within forty (40) days after concluding the hearing, provide a report and recommendation to the City Council regarding the proposed amendment. The findings and recommendations of the Commission shall be adopted by resolution and shall be signed by the Chair of the Commission.

The timing of the Planning Commission hearing on the proposal is coordinated with the public hearings on the draft TSP. Following public hearings before the Planning Commission, the Planning Director will schedule additional public hearings before the City Council at which time the Council can review the findings provided by the Planning Commission. **At conclusion of the public hearing process, this criterion will be satisfied.**

B. In recommending approval of a proposed text amendment, the Planning Commission shall, at a minimum, adopt findings relative to the following:

1. That the application was submitted in compliance with the procedures set forth in Section 4.008;

Section 4.008 references application procedures in Sections 4.008 through 4.024. Most of the procedures apply to development applications, but the following procedures apply to this application:

- **Section 4.009. Who May Initiate Applications.**
  (.02) Applications involving large areas of the community or proposed amendments to the text of this Chapter or the Comprehensive Plan may be initiated by any property owner, business proprietor, or resident of the City, as well as by the City Council, Planning Commission, or Development Review Board acting by motion.

  (.04) In the event that the City of Wilsonville is the applicant, the City Manager may authorize any City employee or consultant to act as the City’s agent.

The Planning Commission discussed the proposed amendments during two work sessions in 2013, and gave staff the direction to present the proposal at a public hearing. The Planning Director initiated the application for the proposed amendments on April 2, 2013. **This criterion has been met.**

(.01) Published Notice. The Planning Director shall have published in a newspaper of general circulation in the City of Wilsonville, prior to the date of the Planning Commission or Development Review Board meeting, a notice that the Commission or the Board will consider proposals, documents, or pending applications.

A. If the matter will require a public hearing, the notice shall be published at least ten (10) and not more than twenty-one (21) days before the first hearing.

B. The publication shall contain a brief description of the subject property, including either the street address or other common description of the site, and including the approximate geographic location such as a reference to nearby cross streets, the time and place that the City’s decision-making body will consider the submitted documents, and the nature of the proposal, as well as other matters required by law. Failure to advertise as specified in this Section shall not invalidate any decisions or proceedings of the City if a good faith attempt was made to comply with the notice requirements of this Code.

(.03) Mailed Notice for Legislative Hearings. Where applicable, the Planning Director shall have notices of legislative hearings mailed to individual property owners as specified in State law.

The City published a notice in the Wilsonville Spokesman on April 24, 2013. The notice described the proposal and included language required by ORS 227.186 regarding possible impacts to private property. This criterion has been met.

2. The amendment substantially complies with all applicable goals, policies and objectives set forth in the Comprehensive Plan;

GOAL 1.1 To encourage and provide means for interested parties to be involved in land use planning processes, on individual cases and City-wide programs and policies.

Policy 1.1.1 The City of Wilsonville shall provide opportunities for a wide range of public involvement in City planning programs and processes.

Response: The proposed amendments are necessary to implement the policies that are included in the proposed Transportation System Plan. During the course of the TSP update project, two public open houses and an on-line open house were held. The Planning Commission discussed the proposed amendments at two televised work sessions; the City Council discussed the proposed amendments at one work session. Interested parties also had the
opportunity to view the draft proposal and provide feedback via a City-hosted project web page.

During 2012 and 2013, the City Council and Planning Commission conducted numerous work sessions on the strategies, policies, and outcomes contained in the updated TSP. These work sessions were open to the public.

The City mailed a notice of the public hearing on this proposal to all property owners in the City, as well as to agencies and interested individuals. The above criteria are supported by the Planning Commission process.

**Implementation Measure 1.1.1.a** Provide for early public involvement to address neighborhood or community concerns regarding Comprehensive Plan and Development Code changes. Whenever practical to do so, City staff will provide information for public review while it is still in “draft” form, thereby allowing for community involvement before decisions have been made.

**Response:** The Planning Commission practice is to conduct a minimum of one work session per legislation agenda item allowing for early involvement into the concepts being proposed. This item has had two work sessions, and was posted on the City website for public review on April 3, 2013.

The proposed amendments are necessary to implement the proposed TSP policies, which were discussed at numerous Planning Commission and City Council meetings, and shared via an on-line open house. This criterion is met.

**GOAL 1.2: For Wilsonville to have an interested, informed, and involved citizenry.**

**Policy 1.2.1** The City of Wilsonville shall provide user-friendly information to assist the public in participating in City planning programs and processes.

**Response:** The City has mailed a public notice to each property in the City, held televised work sessions, posted the draft proposal and Planning Commission meeting minutes on the City website. Since the hearing notice was mailed, approximately fifteen individuals have contacted Planning staff with questions about the proposal and staff has provided further information. The City has informed and encouraged the participation of a wide variety of individuals. This criterion is met.

**GOAL 3.1: To assure that good quality public facilities and services are available with adequate, but not excessive, capacity to meet community needs, while also assuring that growth does not exceed the community’s commitment to provide adequate facilities and services.**
Policy 3.1.1 The City of Wilsonville shall provide public facilities to enhance the health, safety, educational, and recreational aspects of urban living.

Response: The proposed amendments provide further detail on how development applications will be required to contribute to the transportation network and provide on-site access for all modes of transportation. Specifically, the proposal includes requirements for provision of pedestrian access through very large parking lots, bicycle parking, and parking lot access points that are designed for not only vehicular access but also bicycle and pedestrian movements. The proposed amendments also include new thresholds for triggering development to contribute to the improvements of transit improvements in the public right-of-way. The proposal supports the above criteria.

Goal 3.2 To encourage and support the availability of a variety of transportation choices for moving people that balance vehicular use with other transportation modes, including walking, bicycling and transit in order to avoid principal reliance upon any one mode of transportation

Response: The proposed amendments are needed to implement the updated TSP, which describes a multi-modal system. Supplementing this Comprehensive Plan goal, the 2013 TSP has seven goals that further define an ideal transportation system as one that is safe, connected and accessible, functional and reliable, cost effective, compatible, robust, as well as one that promotes livability (TSP Chapter 2). The existing Development Code includes many standards related to how development must contribute to the creation of a multi-modal transportation system. The proposed Code amendments add greater detail to this set of policies, with new triggers for transit improvements, more specificity regarding bike rack requirements, and new requirements for designing bicycle and pedestrian access through large parking lot sites. The overall purpose of the amendments is to ensure that development applications provide appropriate infrastructure to support multiple modes of access to each site and within large sites. This criterion is met.

3. The amendment does not materially conflict with, nor endanger, other provisions of the text of the Code; and

Response: The proposed amendments make modifications to existing policies and add new policies, but generally follow the existing Code’s overall policy of requiring multimodal transportation concurrency. The proposal eliminates outdated placeholder sections that have been in the Code since approximately 2003. It also reorganizes existing policies related to on-site pedestrian access, so the requirements for transportation improvements are
clearly defined for on-site and off-site locations. The proposed amendments do not conflict or endanger sections of the Code that are not proposed to modified.

This criterion is met.

4. If applicable, the amendment is necessary to insure that the City's Land Use and Development Ordinance complies with mandated requirements of State or Federal laws and/or statutes.

Response: Applicable state and regional requirements are addressed below and in Attachment D.

OREGON TRANSPORTATION PLAN

The Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP) is the state’s long-range multimodal transportation plan. The OTP is the overarching policy document among a series of plans that together form the state transportation system plan (TSP). An IAMP must be consistent with applicable OTP goals and policies. Findings of compatibility will be part of the basis for IAMP approval. The most pertinent OTP goals and policies for interchange planning are as follows:

POLICY 1.2 – Equity, Efficiency and Travel Choices
It is the policy of the State of Oregon to promote a transportation system with multiple travel choices that are easy to use, reliable, cost-effective and accessible to all potential users, including the transportation disadvantaged.

Response: The proposed code amendments implement the updated TSP and this OTP policy by such as establishing clear zones for unobstructed travel on sidewalks, strengthening access to and amenities at transit facilities, and expanding bicycle parking requirements to address long-term parking.

POLICY 4.1 - Environmentally Responsible Transportation System
It is the policy of the State of Oregon to provide a transportation system that is environmentally responsible and encourages conservation and protection of natural resources.

Response: The Wilsonville Development Code contains specific review criteria for uses within natural resource areas to ensure that identified natural resources are appropriately considered when development is proposed. The Significant Resource Overlay Zone (SROZ) Ordinance implements “the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan relating to natural resources, open space, environment, flood hazard, and the Willamette River Greenway” and is intended to “achieve compliance with the requirements of the Metro Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (UGMFP) relating to Title 3 Water Quality Resource Areas, and Title 13 Habitat Conservation Areas, and that portion of Statewide Planning Goal 5 relating to significant natural resources (Section 4.139.00).” Transportation improvements are not prohibited in the SROZ, but would need to comply with the SROZ requirements and be constructed so as to “minimize and repair disturbance to existing vegetation and slope stability (Section 4.139.04).”

The majority of the proposed amendments are related to improving non-motorized access, connectivity, or safety. These improvements should encourage non-motorized modes of
transportation and transit usage, thereby reducing pollution and negative impact to the environment. Development Code amendments that are proposed to implement the TSP update and comply with the Regional Transportation Function Plan (RTFP) include provisions to establish unobstructed paths on sidewalks, require more closely spaced pedestrian and bicycle access ways, support crossings in the vicinity of transit stops, and establish requirements for long-term bicycle parking. These amendments reinforce the pedestrian, bicycle, and transit improvements that are recommended in the 2013 TSP. The proposal is consistent with Policy 4.1.

**POLICY 7.1 – A Coordinated Transportation System**

*It is the policy of the State of Oregon to work collaboratively with other jurisdictions and agencies with the objective of removing barriers so the transportation system can function as one system.*

**Response:** Among others, Staff from Metro, Clackamas County, Washington County, City of Tualatin, City of Sherwood, and ODOT were involved in the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) for the TSP update. The updated TSP as well as these associated Code amendments have been reviewed by TAC members to ensure consistency between jurisdictions and other regional and locally adopted plans and regulations. The proposal is consistent with Policy 7.1.

**OREGON HIGHWAY PLAN**

The 1999 Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) establishes policies and investment strategies for Oregon’s state highway system over a 20-year period and refines the goals and policies found in the OTP. Policies in the OHP emphasize the efficient management of the highway system to increase safety and to extend highway capacity, partnerships with other agencies and local governments, and the use of new techniques to improve road safety and capacity. These policies also link land use and transportation, set standards for highway performance and access management, and emphasize the relationship between state highways and local road, bicycle, pedestrian, transit, rail, and air systems. The policies applicable to the proposed amendments are described below.

*Policy 1B (Land Use and Transportation) is designed to clarify how ODOT will work with local governments and others to link land use and transportation in transportation plans, facility and corridor plans, plan amendments, access permitting and project development.*

**Response:** Coordination between City and ODOT staff in developing the TSP update occurred through the project administration and Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) process. ODOT input was received on the technical memoranda that became the basis of the TSP and at various TAC meetings and public forums.

Wilsonville Development Code provisions related to notification of land use actions and traffic impact study requirements also provide the City a tool to facilitate intra-jurisdictional coordination and ensure consistency between land use actions and the planned transportation system. Traffic impact studies are required for a land use and development applications to demonstrate that level of service standards can be met, unless the traffic study requirement is waived by the Community Development Director (Development Code Section 4.008.02.E).
Proposed amendments to Development Code Section 4.012, Public Hearing Notices, includes noticing governmental agencies potentially impacted by a local decision, including agencies with roadway authority. The proposal is consistent with Policy 1B.

**OAR 660 DIVISION 12 TRANSPORTATION PLANNING RULE (TPR)**

The Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) implements Statewide Planning Goal 12 (Transportation). The purpose of the TPR is to “direct transportation planning in coordination with land use planning” to ensure that planned land uses are supported by and consistent with planned transportation facilities and improvements. The TPR’s purpose statement includes promoting the development of transportation systems that serve the mobility needs of the transportation disadvantaged, provide a variety of transportation choices, and provide safe and convenient access and circulation for vehicles, transit, pedestrians and bicycles. The TPR also directs jurisdictions to “provide for the construction and implementation of transportation facilities, improvements and services necessary to support acknowledged comprehensive plans” and that there is “coordination among affected local governments and transportation service providers and consistency between state, regional and local transportation plans.”

*Section 660-012-0060 – Plan and Land Use Regulation Amendments*

**Response:** Proposed amendments to Development Code Section 4.197, Zone Changes and Amendments To This Code – Procedures, will require findings of compliance with applicable Statewide Land Use Planning Goals and related administrative rules, including TPR Section -0060. The City currently requires traffic impact analyses, the tool that will help determine whether or not the transportation system is “significantly affected” pursuant to the TPR (Section 4.008.02.E). The proposed procedures amendment will ensure that TPR Section -0060 is also considered as part of proposed zone changes or code amendments if applicable. The proposed TSP and associated code amendments are consistent with TPR Section -0060.

**REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN**

*The Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP) directs how local jurisdictions should implement the RTP through the TSP and other land use regulations. The RTFP codifies existing and new requirements which local plans must comply with to be consistent with the RTP. If Code policies are consistent with the RTFP, Metro will find them to be consistent with the RTP.*

**Response:** A checklist of RTFP requirements and findings of compliance with these requirements is provided in Attachment D. The checklist addresses the ways that both the TSP document and existing or proposed Development Code provisions comply with RTFP requirements.

**GENERAL CONCLUSIONARY SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

- The proposed amendments are consistent with the Wilsonville Development Code.
- The proposed amendments are consistent with the Regional Transportation Functional Planning Commission - May 8, 2013 LP13-0004 TSP-related Code Amendments Page 13 of 71
Plan.

- The proposed amendments are consistent with the Wilsonville Comprehensive Plan goals and policies.
- Adoption of the 2013 TSP includes modification of existing Comprehensive Plan policies to be consistent with the goals and policies in the updated TSP, and the proposed amendments are needed to implement those revised policies.

As is evidenced by the staff report and findings contained herein, the proposal to amend the City’s Development Code to implement the revised TSP is consistent with all applicable criteria.
Proposed Amendments to the Wilsonville Development Code
Related to the 2013 Transportation System Plan

Section 4.001 Definitions.

4. Access Control Strip Restriction: A type of access restriction that involves establishing a reserve area established adjacent to and paralleling a half street improvement, or across the end of a street that is to be extended in the future, to ensure proper participation by adjoining properties in completion of the required street improvements. See Street, Half.

[New number/renumbering needed.] 32. Bikeway: Bikeway is a general term used to describe any type of transportation facility that is designated for use by bicycles in conformance with City standards. Bikeways may or may not be within a public right-of-way and include the following:
   A. Bike Lane: A bike lane facility is a type of bikeway where a section of the roadway is designated for exclusive bicycle use.
   B. Bike/Pedestrian Path: A bike/pedestrian path facility is a type of bikeway that is entirely separate from the roadway and is designed and constructed to allow for safe use by both pedestrians and bicyclists.
   BC. Recreational Trail: A recreation trail is a type of pedestrian, bicycle, or equestrian facility that is entirely separate from roadways and has unimproved, gravel, or bark dust surface.
   CD. Shared Roadway: A shared roadway facility is a type of bikeway where motorists and cyclists occupy the same roadway area.
   DE. Shoulder Bikeway: A shoulder bikeway facility is a type of bikeway where cyclists occupy the paved roadway shoulder. Shoulder bikeways are common in rural areas.
   E. Cycle Track: A cycle track is a bike lane with a physical barrier between the bike and motor vehicle travel lanes, such as a curb or parking lanes. Cycle tracks must “rejoin” the motor vehicle travel lanes at signalized intersections. Cycle tracks may require a two stage left turn for bicyclists.
   F. See also Multipurpose pathway or path.

[New number/renumbering needed.] Driveway Approach: A driveway connection to a public street or highway where it meets a public right-of-way.

[New number/renumbering needed.] Major transit stop: Transit stops that are located where two or more existing or planned routes intersect or where there are existing or planned transfer locations between transit systems, Park & Ride lots, and shopping centers and other major destinations.

[New number/renumbering needed.] Major transit street: A primary corridor for transit, receiving half-hour or better service during peak traffic hours. Typically, these streets are also arterials or major collectors.
Multiuse pathway or path: A path that is separate from the roadway either in the roadway right-of-way or in an independent right-of-way. It is designed and constructed to allow for safe walking, biking, and other human-powered travel modes.

Through zone: The width of unobstructed space on a sidewalk or pedestrian pathway.

**Section 4.005 Exclusions from Development Permit Requirement.**

(05) Except as otherwise required by Sections 4.184 and 4.500 to 4.510, the establishment, construction or termination of an authorized public facility that serves development, including such facilities as a private or public street, transportation facilities within the public right-of-way, sewer, water line, electrical power or gas distribution line, or telephone or television cable system, provided said construction complies with applicable Public Works Standards. This exemption is not intended to apply to buildings used by utility providers.

**Section 4.012. Public Hearing Notices.**

(01) Published Notice. […]

(02) Mailed Notice for Quasi-Judicial Hearings.

A. For development projects involving Class II Administrative Reviews, or quasijudicial public hearings, the Planning Director shall ensure the following:

1. Public hearing notices shall be mailed to the owners of real property located within 250 feet of the site of the proposed development. The Planning Director shall use the property ownership lists of the County Assessor in determining the recipients of the notices.

2. Notice shall be sent to any governmental agency that is entitled to notice under an intergovernmental agreement entered into with the City and any other affected roadway authority. The failure of another agency to respond with written comments on a pending application shall not invalidate an action or permit approval made by the City under this Code.

B. Notices shall be mailed not less than twenty (20) days nor more than forty (40) days prior to the initial public hearing date. Except, however, in cases where the development proposal will require public hearings before both the City Council and Development Review Board, in which case the notices shall be mailed at least ten (10) days before the initial public hearing.

C. In any case where State law requires different timing or form of notice than that specified in this Code, the standard requiring a broader coverage or duration of notice shall be followed.

D. The City will make a good faith effort to contact property owners whose names do not appear on County ownership records and to contact others who have asked to be contacted for different types of applications.
(03) Mailed Notice for Legislative Hearings. Where applicable, the Planning Director shall have notices of legislative hearings mailed to individual property owners as specified in State law.

Section 4.118. Standards applying to all Planned Development Zones:

(03) Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 4.140 to the contrary, the Development Review Board, in order to implement the purposes and objectives of Section 4.140, and based on findings of fact supported by the record may:

A. Waive the following typical development standards:
   1. minimum lot area;
   2. lot width and frontage;
   3. height and yard requirements;
   4. lot coverage;
   5. lot depth;
   6. street widths;
   7. sidewalk requirements;
   8. height of buildings other than signs;
   9. parking space configuration and drive aisle design;
   10. minimum number of parking or loading spaces;
   11. shade tree islands in parking lots, provided that alternative shading is provided;
   12. fence height;
   13. architectural design standards;
   14. transit facilities;
   15. on-site pedestrian access and circulation standards; and
   16. solar access standards, as provided in Section 4.137.

Section 4.125(.09) Street and Access Improvement Standards- V-Village Zone

(09) Street and Access Improvement Standards

A. Except as noted below, the provisions of Section 4.177 shall apply within the Village zone:

   […]

2. Intersections of streets:

   c. Offsets: Opposing intersections shall be designed so that no offset dangerous to the traveling public is created. Intersections shall be separated by at least:
      i. 1000 ft. for major arterials

NOTE: Completion of Section 4.154 has been postponed pending the completion of the Transportation Systems Plan.

(.01) On-site Pedestrian Access and Circulation

A. The purpose of this section is to implement the pedestrian access and connectivity policies of the Transportation System Plan. It is intended to provide for safe, reasonably direct, and convenient pedestrian access and circulation.

B. Standards. Development shall conform to all of the following standards:

1. Continuous Pathway System. A pedestrian pathway system shall extend throughout the development site and connect to adjacent sidewalks, and to all future phases of the development, as applicable.

2. Safe, Direct, and Convenient. Pathways within developments shall provide safe, reasonably direct, and convenient connections between primary building entrances and all adjacent parking areas, recreational areas/playgrounds, and public rights-of-way based on all of the following criteria:
   a. Pedestrian pathways are designed primarily for pedestrian safety and convenience, meaning they are free from hazards and provide a reasonably smooth and consistent surface.
   b. The pathway is reasonably direct. A pathway is reasonably direct when it follows a route between destinations that does not involve a significant amount of unnecessary out-of-direction travel.
   c. The pathway connects to all primary building entrances and is consistent with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements.
   d. All parking lots larger than three acres in size shall provide an internal bicycle and pedestrian pathway pursuant to Section 4.155.03.B.3.d.

3. Vehicle/Pathway Separation.
   Except as required for crosswalks, per subsection 4, below, where a pathway abuts a driveway or street it shall be vertically or horizontally separated from the vehicular lane. For example, a pathway may be vertically raised six inches above the abutting travel lane, or horizontally separated by a row of bollards.

4. Crosswalks. Where a pathway crosses a parking area or driveway, it shall be clearly marked with contrasting paint or paving materials (e.g., pavers, light-color concrete inlay between asphalt, or similar contrast).

5. Pathway Width and Surface. Primary pathways shall be constructed of concrete, asphalt, brick/masonry pavers, or other durable surface, and not less than five (5) feet wide. Secondary pathways and pedestrian trails may have an alternative surface except as otherwise required by the ADA.
6. All pathways shall be clearly marked with appropriate standard signs.

Section 4.155. General Regulations - Parking, Loading and Bicycle Parking.

(.01) Purpose:

(.02) General Provisions:

A. The provision and maintenance of off-street parking spaces is a continuing obligation of the property owner. The standards set forth herein shall be considered by the Development Review Board as minimum criteria.

1. The Board shall have the authority to grant variances or planned development waivers to these standards in keeping with the purposes and objectives set forth in the Comprehensive Plan and this Code.

2. Waivers to the parking, loading, or bicycle parking standards shall only be issued upon a findings that the resulting development will have no significant adverse impact on the surrounding neighborhood, and the community, and that the development considered as a whole meets the purposes of this section.

(.03) Minimum and Maximum Off-Street Parking Requirements:

A. Parking and loading or delivery areas shall be designed with access and maneuvering area adequate to serve the functional needs of the site and shall:

1. Separate loading and delivery areas and circulation from customer and/or employee parking and pedestrian areas. Circulation patterns shall be clearly marked.

2. To the greatest extent possible, separate vehicle and pedestrian traffic.

B. Parking and loading or delivery areas shall be landscaped to minimize the visual dominance of the parking or loading area, as follows:

3. Due to their large amount of impervious surface, new development with parking areas of more than two hundred (200) spaces that are located in any zone, and that may be viewed from the public right of way, shall be landscaped to the following additional standards:

   a. One (1) tree shall be planted per six (6) parking spaces or fraction thereof. At least twenty-five percent (25%) of the required trees must be planted in the interior of the parking area.

   b. Required trees may be planted within the parking area or the perimeter, provided that a minimum of forty percent (40%) of the canopy dripline of mature perimeter trees can be expected to shade or overlap the parking area. Shading shall be determined based on shadows cast on the summer solstice.

   c. All parking lots in excess of two hundred (200) parking spaces shall provide an internal pedestrian walkway for every six (6) parking aisles. Minimum walkway clearance shall be at least five (5) feet in width. Walkways shall be designed to provide pedestrian access to parking areas in order to minimize pedestrian travel among vehicles. Walkways shall be designed to channel pedestrians to the front entrance of the building.
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d. Parking lots more than three acres in size shall provide street-like features along principal drive isles, including curbs, sidewalks, street trees or planting strips, and bicycle routes.

d. e. All parking lots viewed from the public right of way shall have a minimum twelve (12) foot landscaped buffer...

e. f. Where topography and slope condition permit, the landscape buffer shall integrate parking lot storm water treatment [...]

f. g. In addition to the application requirements of section 4.035(.04)(6)(d), [...]

C. 4. Off Street Parking shall be designed for safe and convenient access that meets ADA and ODOT standards.

D. 5. Where possible, parking areas shall be designed to connect with parking areas on adjacent sites so as to eliminate the necessity for any mode of travel to utilize the public street for multiple accesses or cross movements. In addition, on-site parking shall be designed for efficient on-site circulation and parking.

E. 6. In all multi-family dwelling developments, there shall be sufficient areas established to provide for parking and storage of motorcycles, mopeds and bicycles. Such areas shall be clearly defined and reserved for the exclusive use of these vehicles.

F. 7. On-street parking spaces, directly adjoining the frontage of and on the same side of the street as the subject property, may be counted towards meeting the minimum off street parking standards.

G. 8. Tables 5, below, shall be used to determine the minimum and maximum parking standards for various land uses. The minimum number of required parking spaces shown on Tables 5 shall be determined by rounding to the nearest whole parking space. For example, a use containing 500 square feet, in an area where the standard is one space for each 400 square feet of floor area, is required to provide one off-street parking space. If the same use contained more than 600 square feet, a second parking space would be required. [Amended by Ordinance No. 538, 2/21/02.] Structured parking and on-street parking are exempted from the parking maximums in Table 5.

H. Electrical Vehicle Charging Stations:

1. Parking spaces designed to accommodate and provide one or more electric vehicle charging stations on site may be counted towards meeting the minimum off-street parking standards.

2. Modification of existing parking spaces to accommodate electric vehicle charging stations on site is allowed outright.

I. Motorcycle parking:

1. Motorcycle parking may substitute for up to 5 spaces or 5 percent of required automobile parking, whichever is less. For every 4 motorcycle parking spaces provided, the automobile parking requirement is reduced by one space.

2. Each motorcycle space must be at least 4 feet wide and 8 feet deep. Existing parking may be converted to take advantage of this provision.

(.04) Bicycle Parking:

A. Required Bicycle Parking - General Provisions

1. The required minimum number of bicycle parking spaces for each use category is shown in Table 5, Parking Standards, below.

2. A minimum of 50% of the bicycle parking spaces shall be provided as long-term bicycle parking in any of the following situations:
   a. When 10% or more of automobile vehicle parking is covered.
b. If more than four (4) bicycle parking spaces are required.
c. Multifamily residential development with nine or more units.

3. Bicycle parking spaces are not required for accessory buildings. If a primary use is listed in Table 5, bicycle parking is not required for the accessory use.

4. When there are two or more primary uses on a site, the required bicycle parking for the site is the sum of the required bicycle parking for the individual primary uses.

B. Short-term Bicycle Parking
   1. Short-term bicycle parking encourages shoppers, customers, and other visitors to use bicycles by providing a convenient and readily accessible place to park bicycles.
   2. Required short-term bicycle parking shall meet the following standards:
      a. Provide lockers or racks that meet the standards of this section.
      b. Locate within 30 feet of the main entrance to the building or inside a building, in a location that is easily accessible for bicycles.
      c. If 10 or more spaces are required, then at least 50 percent of these shall be covered.
      d. Each space must be at least 2 feet by 6 feet in area and be accessible without moving another bicycle and must provide enough space between the rack and a building or other obstructions to use the rack properly.
      e. There must be an aisle at least 5 feet wide behind all required bicycle parking to allow room for bicycle maneuvering. Where the bicycle parking is adjacent to a sidewalk, the maneuvering area may extend into the right-of-way.

C. Long-term Bicycle Parking
   1. Long-term bicycle parking provides employees, students, residents, commuters, and others who generally stay at a site for several hours a weather-protected place to park bicycles.
   2. Required long-term bicycle parking shall meet the following standards:
      a. Provide racks, storage rooms, or lockers in areas that are secure or monitored (e.g., visible to employees or monitored by security guards).
      b. Locate the space within 100 feet of the entrance that will be used by the intended users.
      c. At least 50 percent of the spaces shall be covered.
   3. Bicycle Lockers, Racks and Cover (Weather Protection):
      a. Where required bicycle parking is provided in lockers, the lockers shall be securely anchored.
      b. Covered bicycle parking, as required by this section, shall be provided inside buildings, under roof overhangs or awnings, in bicycle lockers, or within or under other structures. Where required covered bicycle parking is not within a building or locker, the cover must be permanent and designed to protect the bicycle from rainfall and provide seven (7) foot minimum overhead clearance.
Note: In considering proposed waivers to the following standards, the City will consider the potential uses of the site and not just the uses that are currently proposed. For waivers to exceed the maximum standards, applicants shall bear the burden of proving that Metro, State, and federal clean air standards will not be violated.

### TABLE 5: PARKING STANDARDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE</th>
<th>PARKING MINIMUMS</th>
<th>PARKING MAXIMUMS</th>
<th>BICYCLE MINIMUMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Single and attached units and any apartments (9 or fewer units)</td>
<td>1 per D.U., except accessory dwelling units, which have no minimum.</td>
<td>No Limit</td>
<td>0 Apartments – Min. of 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>[...]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(.045) Minimum Off-Street Loading Requirements:
   A. […]
   B. Exceptions and Adjustments.
      1. The Planning Director or Development Review Board may approve a loading area
         adjacent to or within a street right-of-way where it finds that loading and
         unloading operations:
         a. Are short in duration (i.e., less than one hour);
         b. Are infrequent (less than three operations daily);
         c. Do not obstruct traffic during peak traffic hours;
         d. Do not interfere with emergency response services or bicycle and pedestrian
            facilities; and
         e. Are acceptable to the applicable roadway authority.

(.06) Carpool and Vanpool Parking Requirements:
   A. Carpool and vanpool parking spaces shall be identified for the following uses:
      1. New commercial and industrial developments with seventy-five (75) or more
         parking spaces,
      2. New institutional or public assembly uses, and
      3. Transit park-and-ride facilities with fifty (50) or more parking spaces.
   B. Of the total spaces available for employee, student, and commuter parking, at least
      five percent, but not fewer than two, shall be designated for exclusive carpool and
      vanpool parking.
   BC. Carpool and vanpool parking spaces shall be located closer to the main employee,
      student or commuter entrance than all other parking spaces with the exception of
      ADA parking spaces.
   CD. Required carpool/vanpool spaces shall be clearly marked "Reserved -
      Carpool/Vanpool Only."

(.07) Parking Area Redevelopment:
   The number of parking spaces may be reduced by up to 10% of the minimum required
   parking spaces for that use when a portion of the existing parking area is modified to
   accommodate or provide transit-related amenities such as transit stops, pull-outs, shelters,
   and park and ride stations.

Section 4.177. Street Improvement Standards.
Note: This section is expected to be revised after the completion of the Transportation Systems
Plan.

This section contains the City’s requirements and standards for pedestrian, bicycle, and transit
facility improvements to public streets, or within public easements. The purpose of this section is
to ensure that development, including redevelopment, provides transportation facilities that are
safe, convenient, and adequate in rough proportion to their impacts.

(.01) Except as specifically approved by the Development Review Board, all street and
access improvements shall conform to the Transportation Systems Plan and the
Public Works Standards, together with the following standards: [Amended by Ord.
682, 9/9/10] Development and related public facility improvements shall comply with
the standards in this section, the Wilsonville Public Works Standards, and the
Transportation System Plan, in rough proportion to the potential impacts of the
development. Such improvements shall be provided at the time of development except as waived by the City Engineer for reasons of safety or traffic operations.

(02) Street Design Standards
A. All street improvements and intersections shall conform to the Public Works Standards and shall provide for the continuation of streets through specific developments to adjoining properties or subdivisions.
   1. Development shall be required to provide existing or future connections to adjacent sites through the use of access easements where applicable. Such easements shall be required in addition to required public street dedications as required in Section 4.236(.04).
B. The City Engineer shall make the final determination regarding right-of-way and street element widths using the ranges provided in Chapter 3 of the Transportation System Plan and the additional street design standards in the Public Works Standards. All streets shall be developed with curbs, utility strips and sidewalks on both sides; or a sidewalk on one side and a bike path on the other side.
   1. Within a Planned Development the Development Review Board may approve a sidewalk on only one side. If the sidewalk is permitted on just one side of the street, the owners will be required to sign an agreement to an assessment in the future to construct the other sidewalk if the City Council decides it is necessary.
C. Rights-of-way.
   1. Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy Building permits or as a part of the recordation of a final plat, the City shall require dedication of rights-of-way in accordance with the Street System Master Transportation Systems Plan. All dedications shall be recorded with the County Assessor's Office.
   2. The City shall also require a waiver of remonstrance against formation of a local improvement district, and all non-remonstrances shall be recorded in the County Recorder’s Office as well as the City's Lien Docket, prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy Building Permit or as a part of the recordation of a final plat.
   3. In order to allow for potential future widening, a special setback requirement shall be maintained adjacent to all arterial streets. The minimum setback shall be 55 feet from the centerline or 25 feet from the right-of-way designated on the Master Plan, whichever is greater.
D. Dead-end Streets. New dead-end streets or cul-de-sacs shall not exceed 200 feet in length, unless the adjoining land contains barriers such as existing buildings, railroads or freeways, or environmental constraints such as steep slopes, or major streams or rivers, that prevent future street extension and connection. A central landscaped island with rainwater management and infiltration are encouraged in cul-de-sac design. No more than 25 dwelling units shall take access to a new dead-end or cul-de-sac street unless it is determined that the traffic impacts on adjacent streets will not exceed those from a development of 25 or fewer units. All other dimensional standards of dead-end streets shall be governed by the Public Works Standards. Notification that the street is planned for future extension shall be posted on the dead-end street. [Amended by Ord. # 674 11/16/09]
E. Access drives and travel lanes.
1. An access drive to any proposed development shall be designed to provide a clear travel lane free from any obstructions.

2. Access drive travel lanes shall be constructed with a hard surface capable of carrying a 23-ton load.

3. Secondary or emergency access lanes may be improved to a minimum 12 feet with an all-weather surface as approved by the Fire District. All fire lanes shall be dedicated easements.

4. Minimum access requirements shall be adjusted commensurate with the intended function of the site based on vehicle types and traffic generation.

5. Where access drives connect to the public right-of-way, construction within the right-of-way shall be in conformance to the Public Works Standards.

FE. Corner or clear vision area.

1. A clear vision area which meets the Public Works Standards shall be maintained on each corner of property at the intersection of any two streets, a street and a railroad or a street and a driveway. However, the following items shall be exempt from meeting this requirement:
   a. Light and utility poles with a diameter less than 12 inches.
   b. Trees less than 6” d.b.h., approved as a part of the Stage II Site Design, or administrative review.
   c. Except as allowed by b., above, an existing tree, trimmed to the trunk, 10 feet above the curb.
   d. Official warning or street sign.
   e. Natural contours where the natural elevations are such that there can be no cross-visibility at the intersection and necessary excavation would result in an unreasonable hardship on the property owner or deteriorate the quality of the site.

GF. Vertical clearance - a minimum clearance of 12 feet above the pavement surface shall be maintained over all streets and access drives.

HG. Interim improvement standard. It is anticipated that all existing streets, except those in new subdivisions, will require complete reconstruction to support urban level traffic volumes. However, in most cases, existing and short-term projected traffic volumes do not warrant improvements to full Master Plan standards. Therefore, unless otherwise specified by the Development Review Board or Planning Commission, the following interim standards shall apply.

1. Arterials - 24 foot paved, with standard sub-base. Asphalt overlays are generally considered unacceptable, but may be considered as an interim improvement based on the recommendations of the City Engineer, regarding adequate structural quality to support an overlay.

2. Half-streets are generally considered unacceptable. However, where the Development Review Board finds it essential to allow for reasonable development, a half-street may be approved. Whenever a half-street improvement is approved, it shall conform to the requirements in the Public Works Standards:

3. When considered appropriate in conjunction with other anticipated or scheduled street improvements, the City Engineer may approve street improvements with a single asphalt lift. However, adequate provision must be
made for interim storm drainage, pavement transitions at seams and the
scheduling of the second lift through the Capital Improvements Plan.

[Section 4.177(.01) amended by Ord. 610, 5/1/06]

(.03) Sidewalks. Sidewalks shall be provided on the public street frontage of all development.
Sidewalks shall generally be constructed within the dedicated public right-of-way, but
may be located outside of the right-of-way within a public easement with the approval of
the City Engineer.
A. Sidewalk widths shall include a minimum through zone of at least five feet. The
through zone may be reduced pursuant to variance procedures in Section 4.196, a
waiver pursuant to Section 4.118, or by authority of the City Engineer for reasons of
traffic operations, efficiency, or safety.
B. Within a Planned Development the Development Review Board may approve a
sidewalk on only one side. If the sidewalk is permitted on just one side of the street,
the owners will be required to sign an agreement to an assessment in the future to
construct the other sidewalk if the City Council decides it is necessary.

(.04) Bicycle Facilities. Bicycle facilities shall be provided to implement the Transportation
System Plan, and may include on-street and off-street bike lanes, shared lanes, bike
boulevards, and cycle tracks. The design of on-street bicycle facilities will vary according
to the functional classification and the average daily traffic of the facility.

(.05) Multiuse Pathways. Pathways may be in addition to, or in lieu of, a public street. Paths
that are in addition to a public street shall generally run parallel to that street, and shall be
designed in accordance with the Public Works Standards or as specified by the City
Engineer. Paths that are in lieu of a public street shall be considered in areas only where
no other public street connection options are feasible, and are subject to the following
standards.
A. Paths shall be located to provide a reasonably direct connection between likely
pedestrian and bicyclist destinations. Additional standards relating to entry points,
maximum length, visibility, and path lighting are provided in the Public Works
Standards.
B. To ensure ongoing access to and maintenance of pedestrian/bicycle paths, the City
Engineer will require dedication of the path to the public and acceptance of the path
by the City as public right-of-way; or creation of a public access easement over the
path.

(.06) Transit Improvements
A. Development on sites that are adjacent to or incorporate major transit streets shall
provide improvements as described in this section to any bus stop located along
the site’s frontage, unless waived by the City Engineer for reasons of safety or
traffic operations. Transit facilities include bus stops, shelters, and related
facilities. Required transit facility improvements may include the dedication of
land or the provision of a public easement.
B. Development shall at a minimum provide:
   1. Reasonably direct pedestrian connections, as defined by Section 4.154,
      between building entrances and the transit facility and between buildings on
      the site and streets adjoining transit stops.
2. Improvements at major transit stops. Improvements may include intersection or mid-block traffic management improvements to allow for pedestrian crossings at major transit stops.

C. Developments generating an average of 49 or more pm peak hour trips shall provide bus stop improvements per the Public Works Standards. Required improvements may include provision of benches, shelters, pedestrian lighting; or provision of an easement or dedication of land for transit facilities.

D. In addition to the requirements of 4.177.06.B.2, development generating more than 199 pm peak hour trips on major transit streets shall provide a bus pullout, curb extension, and intersection or mid-block traffic management improvements to allow for pedestrian crossings at major transit stops.

E. In addition to the requirements of 4.177.06.B. and C., development generating more than 500 pm peak-hour trips on major transit streets shall provide on-site circulation to accommodate transit service.

(.027) Residential Private Access Drives shall meet the following standards:

A. Residential Private Access Drives shall provide primary vehicular access to no more than four (4) dwelling units, excluding accessory dwelling units.

B. The design and construction of a Residential Private Access Drive shall ensure a useful lifespan and structural maintenance schedule comparable, as determined by the City Engineer or City’s Authorized Representative, to a local street constructed in conformance to current public works standards.

1. The design of residential private access drives shall be stamped by a professional engineer registered in the state of Oregon and shall be approved by the City Engineer or City’s Authorized Representative to ensure the above requirement is met.

2. Prior to issuing a certificate of occupancy for any residential dwelling unit whose primary vehicular access is from a Residential Private Access Drive the City Engineer or City’s Authorized Representative shall certify construction of the Residential Private Access Drive substantially conforms the design approved by the City Engineer or City’s Authorized Representative.

C. Residential Private Access Drives shall be named for addressing purposes. All Residential Private Access Drives shall use the suffix “Lane”, i.e. SW Oakview Lane.

D. Residential Private Access Drives shall meet or exceed the standards for access drives and travel lanes established in Subsection (.01) G. (.08) of this Section.

[Section 4.177(.02) added by Ord. 682, 9/1/10]

(.08) Access Drive and Driveway Approach Development Standards.

A. An access drive to any proposed development shall be designed to provide a clear travel lane free from any obstructions.

B. Access drive travel lanes shall be constructed with a hard surface capable of carrying a 23-ton load.

C. Where emergency vehicle access is required, approaches and driveways shall be designed and constructed to accommodate emergency vehicle apparatus and shall conform to applicable fire protection requirements. The City may restrict parking, require signage, or require other public safety improvements pursuant to the recommendations of an emergency service provider.
D. Secondary or emergency access lanes may be improved to a minimum 12 feet with an all-weather surface as approved by the Fire District. All fire lanes shall be dedicated easements.
E. Minimum access requirements shall be adjusted commensurate with the intended function of the site based on vehicle types and traffic generation.
F. The number of approaches on higher classification streets (e.g., collector and arterial streets) shall be minimized; where practicable, access shall be taken first from a lower classification street.
G. The City may limit the number or location of connections to a street, or impose access restrictions where the roadway authority requires mitigation to alleviate safety or traffic operations concerns.
H. The City may require a driveway to extend to one or more edges of a parcel and be designed to allow for future extension and inter-parcel circulation as adjacent properties develop. The City may also require the owner(s) of the subject site to record an access easement for future joint use of the approach and driveway as the adjacent property(ies) develop(s).
I. Driveways shall accommodate all projected vehicular traffic on-site without vehicles stacking or backing up onto a street.
J. Driveways shall be designed so that vehicle areas, including but not limited to drive-up and drive-through facilities and vehicle storage and service areas, do not obstruct any public right-of-way.
K. Approaches and driveways shall not be wider than necessary to safely accommodate projected peak hour trips and turning movements, and shall be designed to minimize crossing distances for pedestrians.
L. As it deems necessary for pedestrian safety, the City, in consultation with the roadway authority, may require traffic-calming features, such as speed tables, textured driveway surfaces, curb extensions, signage or traffic control devices, or other features, be installed on or in the vicinity of a site.
M. Approaches and driveways shall be located and designed to allow for safe maneuvering in and around loading areas, while avoiding conflicts with pedestrians, parking, landscaping, and buildings.
N. Where a proposed driveway crosses a culvert or drainage ditch, the City may require the developer to install a culvert extending under and beyond the edges of the driveway on both sides of it, pursuant applicable Public Works standards.
O. Except as otherwise required by the applicable roadway authority or waived by the City Engineer, temporary driveways providing access to a construction site or staging area shall be paved or graveled to prevent tracking of mud onto adjacent paved streets.
P. Unless constrained by topography, natural resources, rail lines, freeways, existing or planned or approved development, or easements or covenants, driveways proposed as part of a residential or mixed-use development shall meet local street spacing standards and shall be constructed to align with existing or planned streets, if the driveway.
1. Intersects with a public street that is controlled, or is to be controlled in the planning period, by a traffic signal;
2. Intersects with an existing or planned arterial or collector street; or
3. Would be an extension of an existing or planned local street, or of another major driveway.

(.09) Minimum street intersection spacing standards.
   A. New streets shall intersect at existing street intersections so that centerlines are not offset. Where existing streets adjacent to a proposed development do not align properly, conditions shall be imposed on the development to provide for proper alignment.
   B. Minimum intersection spacing standards are provided in Transportation System Plan Table 3-2.

(.10) Exceptions and Adjustments. The City may approve adjustments to the spacing standards of subsections (.08) and (.9) above through a Class II process, or as a waiver per Section 4.118(0.3)A, where an existing connection to a City street does not meet the standards of the roadway authority, the proposed development moves in the direction of code compliance, and mitigation measures alleviate all traffic operations and safety concerns. Mitigation measures may include consolidated access (removal of one access), joint use driveways (more than one property uses same access), directional limitations (e.g., one-way), turning restrictions (e.g., right in/out only), or other mitigation.

Section 4.178. Sidewalk and Pathway Standards.

(.01) Sidewalks. All sidewalks shall be concrete and a minimum of five (5) feet in width, except where the walk is adjacent to commercial storefronts. In such cases, they shall be increased to a minimum of ten (10) feet in width. Sidewalk widths shall include a minimum through zone of at least five feet. The clear zone may be reduced pursuant to variance procedures in Section 4.196.

(.02) Pathways
   A. Bicycle facilities shall be provided using a bicycle lane as the preferred facility design. Other facility designs described in the Public Works Standards shall only be used if the bike lane standard cannot be constructed due to physical or financial constraints. The order of preference for bicycle facilities is:
      1. Bike lane.
      2. Shoulder bikeway.
      3. Shared roadway.
   B. Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities located within the public right of way or public easement shall be constructed in conformance with the Public Works Standards.
   C. To increase safety, all street crossings shall be marked and should be designed with a change of pavement such as brick or exposed aggregate. Arterial crossings may be signalized at the discretion of the City Engineer.
   D. All pathways shall be clearly posted with standard bikeway signs.
   E. Pedestrian and equestrian trails may have a gravel or sawdust surface if not intended for all weather use.

(.03) Bicycle and pedestrian paths shall be located to provide a reasonably direct connection between likely destinations. A reasonably direct connection is a route which minimizes out-of-direction travel considering terrain, physical barriers, and
safety. The objective of this standard is to achieve the equivalent of a 1/4 mile grid of routes.

(.04) Pathway Clearance.

A. Vertical and horizontal clearance for bicycle and pedestrian paths is specified in the Public Works Standards. The clearance above equestrian trails shall be a minimum of ten feet. [Section 4.178 amended by Ord. 610, 5/1/06]

Section 4.197. Zone Changes and Amendments To This Code – Procedures.

(.01) The following procedure shall be followed in applying for an amendment to the text of this Chapter:

A. The Planning Commission shall conduct a public hearing on the proposed amendment at its earliest practicable meeting after it is proposed and shall, within forty (40) days after concluding the hearing, provide a report and recommendation to the City Council regarding the proposed amendment. The findings and recommendations of the Commission shall be adopted by resolution and shall be signed by the Chair of the Commission.

B. In recommending approval of a proposed text amendment, the Planning Commission shall, at a minimum, adopt findings relative to the following:

1. That the application was submitted in compliance with the procedures set forth in Section 4.008; and
2. The amendment substantially complies with all applicable goals, policies and objectives set forth in the Comprehensive Plan; and
3. The amendment does not materially conflict with, nor endanger, other provisions of the text of the Code; and
4. If applicable, the amendment is in compliance with Statewide Land Use Planning Goals and related administrative rules; and
4.5. If applicable, the amendment is necessary to ensure that the City's Land Use and Development Ordinance complies with mandated requirements of State or Federal laws and/or statutes.

(.02) In recommending approval or denial of a proposed zone map amendment, the Planning Commission or Development Review Board shall at a minimum, adopt findings addressing the following criteria:

A. That the application before the Commission or Board was submitted in accordance with the procedures set forth in Section 4.008, Section 4.125 (.18)(B)(2) or, in the case of a Planned Development, Section 4.140; and [Amended by Ord 557, adopted 9/5/03]

B. That the proposed amendment is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan map designation and substantially complies with the applicable goals, policies and objectives, set forth in the Comprehensive Plan text; and

C. In the event that the subject property, or any portion thereof, is designated as "Residential" on the City's Comprehensive Plan Map; specific findings shall be made addressing substantial compliance with Implementation Measures 4.1.4.b, d, e, q, and x of Wilsonville's Comprehensive Plan text; and [Amended by Ordinance No. 538, 2/21/02.]

D. That the existing primary public facilities, i.e., roads and sidewalks, water, sewer and storm sewer are available and are of adequate size to serve the proposed
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development; or, that adequate facilities can be provided in conjunction with project development. The Planning Commission and Development Review Board shall utilize any and all means to insure that all primary facilities are available and are adequately sized; and

E. That the proposed development does not have a significant adverse effect upon Significant Resource Overlay Zone areas, an identified natural hazard, or an identified geologic hazard. When Significant Resource Overlay Zone areas or natural hazard, and/or geologic hazard are located on or abut the proposed development, the Planning Commission or Development Review Board shall use appropriate measures to mitigate and significantly reduce conflicts between the development and identified hazard or Significant Resource Overlay Zone and

F. That the applicant is committed to a development schedule demonstrating that development of the property is reasonably expected to commence within two (2) years of the initial approval of the zone change; and

G. That the proposed development and use(s) can be developed in compliance with the applicable development standards or appropriate conditions are attached that insure that the project development substantially conforms to the applicable development standards.

H. Adequate public facilities, services, and transportation networks are in place, or are planned to be provided concurrently with the development of the property. The applicant shall demonstrate compliance with the Transportation Planning Rule, specifically by addressing whether the proposed amendment has a significant effect on the transportation system pursuant to OAR 660-012-0060. A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) shall be prepared pursuant to the requirements in Section 4.133.05.(01).

Section 4.236. General Requirements - Streets.

(.01) Conformity to the Master Transportation System Plan or Map: Land divisions shall conform to and be in harmony with the Transportation Master Plan, the Transportation Systems Plan, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, and the Parks and Recreation Master Plan, the Official Plan or Map and especially to the Master Street Plan.

(.02) Relation to Adjoining Street System.

[...]

(.03) All streets shall conform to the standards set forth in Section 4.177 and the block size requirements of the zone.

(.04) Creation of Easements: [...]

(.05) Topography: [...]

(.06) Reserve Strips: [...]

(.07) Future Expansion of Street: When necessary to give access to, or permit a satisfactory future division of, adjoining land, streets shall be extended to the boundary of the land division and the resulting dead-end street may be approved without a turn-around. Reserve strips and street plugs shall be required to preserve the objective of street extension. Notification that the street is planned for future extension shall be posted on the stub street.
Proposed Amendments to the Wilsonville Development Code
Related to the 2013 Transportation System Plan

Section 4.001 Definitions.

4. Access Control Restriction: A type of access restriction that involves establishing a reserve area adjacent to and paralleling a half street improvement, or across the end of a street that is to be extended in the future, to ensure proper participation by adjoining properties in completion of the required street improvements. See Street, Half.

[##]. Bikeway: Bikeway is a general term used to describe any type of transportation facility that is designated for use by bicycles in conformance with City standards. Bikeways may or may not be within a public right-of-way and include the following:

A. Bike Lane: A bike lane facility is a type of bikeway where a section of the roadway is designated for exclusive bicycle use.

B. Recreational Trail: A recreation trail is a type of pedestrian, bicycle, or equestrian facility that is entirely separate from roadways and has unimproved, gravel, or bark dust surface.

C. Shared Roadway: A shared roadway facility is a type of bikeway where motorists and cyclists occupy the same roadway area.

D. Shoulder Bikeway: A shoulder bikeway facility is a type of bikeway where cyclists occupy the paved roadway shoulder. Shoulder bikeways are common in rural areas.

E. Cycle Track: A cycle track is a bike lane with a physical barrier between the bike and motor vehicle travel lanes, such as a curb or parking lanes. Cycle tracks must “rejoin” the motor vehicle travel lanes at signalized intersections. Cycle tracks may require a two stage left turn for bicyclists.

F. See also: Multipurpose Pathway or Path.

[##]. Driveway Approach: A driveway connection to a public street or highway where it meets a public right-of-way.

[##]. Major Transit Stop: Transit stops that are located where two or more existing or planned routes interect or where there are existing or planned transfer locations between transit systems, Park & Ride lots, and shopping centers and other major destinations.

[##]. Major Transit Street: A primary corridor for transit, receiving half-hour or better service during peak traffic hours. Typically, these streets are also arterials or major collectors.

[##]. Multiuse Pathway or Path: A path that is separate from the roadway either in the roadway right-of-way or in an independent right-of-way. It is designed and constructed to allow for safe walking, biking, and other human-powered travel modes.

[##]. Through Zone: The width of unobstructed space on a sidewalk or pedestrian pathway.
Section 4.005  **Exclusions from Development Permit Requirement.**

(.05) Except as otherwise required by Sections 4.184 and 4.500 to 4.510, the establishment, construction or termination of an authorized public facility that serves development, including such facilities as a private street, transportation facilities within the public right-of-way, sewer, water line, electrical power or gas distribution line, or telephone or television cable system, provided said construction complies with applicable Public Works Standards. This exemption is not intended to apply to buildings used by utility providers.

Section 4.012.  **Public Hearing Notices.**

(.01) Published Notice. […]

(.02) Mailed Notice for Quasi-Judicial Hearings.

A. For development projects involving Class II Administrative Reviews, or quasi-judicial public hearings, the Planning Director shall ensure the following:

1. Public hearing notices shall be mailed to the owners of real property located within 250 feet of the site of the proposed development. The Planning Director shall use the property ownership lists of the County Assessor in determining the recipients of the notices.

2. Notice shall be sent to any governmental agency that is entitled to notice under an intergovernmental agreement entered into with the City and any other affected roadway authority. The failure of another agency to respond with written comments on a pending application shall not invalidate an action or permit approval made by the City under this Code.

B. Notices shall be mailed not less than twenty (20) days nor more than forty (40) days prior to the initial public hearing date. Except, however, in cases where the development proposal will require public hearings before both the City Council and Development Review Board, in which case the notices shall be mailed at least ten (10) days before the initial public hearing.

C. In any case where State law requires different timing or form of notice than that specified in this Code, the standard requiring a broader coverage or duration of notice shall be followed.

D. The City will make a good faith effort to contact property owners whose names do not appear on County ownership records and to contact others who have asked to be contacted for different types of applications.

(.03) Mailed Notice for Legislative Hearings. Where applicable, the Planning Director shall have notices of legislative hearings mailed to individual property owners as specified in State law.
Section 4.118. Standards applying to all Planned Development Zones:

(.03) Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 4.140 to the contrary, the Development Review Board, in order to implement the purposes and objectives of Section 4.140, and based on findings of fact supported by the record may:

A. Waive the following typical development standards:
   1. Minimum lot area;
   2. Lot width and frontage;
   3. Height and yard requirements;
   4. Lot coverage;
   5. Lot depth;
   6. Street widths;
   7. Sidewalk requirements;
   8. Height of buildings other than signs;
   9. Parking space configuration and drive aisle design;
   10. Minimum number of parking or loading spaces;
   11. Shade tree islands in parking lots, provided that alternative shading is provided;
   12. Fence height;
   13. Architectural design standards;
   14. Transit facilities;
   15. On-site pedestrian access and circulation standards; and
   16. Solar access standards, as provided in section 4.137.

Section 4.125. V – Village Zone

(.09) Street and Access Improvement Standards

A. Except as noted below, the provisions of Section 4.177 shall apply within the Village Zone:

 […]

2. Intersections of streets:

 […]

c. Offsets: Opposing intersections shall be designed so that no offset dangerous to the traveling public is created. Intersections shall be separated by at least:
   i. 1000 ft. for major arterials
   ii. 600 ft. for minor arterials
   iii. 100 ft. for collectors
   iv. 50 ft. for local streets
Section 4.154. **On-site Pedestrian Access and Circulation.**

(.01) **On-site Pedestrian Access and Circulation**

A. The purpose of this section is to implement the pedestrian access and connectivity policies of the Transportation System Plan. It is intended to provide for safe, reasonably direct, and convenient pedestrian access and circulation.

B. Standards. Development shall conform to all of the following standards:

1. Continuous Pathway System. A pedestrian pathway system shall extend throughout the development site and connect to adjacent sidewalks, and to all future phases of the development, as applicable.

2. Safe, Direct, and Convenient. Pathways within developments shall provide safe, reasonably direct, and convenient connections between primary building entrances and all adjacent parking areas, recreational areas/playgrounds, and public rights-of-way based on all of the following criteria:
   a. Pedestrian pathways are designed primarily for pedestrian safety and convenience, meaning they are free from hazards and provide a reasonably smooth and consistent surface.
   b. The pathway is reasonably direct. A pathway is reasonably direct when it follows a route between destinations that does not involve a significant amount of unnecessary out-of-direction travel.
   c. The pathway connects to all primary building entrances and is consistent with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements.
   d. All parking lots larger than three acres in size shall provide an internal bicycle and pedestrian pathway pursuant to Section 4.155(.03)(B.)(3.)(d.).

3. Vehicle/Pathway Separation. Except as required for crosswalks, per subsection 4, below, where a pathway abuts a driveway or street it shall be vertically or horizontally separated from the vehicular lane. For example, a pathway may be vertically raised six inches above the abutting travel lane, or horizontally separated by a row of bollards.

4. Crosswalks. Where a pathway crosses a parking area or driveway, it shall be clearly marked with contrasting paint or paving materials (e.g., pavers, light-color concrete inlay between asphalt, or similar contrast).

5. Pathway Width and Surface. Primary pathways shall be constructed of concrete, asphalt, brick/masonry pavers, or other durable surface, and not less than five (5) feet wide. Secondary pathways and pedestrian trails may have an alternative surface except as otherwise required by the ADA.

6. All pathways shall be clearly marked with appropriate standard signs.

Section 4.155. **General Regulations - Parking, Loading and Bicycle Parking.**

(.01) Purpose:

[...]
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(02) General Provisions:

A. The provision and maintenance of off-street parking spaces is a continuing obligation of the property owner. The standards set forth herein shall be considered by the Development Review Board as minimum criteria.

1. The Board shall have the authority to grant variances or planned development waivers to these standards in keeping with the purposes and objectives set forth in the Comprehensive Plan and this Code.

2. Waivers to the parking, loading, or bicycle parking standards shall only be issued upon a findings that the resulting development will have no significant adverse impact on the surrounding neighborhood, and the community, and that the development considered as a whole meets the purposes of this section.

(03) Minimum and Maximum Off-Street Parking Requirements:

A. Parking and loading or delivery areas shall be designed with access and maneuvering area adequate to serve the functional needs of the site and shall:

1. Separate loading and delivery areas and circulation from customer and/or employee parking and pedestrian areas. Circulation patterns shall be clearly marked.

2. To the greatest extent possible, separate vehicle and pedestrian traffic.

B. Parking and loading or delivery areas shall be landscaped to minimize the visual dominance of the parking or loading area, as follows:

3. Due to their large amount of impervious surface, new development with parking areas of more than two hundred (200) spaces that are located in any zone, and that may be viewed from the public right of way, shall be landscaped to the following additional standards:
   a. One (1) tree shall be planted per six (6) parking spaces or fraction thereof. At least twenty-five percent (25%) of the required trees must be planted in the interior of the parking area.
   b. Required trees may be planted within the parking area or the perimeter, provided that a minimum of forty percent (40%) of the canopy dripline of mature perimeter trees can be expected to shade or overlap the parking area. Shading shall be determined based on shadows cast on the summer solstice.
   c. All parking lots in excess of two hundred (200) parking spaces shall provide an internal pedestrian walkway for every six (6) parking aisles. Minimum walkway clearance shall be at least five (5) feet in width. Walkways shall be designed to provide pedestrian access to parking areas in order to minimize pedestrian travel among vehicles. Walkways shall be designed to channel pedestrians to the front entrance of the building.
d. Parking lots more than three acres in size shall provide street-like features along principal drive isles, including curbs, sidewalks, street trees or planting strips, and bicycle routes.

e. All parking lots viewed from the public right-of-way shall have a minimum twelve (12) foot landscaped buffer […]

f. Where topography and slope condition permit, the landscape buffer shall integrate parking lot storm water treatment […]

g. In addition to the application requirements of Section 4.035(.04)(6)(d), […]

C. Off Street Parking shall be designed for safe and convenient access that meets ADA and ODOT standards.

D. Where possible, parking areas shall be designed to connect with parking areas on adjacent sites so as to eliminate the necessity for any mode of travel to utilize the public street for multiple accesses or cross movements. In addition, on-site parking shall be designed for efficient on-site circulation and parking.

E. In all multi-family dwelling developments, there shall be sufficient areas established to provide for parking and storage of motorcycles, mopeds and bicycles. Such areas shall be clearly defined and reserved for the exclusive use of these vehicles.

F. On-street parking spaces, directly adjoining the frontage of and on the same side of the street as the subject property, may be counted towards meeting the minimum off street parking standards.

G. Table 5 shall be used to determine the minimum and maximum parking standards for various land uses. The minimum number of required parking spaces shown on Table 5 shall be determined by rounding to the nearest whole parking space. For example, a use containing 500 square feet, in an area where the standard is one space for each 400 square feet of floor area, is required to provide one off-street parking space. If the same use contained more than 600 square feet, a second parking space would be required. [Amended by Ordinance No. 538, 2/21/02.] Structured parking and on-street parking are exempted from the parking maximums in Table 5.

H. Electrical Vehicle Charging Stations:

1. Parking spaces designed to accommodate and provide one or more electric vehicle charging stations on site may be counted towards meeting the minimum off-street parking standards.

2. Modification of existing parking spaces to accommodate electric vehicle charging stations on site is allowed outright.

I. Motorcycle parking:

1. Motorcycle parking may substitute for up to 5 spaces or 5 percent of required automobile parking, whichever is less. For every 4 motorcycle parking spaces provided, the automobile parking requirement is reduced by one space.
2. Each motorcycle space must be at least 4 feet wide and 8 feet deep. Existing parking may be converted to take advantage of this provision.

(.04) Bicycle Parking:

A. Required Bicycle Parking - General Provisions

1. The required minimum number of bicycle parking spaces for each use category is shown in Table 5, Parking Standards, below.

2. A minimum of 50% of the bicycle parking spaces shall be provided as long-term bicycle parking in any of the following situations:
   a. When 10% or more of automobile vehicle parking is covered.
   b. If more than four (4) bicycle parking spaces are required.
   c. Multifamily residential development with nine or more units.

3. Bicycle parking spaces are not required for accessory buildings. If a primary use is listed in Table 5, bicycle parking is not required for the accessory use.

4. When there are two or more primary uses on a site, the required bicycle parking for the site is the sum of the required bicycle parking for the individual primary uses.

B. Short-term Bicycle Parking

1. Short-term bicycle parking encourages shoppers, customers, and other visitors to use bicycles by providing a convenient and readily accessible place to park bicycles.

2. Required short-term bicycle parking shall meet the following standards:
   a. Provide lockers or racks that meet the standards of this section.
   b. Locate within 30 feet of the main entrance to the building or inside a building, in a location that is easily accessible for bicycles.
   c. If 10 or more spaces are required, then at least 50 percent of these shall be covered.
   d. Each space must be at least 2 feet by 6 feet in area and be accessible without moving another bicycle and must provide enough space between the rack and a building or other obstructions to use the rack properly.
   e. There must be an aisle at least 5 feet wide behind all required bicycle parking to allow room for bicycle maneuvering. Where the bicycle parking is adjacent to a sidewalk, the maneuvering area may extend into the right-of-way.

C. Long-term Bicycle Parking

1. Long-term bicycle parking provides employees, students, residents, commuters, and others who generally stay at a site for several hours a weather-protected place to park bicycles.

2. Required long-term bicycle parking shall meet the following standards:
   a. Provide racks, storage rooms, or lockers in areas that are secure or monitored (e.g., visible to employees or monitored by security guards).
b. Locate the space within 100 feet of the entrance that will be used by the intended users.

c. At least 50 percent of the spaces shall be covered.

3. Bicycle Lockers, Racks and Cover (Weather Protection):

a. Where required bicycle parking is provided in lockers, the lockers shall be securely anchored.

b. Covered bicycle parking, as required by this section, shall be provided inside buildings, under roof overhangs or awnings, in bicycle lockers, or within or under other structures. Where required covered bicycle parking is not within a building or locker, the cover must be permanent and designed to protect the bicycle from rainfall and provide seven (7) foot minimum overhead clearance.
### TABLE 5: PARKING STANDARDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE</th>
<th>PARKING MINIMUMS</th>
<th>PARKING MAXIMUMS</th>
<th>BICYCLE MINIMUMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Single and attached units and any apartments (9 or fewer units)</td>
<td>1 per D.U., except accessory dwelling units, which have no minimum.</td>
<td>No Limit</td>
<td>Apartments – Min. of 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…</td>
<td>[…]</td>
<td>[…]</td>
<td>[…]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In considering proposed waivers to the following standards, the City will consider the potential uses of the site and not just the uses that are currently proposed. For waivers to exceed the maximum standards, applicants shall bear the burden of proving that Metro, State, and federal clean air standards will not be violated.
(.05) **Minimum Off-Street Loading Requirements:**

A. […]

B. **Exceptions and Adjustments.**

1. The Planning Director or Development Review Board may approve a loading area adjacent to or within a street right-of-way where it finds that loading and unloading operations:
   a. Are short in duration (*i.e.*, less than one hour);
   b. Are infrequent (less than three operations daily);
   c. Do not obstruct traffic during peak traffic hours;
   d. Do not interfere with emergency response services or bicycle and pedestrian facilities; and
   e. Are acceptable to the applicable roadway authority.

(.06) **Carpool and Vanpool Parking Requirements:**

A. Carpool and vanpool parking spaces shall be identified for the following uses:
   1. New commercial and industrial developments with seventy-five (75) or more parking spaces,
   2. New institutional or public assembly uses, and
   3. Transit park-and-ride facilities with fifty (50) or more parking spaces.

B. Of the total spaces available for employee, student, and commuter parking, at least five percent, but not fewer than two, shall be designated for exclusive carpool and vanpool parking.

C. Carpool and vanpool parking spaces shall be located closer to the main employee, student or commuter entrance than all other parking spaces with the exception of ADA parking spaces.

D. Required carpool/vanpool spaces shall be clearly marked "Reserved - Carpool/Vanpool Only."

(.07) **Parking Area Redevelopment.** The number of parking spaces may be reduced by up to 10% of the minimum required parking spaces for that use when a portion of the existing parking area is modified to accommodate or provide transit-related amenities such as transit stops, pull-outs, shelters, and park and ride stations.

Section 4.177. **Street Improvement Standards.**

This section contains the City’s requirements and standards for pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facility improvements to public streets, or within public easements. The purpose of this section is to ensure that development, including redevelopment, provides transportation facilities that are safe, convenient, and adequate in rough proportion to their impacts.

(.01) Development and related public facility improvements shall comply with the standards in this section, the Wilsonville Public Works Standards, and the
Transportation System Plan, in rough proportion to the potential impacts of the development. Such improvements shall be provided at the time of development except as waived by the City Engineer for reasons of safety or traffic operations.

(.02) Street Design Standards

A. All street improvements and intersections shall provide for the continuation of streets through specific developments to adjoining properties or subdivisions.

1. Development shall be required to provide existing or future connections to adjacent sites through the use of access easements where applicable. Such easements shall be required in addition to required public street dedications as required in Section 4.236(.04).

B. The City Engineer shall make the final determination regarding right-of-way and street element widths using the ranges provided in Chapter 3 of the Transportation System Plan and the additional street design standards in the Public Works Standards.

C. Rights-of-way.

1. Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy Building permits or as a part of the recordation of a final plat, the City shall require dedication of rights-of-way in accordance with the Transportation System Plan. All dedications shall be recorded with the County Assessor's Office.

2. The City shall also require a waiver of remonstrance against formation of a local improvement district, and all non-remonstrances shall be recorded in the County Recorder’s Office as well as the City's Lien Docket, prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy Building Permit or as a part of the recordation of a final plat.

3. In order to allow for potential future widening, a special setback requirement shall be maintained adjacent to all arterial streets. The minimum setback shall be 55 feet from the centerline or 25 feet from the right-of-way designated on the Master Plan, whichever is greater.

D. Dead-end Streets. New dead-end streets or cul-de-sacs shall not exceed 200 feet in length, unless the adjoining land contains barriers such as existing buildings, railroads or freeways, or environmental constraints such as steep slopes, or major streams or rivers, that prevent future street extension and connection. A central landscaped island with rainwater management and infiltration are encouraged in cul-de-sac design. No more than 25 dwelling units shall take access to a new dead-end or cul-de-sac street unless it is determined that the traffic impacts on adjacent streets will not exceed those from a development of 25 or fewer units. All other dimensional standards of dead-end streets shall be governed by the Public Works Standards. Notification that the street is planned for future extension shall be posted on the dead-end street. [Amended by Ord. # 674 11/16/09]

E. Corner or clear vision area.

1. A clear vision area which meets the Public Works Standards shall be maintained on each corner of property at the intersection of any two streets, a
street and a railroad or a street and a driveway. However, the following items shall be exempt from meeting this requirement:

a. Light and utility poles with a diameter less than 12 inches.
b. Trees less than 6” d.b.h., approved as a part of the Stage II Site Design, or administrative review.
c. Except as allowed by b., above, an existing tree, trimmed to the trunk, 10 feet above the curb.
d. Official warning or street sign.
e. Natural contours where the natural elevations are such that there can be no cross-visibility at the intersection and necessary excavation would result in an unreasonable hardship on the property owner or deteriorate the quality of the site.

F. Vertical clearance - a minimum clearance of 12 feet above the pavement surface shall be maintained over all streets and access drives.

G. Interim improvement standard. It is anticipated that all existing streets, except those in new subdivisions, will require complete reconstruction to support urban level traffic volumes. However, in most cases, existing and short-term projected traffic volumes do not warrant improvements to full Master Plan standards. Therefore, unless otherwise specified by the Development Review Board, the following interim standards shall apply.

1. Arterials - 24 foot paved, with standard sub-base. Asphalt overlays are generally considered unacceptable, but may be considered as an interim improvement based on the recommendations of the City Engineer, regarding adequate structural quality to support an overlay.
2. Half-streets are generally considered unacceptable. However, where the Development Review Board finds it essential to allow for reasonable development, a half-street may be approved. Whenever a half-street improvement is approved, it shall conform to the requirements in the Public Works Standards:
3. When considered appropriate in conjunction with other anticipated or scheduled street improvements, the City Engineer may approve street improvements with a single asphalt lift. However, adequate provision must be made for interim storm drainage, pavement transitions at seams and the scheduling of the second lift through the Capital Improvements Plan.

(.03) Sidewalks. Sidewalks shall be provided on the public street frontage of all development. Sidewalks shall generally be constructed within the dedicated public right-of-way, but may be located outside of the right-of-way within a public easement with the approval of the City Engineer.

A. Sidewalk widths shall include a minimum through zone of at least five feet. The through zone may be reduced pursuant to variance procedures in Section 4.196, a
waiver pursuant to Section 4.118, or by authority of the City Engineer for reasons of traffic operations, efficiency, or safety.

B. Within a Planned Development, the Development Review Board may approve a sidewalk on only one side. If the sidewalk is permitted on just one side of the street, the owners will be required to sign an agreement to an assessment in the future to construct the other sidewalk if the City Council decides it is necessary.

(.04) **Bicycle Facilities.** Bicycle facilities shall be provided to implement the Transportation System Plan, and may include on-street and off-street bike lanes, shared lanes, bike boulevards, and cycle tracks. The design of on-street bicycle facilities will vary according to the functional classification and the average daily traffic of the facility.

(.05) **Multiuse Pathways.** Pathways may be in addition to, or in lieu of, a public street. Paths that are in addition to a public street shall generally run parallel to that street, and shall be designed in accordance with the Public Works Standards or as specified by the City Engineer. Paths that are in lieu of a public street shall be considered in areas only where no other public street connection options are feasible, and are subject to the following standards.

A. Paths shall be located to provide a reasonably direct connection between likely pedestrian and bicyclist destinations. Additional standards relating to entry points, maximum length, visibility, and path lighting are provided in the Public Works Standards.

B. To ensure ongoing access to and maintenance of pedestrian/bicycle paths, the City Engineer will require dedication of the path to the public and acceptance of the path by the City as public right-of-way; or creation of a public access easement over the path.

(.06) **Transit Improvements**

A. Development on sites that are adjacent to or incorporate major transit streets shall provide improvements as described in this section to any bus stop located along the site’s frontage, unless waived by the City Engineer for reasons of safety or traffic operations. Transit facilities include bus stops, shelters, and related facilities. Required transit facility improvements may include the dedication of land or the provision of a public easement.

B. Development shall at a minimum provide:

1. Reasonably direct pedestrian connections, as defined by Section 4.154, between building entrances and the transit facility and between buildings on the site and streets adjoining transit stops.

2. Improvements at major transit stops. Improvements may include intersection or mid-block traffic management improvements to allow for pedestrian crossings at major transit stops.

C. Developments generating an average of 49 or more pm peak hour trips shall provide bus stop improvements per the Public Works Standards. Required
improvements may include provision of benches, shelters, pedestrian lighting; or provision of an easement or dedication of land for transit facilities.

D. In addition to the requirements of 4.177(.06)(B.)(2.), development generating more than 199 pm peak hour trips on major transit streets shall provide a bus pullout, curb extension, and intersection or mid-block traffic management improvements to allow for pedestrian crossings at major transit stops.

E. In addition to the requirement(s) of 4.177(.06)(B.) and (C.), development generating more than 500 pm peak-hour trips on major transit streets shall provide on-site circulation to accommodate transit service.

(.07) Residential Private Access Drives. Residential Private Access Drives shall meet the following standards:

A. Residential Private Access Drives shall provide primary vehicular access to no more than four (4) dwelling units, excluding accessory dwelling units.

B. The design and construction of a Residential Private Access Drive shall ensure a useful lifespan and structural maintenance schedule comparable, as determined by the City Engineer or City’s Authorized Representative, to a local street constructed in conformance to current public works standards.

1. The design of residential private access drives shall be stamped by a professional engineer registered in the state of Oregon and shall be approved by the City Engineer or City’s Authorized Representative to ensure the above requirement is met.

2. Prior to issuing a certificate of occupancy for any residential dwelling unit whose primary vehicular access is from a Residential Private Access Drive the City Engineer or City’s Authorized Representative shall certify construction of the Residential Private Access Drive substantially conforms the design approved by the City Engineer or City’s Authorized Representative.

C. Residential Private Access Drives shall be named for addressing purposes. All Residential Private Access Drives shall use the suffix “Lane”, i.e. SW Oakview Lane.

D. Residential Private Access Drives shall meet or exceed the standards for access drives and travel lanes established in Subsection (.08) of this Section.

[Section 4.177(.02) added by Ord. 682, 9/1/10]

(.08) Access Drive and Driveway Approach Development Standards.

A. An access drive to any proposed development shall be designed to provide a clear travel lane free from any obstructions.

B. Access drive travel lanes shall be constructed with a hard surface capable of carrying a 23-ton load.

C. Where emergency vehicle access is required, approaches and driveways shall be designed and constructed to accommodate emergency vehicle apparatus and shall conform to applicable fire protection requirements. The City may restrict parking,
require signage, or require other public safety improvements pursuant to the recommendations of an emergency service provider.

D. Secondary or emergency access lanes may be improved to a minimum 12 feet with an all-weather surface as approved by the Fire District. All fire lanes shall be dedicated easements.

E. Minimum access requirements shall be adjusted commensurate with the intended function of the site based on vehicle types and traffic generation.

F. The number of approaches on higher classification streets (e.g., collector and arterial streets) shall be minimized; where practicable, access shall be taken first from a lower classification street.

G. The City may limit the number or location of connections to a street, or impose access restrictions where the roadway authority requires mitigation to alleviate safety or traffic operations concerns.

H. The City may require a driveway to extend to one or more edges of a parcel and be designed to allow for future extension and inter-parcel circulation as adjacent properties develop. The City may also require the owner(s) of the subject site to record an access easement for future joint use of the approach and driveway as the adjacent property(ies) develop(s).

I. Driveways shall accommodate all projected vehicular traffic on-site without vehicles stacking or backing up onto a street.

J. Driveways shall be designed so that vehicle areas, including but not limited to drive-up and drive-through facilities and vehicle storage and service areas, do not obstruct any public right-of-way.

K. Approaches and driveways shall not be wider than necessary to safely accommodate projected peak hour trips and turning movements, and shall be designed to minimize crossing distances for pedestrians.

L. As it deems necessary for pedestrian safety, the City, in consultation with the roadway authority, may require traffic-calming features, such as speed tables, textured driveway surfaces, curb extensions, signage or traffic control devices, or other features, be installed on or in the vicinity of a site.

M. Approaches and driveways shall be located and designed to allow for safe maneuvering in and around loading areas, while avoiding conflicts with pedestrians, parking, landscaping, and buildings.

N. Where a proposed driveway crosses a culvert or drainage ditch, the City may require the developer to install a culvert extending under and beyond the edges of the driveway on both sides of it, pursuant applicable Public Works standards.

O. Except as otherwise required by the applicable roadway authority or waived by the City Engineer, temporary driveways providing access to a construction site or staging area shall be paved or graveled to prevent tracking of mud onto adjacent paved streets.
P. Unless constrained by topography, natural resources, rail lines, freeways, existing or planned or approved development, or easements or covenants, driveways proposed as part of a residential or mixed-use development shall meet local street spacing standards and shall be constructed to align with existing or planned streets, if the driveway.

1. Intersects with a public street that is controlled, or is to be controlled in the planning period, by a traffic signal;
2. Intersects with an existing or planned arterial or collector street; or
3. Would be an extension of an existing or planned local street, or of another major driveway.

(.09) Minimum street intersection spacing standards.

A. New streets shall intersect at existing street intersections so that centerlines are not offset. Where existing streets adjacent to a proposed development do not align properly, conditions shall be imposed on the development to provide for proper alignment.

B. Minimum intersection spacing standards are provided in Transportation System Plan Table 3-2.

(.10) Exceptions and Adjustments. The City may approve adjustments to the spacing standards of subsections (.08) and (.09) above through a Class II process, or as a waiver per Section 4.118(.03)(A.), where an existing connection to a City street does not meet the standards of the roadway authority, the proposed development moves in the direction of code compliance, and mitigation measures alleviate all traffic operations and safety concerns. Mitigation measures may include consolidated access (removal of one access), joint use driveways (more than one property uses same access), directional limitations (e.g., one-way), turning restrictions (e.g., right in/out only), or other mitigation.

Section 4.197. Zone Changes and Amendments To This Code – Procedures.

(.01) The following procedure shall be followed in applying for an amendment to the text of this Chapter:

A. The Planning Commission shall conduct a public hearing on the proposed amendment at its earliest practicable meeting after it is proposed and shall, within forty (40) days after concluding the hearing, provide a report and recommendation to the City Council regarding the proposed amendment. The findings and recommendations of the Commission shall be adopted by resolution and shall be signed by the Chair of the Commission.

B. In recommending approval of a proposed text amendment, the Planning Commission shall, at a minimum, adopt findings relative to the following:

1. That the application was submitted in compliance with the procedures set forth in Section 4.008; and
2. The amendment substantially complies with all applicable goals, policies and objectives set forth in the Comprehensive Plan; and

3. The amendment does not materially conflict with, nor endanger, other provisions of the text of the Code; and

4. If applicable, the amendment is in compliance with Statewide Land Use Planning Goals and related administrative rules; and

5. If applicable, the amendment is necessary to ensure that the City's Land Use and Development Ordinance complies with mandated requirements of State or Federal laws and/or statutes.

(.02) In recommending approval or denial of a proposed zone map amendment, the Planning Commission or Development Review Board shall at a minimum, adopt findings addressing the following criteria:

A. That the application before the Commission or Board was submitted in accordance with the procedures set forth in Section 4.008, Section 4.125(.18)(B)(2) or, in the case of a Planned Development, Section 4.140; and [Amended by Ord 557, adopted 9/5/03]

B. That the proposed amendment is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan map designation and substantially complies with the applicable goals, policies and objectives, set forth in the Comprehensive Plan text; and

C. In the event that the subject property, or any portion thereof, is designated as "Residential" on the City's Comprehensive Plan Map; specific findings shall be made addressing substantial compliance with Implementation Measures 4.1.4.b, d, e, q, and x of Wilsonville's Comprehensive Plan text; and [Amended by Ordinance No. 538, 2/21/02.]

D. That the existing primary public facilities, i.e., roads and sidewalks, water, sewer and storm sewer are available and are of adequate size to serve the proposed development; or, that adequate facilities can be provided in conjunction with project development. The Planning Commission and Development Review Board shall utilize any and all means to insure that all primary facilities are available and are adequately sized; and

E. That the proposed development does not have a significant adverse effect upon Significant Resource Overlay Zone areas, an identified natural hazard, or an identified geologic hazard. When Significant Resource Overlay Zone areas or natural hazard, and/or geologic hazard are located on or abut the proposed development, the Planning Commission or Development Review Board shall use appropriate measures to mitigate and significantly reduce conflicts between the development and identified hazard or Significant Resource Overlay Zone and

F. That the applicant is committed to a development schedule demonstrating that development of the property is reasonably expected to commence within two (2) years of the initial approval of the zone change; and

G. That the proposed development and use(s) can be developed in compliance with the applicable development standards or appropriate conditions are attached that
insure that the project development substantially conforms to the applicable
development standards.

H. Adequate public facilities, services, and transportation networks are in place, or
are planned to be provided concurrently with the development of the property.
The applicant shall demonstrate compliance with the Transportation Planning
Rule, specifically by addressing whether the proposed amendment has a
significant effect on the transportation system pursuant to OAR 660-012-0060. A
Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) shall be prepared pursuant to the requirements in
Section 4.133.05.(01).

Section 4.236. General Requirements - Streets.

(.01) Conformity to the Transportation System Plan. Land divisions shall conform to and
be in harmony with the Transportation Systems Plan, the Bicycle and Pedestrian
Master Plan, and the Parks and Recreation Master Plan.

(.02) Relation to Adjoining Street System.

[...] (03) All streets shall conform to the standards set forth in Section 4.177 and the block size
requirements of the zone.

(.04) Creation of Easements. [...] (05) Topography. [...] (06) Reserve Strips. [...] (07) Future Expansion of Street. When necessary to give access to, or permit a satisfactory
future division of, adjoining land, streets shall be extended to the boundary of the land
division and the resulting dead-end street may be approved without a turn-around.
Reserve strips and street plugs shall be required to preserve the objective of street
extension. Notification that the street is planned for future extension shall be posted
on the stub street.
Commentary on Proposed TSP Code Amendments

April 30, 2013

The purpose of this document is to explain the changes proposed in the accompanying draft of amendments to the Development Code.

Administration (Chapter 4, Sections 4.000-4.035)

Section 4.001 Definitions.

Amendments are proposed to the following definitions:

- New definitions for terms introduced to the Code with this package of amendments: “major transit stop”, “major transit street”, “multiuse pathway”, “bikeway - cycle track,” and “through zone.”
- Definition modifications are proposed for: “access control strip,” as requested by the County surveyor.
- Deletion of “Bikeway - bike/pedestrian path,” to be replaced with the “multiuse pathway or path” definition.

Section 4.005 Exclusions from Development Permit Requirement.

The State Transportation Planning Rule (OAR 660, Division 12) requires that local codes explicitly permit transportation facilities. Proposed modifies existing code, clarifying that all transportation improvements are allowed outright, without additional land use approval.

Section 4.012 Public Hearing Notices.

Proposed modifications to public notice requirements reflect current City practice. Proposed text ensures that other public agencies are provided notice of Class II Administrative Reviews and Quasi-Judicial Hearings, specifically agencies with jurisdiction over roadways. Necessary to comply with OAR 660-12-0045(1)(c).

Zoning (Chapter 4, Sections 4.100-4.141)

These proposed changes to the Village Zone street and access standards reflect standards and functional classifications proposed in the updated TSP.
Section 4.118. Standards applying to all Planned Development Zones

The list of allowed waivers is modified to include some specific elements that have been introduced by this package of amendments.

Section 4.125(.09) Street and Access Improvement Standards

References to street classifications have been updated to coordinate with the updated TSP.

General Development Regulations (Chapter 4, Sections 4.154 - 4.199)

Section 4.154. (.01) On-site Pedestrian Access and Circulation. Related to draft TSP Policies 1, 4, 9, 10, 16, 30, 35, 37, 38, 39, and 42

This section would require proposed new development to provide for pedestrian pathways through the development site, connecting to adjacent sidewalks and future phases of the development, as applicable. This increases the connectivity and viability of transportation options in the city. The proposed language is based on that from Oregon’s Model Development Code for Small Cities. The amendments would comply with Metro Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP) Title 1, Pedestrian System Design Sec 3.08.130C (on-site pedestrian systems).

Section 4.155. Parking, Loading and Bicycle Parking. Related to Transportation Policies 14, 37, and 42; also see Transportation Demand Management (TDM) in draft TSP Chapter 6

A proposed provision under (.03) Minimum and Maximum Off-Street Parking Requirements, the proposed policy would require that proposals that include parking lots larger than three acres provide street-like features along driveways, including curbs, sidewalks, street trees or planting strips, and bicycle routes in order to make large parking lots safer and more attractive to walk and/or bike around. A minor, more procedural amendment under this same subsection would exempt structured parking and on-street parking from the parking maximums in Table 5, Parking Standards. The amendments would comply with Metro RTFP Title 4, Parking Management Sec 3.08.410, and OAR 660-12-0045(4).
Proposed new Subsections .03.H and 03.I address electric vehicle parking and motorcycle parking, which are not clearly addressed in the current code.

Section (.04) Bicycle Parking is a new section that borrows its purpose statement and bicycle parking standards from existing Village Zone requirements in the City code (Section 4.125.07.D). 50% of the total required bicycle parking spaces would be for "long-term" use under specified conditions. Long-term bicycle parking is targeted for users such as employees and students, and designed to be secure, weather-protected, and located within a reasonable distance of the proposed users' destination. (For example, bicycle parking for employees may be more appropriately located near a back door close to the shower room, instead of near the front door.)

The new bicycle parking facility standards in this section are industry standard, but absent in current City policy. In the past staff has been able to require that minimum number of bicycle parking spaces be provided, but unable to enforce if the racks are placed too close to a building or blocked by shopping cart storage.

(.05) Minimum Off-Street Loading Requirements

The current policy is revised (existing Section (.04), renumbered to (.05)) to include a new provision allowing the Planning Director or Development Review Board to approve on-street loading and unloading operations under certain circumstances. This adds some flexibility to the requirements and could allow approval of a proposal where the future use has limited needs for loading/unloading and where such activity in the public right-of-way would not interfere with the operations of the roadway. This allowance will likely be most relevant and useful in Town Center and other mixed-use areas.

(.06) Carpool and Vanpool Parking Requirements

This new Section would require that there be parking spaces identified as reserved for employee, student, and commuter use for new commercial and industrial developments (those with 75 or more parking spaces), and new institutional or public assembly uses, and transit park-and-ride facilities (those with 50 or more parking spaces). A percentage of those parking spaces (no less than 2) should be reserved for exclusive carpool and vanpool parking. These proposed requirements include locating the carpool/vanpool spaces closest to the main employee, student or commuter entrance of the proposed building(s). This "preferential parking" is designed to more strongly support and promote carpooling and vanpooling. Note that the requirements only apply to larger employers or public assembly
uses. The assumption is that the relatively small amount of vanpool or carpool spaces required could be accommodated without negatively impacting the number of spaces available for visitor parking. The language of this section is from model code for complying with state Transportation Planning Rule section 0045(4).

(.07) Parking Area Redevelopment

This new Section encourages addition of transit-related amenities and electric vehicle charging stations by allowing an outright reduction in the minimum required parking spaces (up to 10% reduction). This provision would allow modification of an existing lot. Transit-related site improvements should improve access to the site for transit users and increase transit usage, thereby reducing the need for parking spaces.

Section 4.177. Street Improvement Standards

Changes to this section make it clearer when the street improvement standards apply and include a reference in Section (.02) to street standards in the TSP. New sections (.03), (.04), and (.05) consist of existing requirements for sidewalks and pathways moved from Section 4.178. A new section, (.06) Transit Improvements, is a new set of requirements that implement the City's adopted Transit Master Plan implementation measures, as well as the RTFP and TPR.

New Sections (.08), (.09), and (.10) address approach and driveway development standards and street intersection spacing standards. They implement RTFP and State Transportation Planning Rule requirements related to access management. Section (.08) language is based on Oregon's Model Development Code for Small Cities. Access management seeks to balance accessibility, safety, and mobility; providing access to sites while limiting potential conflicts and traffic flow interruptions presented by vehicles that are slowing, stopping, and turning. New language also allows the City to approve exceptions or deviations from the driveway and spacing standards through Class II or waiver procedures in special situations.

The amendments would comply with Metro RTFP Title 1, Street System Design Sec 3.08.110B and Sec 3.08.110G, Transit System Design Sec 3.08.120B(2), and OAR 660-012-0045.
Section 4.178. Sidewalk and Pathway Standards.

The proposed deletion of text under this section is administrative. This section has been incorporated into Section 4.177.

Section 4.197. Zone Changes and Amendments To This Code - Procedures Related to TSP Policy 17

Proposed additions to this section codify existing City practice, ensuring that findings of fact address applicable Statewide Land Use Planning Goals and related administrative rules, in particular the Transportation Planning Rule. This amendment is needed to comply with OAR 660-12-0060.

Site Design Review (Chapter 4, Sections 4.400 - 4.450)

Section 4.236. General Requirements - Streets. Related to TSP Policy 10

Modifications to subsection (.07) Future Expansion of Street require posted notice on the stub street where a street is planned for future extension. Proposed language is similar to (new) Section 4.167(.04)(B) addressing street connectivity. Posting a stub street is a formal way of informing the community, in particular existing and future residents in the vicinity, that a connected street system is planned for this area. The amendment would comply with Metro RTFP Title 1, Street System Design Sec 3.08.110B.
Findings of Compliance with the RTFP and TPR

In support of the adoption of the proposed amendments to the Wilsonville Land Development Code, the following tables present findings of compliance with the Metro Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP) and the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR). As established in the RTFP, demonstrating compliance with the RTFP constitutes compliance with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

In Table 1 the left column relates to the RTFP requirements (and contains content that was prepared by Metro), and the right column documents how the City of Wilsonville meets the requirements through existing requirements, or how proposed amendments to the Land Development Ordinance (the “Development Code,” Chapter 4 of the City Code) will meet the requirement upon adoption.

Table 2 includes findings of compliance for the TPR, OAR 660-012. The findings address the relevant sections of the TPR including Section -0045 (Implementation of the TSP) and Section -0060 (Plan and Land Use Regulation Amendments). In some cases, there are cross-references in sub-sections of the TPR to requirements in the RTFP.

### Table 1: RTFP Compliance of Wilsonville Development Code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement</th>
<th>Development Code Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allow complete street designs consistent with regional street design policies <em>(Title 1, Street System Design Sec 3.08.110A(1))</em></td>
<td>Existing code requirements meet these RTFP requirements in the following ways. Code Sections 4.177 (Street Improvement Standards, as revised to include requirements from 4.178 Sidewalk and Pathway Standards establish general standards for streets, sidewalks, and pathways in addition to other criteria established for streets, blocks, and pathways in land divisions in Code Sections 4.236 (General Requirements – Streets) and 4.237 (General Requirements – Other). Otherwise, existing code (Section 4.177.02) defers to the Transportation System Plan (TSP) and Public Works Standards for specific roadway cross section design and dimensions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow green street designs consistent with federal regulations for stream protection <em>(Title 1, Street System Design Sec 3.08.110A(2))</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow transit-supportive street designs that facilitate existing and planned transit service pursuant 3.08.120B <em>(Title 1, Street System Design Sec 3.08.110A(3))</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow implementation of: • narrow streets (&lt;28 ft curb to curb); • wide sidewalks (at least five feet of through zone); • landscaped pedestrian buffer strips or paved furnishing zones of at least five feet, that include street trees; • Traffic calming to discourage traffic infiltration and excessive speeds; • short and direct right-of-way routes and shared-use paths to connect residences with</td>
<td>Existing code and the proposed code amendments meet these RTFP requirements as follows: Section 4.177, Street Improvement Standards, require that all street and access improvements conform to the Transportation System Plan and the Public Works Standards. *Note that the Public Works Standards defers to the TSP for street classification, and access and design standards (Section 201.1.03). Proposed code modifications would clarify that sidewalks are required at a minimum to have a five feet wide unobstructed “through zone.” (Proposed new Section 4.177.03.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1: RTFP Compliance of Wilsonville Development Code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement</th>
<th>Development Code Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>commercial services, parks, schools, hospitals, institutions, transit corridors, regional trails and other neighborhood activity centers; • opportunities to extend streets in an incremental fashion, including posted notification on streets to be extended. <em>(Title 1, Street System Design Sec 3.08.110B)</em></td>
<td>Existing code language in Section 4.177 requires all street improvements and intersections to conform to the Public Works Standards and to provide for “the continuation of streets through specific developments to adjoining properties or subdivisions,” unless there are substantial constraints posed by existing development or topographic or environmental conditions. Proposed code modifications would require a posted notification to indicate that a street will be extended in the future. <em>(Additions to Section 4.177.02.D and Section 4.236. General Requirements - Streets.)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sections 4.177.03, .04. and .04 contain both new text that has been relocated and proposed text that address needed pedestrian and bicycle facilities within the public right-of-way, consistent with the RTFP requirements. Proposed new Section 4.154. On-site Pedestrian Access and Circulation includes new pedestrian access and circulation language to ensure connectivity through development sites and to community attractors. Currently, existing code requires Site Design Review for all new development in the city except single-family and two-family homes in residential zones and row houses and apartments in the Village zone. Site design review plans are required to show access to the site as well as vehicle and pedestrian circulation within the site <em>(Section 4.421.)</em>. Existing standards for streets, blocks, and pathways for land divisions in Sections 4.236 <em>(General Requirements – Streets)</em> and 4.237 <em>(General Requirements – Other)</em> further support circulation and connectivity in the city. Note that these requirements will serve to implement the TSP’s Safe Routes to School plan <em>(TSP Chapter 6).</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require new residential or mixed-use development (of five or more acres) that proposes or is required to construct or extend street(s) to provide a site plan <em>(consistent with the conceptual new streets map required by Title 1, Sec 3.08.110D)</em> that: • provides full street connections with spacing of no more than 530 feet between connections except where prevented by barriers • Provides a crossing every 800 to 1,200 feet if streets must cross water features protected pursuant to Title 3 UGMFP <em>(unless habitat quality or the length of the crossing prevents a full street connection)</em> • provides bike and pedestrian accessways in</td>
<td>Existing code requirements meet these RTFP requirements as follows: Before property over 2 acres in size can be developed it must be zoned in one of the Planned Development categories <em>(PDR, PDC, PDI, etc.)</em>. Standards for residential zones, the Village Zone, the Holding Zone, the Public Facility Zone, and planned development in the city include: 1. Maximum block perimeter: 1,800 feet. 2. Maximum spacing between streets or private drives for local access: 530 feet, unless waived by the Development Review Board upon finding that barriers such as railroads, freeways, existing buildings, topographic variations, or designated Significant Resource Overlay Zone areas will prevent street extensions meeting this standard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Text

Existing code language in Section 4.177 requires all street improvements and intersections to conform to the Public Works Standards and to provide for “the continuation of streets through specific developments to adjoining properties or subdivisions,” unless there are substantial constraints posed by existing development or topographic or environmental conditions. Proposed code modifications would require a posted notification to indicate that a street will be extended in the future. *(Additions to Section 4.177.02.D and Section 4.236. General Requirements - Streets.)*

Sections 4.177.03, .04. and .04 contain both new text that has been relocated and proposed text that address needed pedestrian and bicycle facilities within the public right-of-way, consistent with the RTFP requirements.

Proposed new Section 4.154. On-site Pedestrian Access and Circulation includes new pedestrian access and circulation language to ensure connectivity through development sites and to community attractors.

Currently, existing code requires Site Design Review for all new development in the city except single-family and two-family homes in residential zones and row houses and apartments in the Village zone. Site design review plans are required to show access to the site as well as vehicle and pedestrian circulation within the site *(Section 4.421.)*. Existing standards for streets, blocks, and pathways for land divisions in Sections 4.236 *(General Requirements – Streets)* and 4.237 *(General Requirements – Other)* further support circulation and connectivity in the city. Note that these requirements will serve to implement the TSP’s Safe Routes to School plan *(TSP Chapter 6).*
### Table 1: RTFP Compliance of Wilsonville Development Code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Development Code Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **lieu of streets with spacing of no more than 330 feet except where prevented by barriers**  
- limits use of cul-de-sacs and other closed-end street systems to situations where barriers prevent full street connections  
- includes no closed-end street longer than 220 feet or having more than 25 dwelling units  
*(Title 1, Street System Design Sec 3.08.110E)* | 3. Maximum block length without pedestrian and bicycle crossing: 330 feet, unless waived by the Development Review Board upon finding that barriers such as railroads, freeways, existing buildings, topographic variations, or designated Significant Resource Overlay Zone areas will prevent pedestrian and bicycle facility extensions meeting this standard.  

The City’s subdivision standards require that all streets shall conform to the standards in Section 4.177 and the block size requirements of the zone *(Section Section 4.236)*.  

Existing code Section 4.177.01.D *(proposed to be renumbered to .02.D)* limits dead-end streets and cul-de-sacs to 200 feet in length and restricts them to no more than 25 units, unless, respectively, there are significant constraints posed by existing development, major transportation facilities, or environmental conditions that prevent future street extension and connection, and it is determined that the traffic impacts on adjacent streets will not exceed those from a development of 25 or fewer units. |

| Establish city/county standards for local street connectivity, consistent with Title 1, Sec 3.08.110E, that applies to new residential or mixed-use development *(of less than five acres)* that proposes or is required to construct or extend street(s).  
*(Title 1, Street System Design Sec 3.08.110F)* | Existing code requirements meet these RTFP requirements as follows:  

Section 4.177, Street Improvement Standards, require that all street and access improvements conform to the Transportation System Plan; the draft TSP includes local street connectivity standards *(TSP Chapter 3)*.  

Existing street improvement standards for general development address block size, maximum spacing, and dead-ends, and existing street improvement standards for land divisions *(Section 4.236)* require street plans and, in some cases, reserve strips and street plugs to preserve opportunities for good connections with potential future adjacent development. |

| Applicable to both Development Code and TSP  
To the extent feasible, restrict driveway and street access in the vicinity of interchange ramp terminals, consistent with Oregon Highway Plan Access Management Standards, and accommodate local circulation on the local system. Public street connections, consistent with regional street design and spacing standards, shall be encouraged and shall supersede this access restriction. Multimodal street design features including pedestrian crossings and on-street parking shall be allowed where appropriate. | Existing code meet these RTFP requirements as follows:  

In addition to the standards and requirements of Section 4.237 for land divisions and street improvement standards in Section 4.177, parcels wholly or partially within the Wilsonville Road Interchange Area Management Plan *(IAMP)* Overlay Zone are governed by the Access Management Plan in the Wilsonville Road Interchange Area Management Plan *(Section 4.133.04. Access Management)*. The recent Wilsonville Road IAMP and current construction project has already improved the Wilsonville Road interchange.  

ODOT spacing standards apply to development in the Ellingsen Road interchange. |
### Table 1: RTFP Compliance of Wilsonville Development Code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement</th>
<th>Development Code Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>(Title 1, Street System Design Sec 3.08.110G)</em></td>
<td>Additions to Section 4.177 include text to address vehicular connectivity and access requirements, including references to TSP Table 3-2 Access Spacing Standards (TSP Chapter 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include Site design standards for new retail, office, multi-family and institutional buildings located near or at major transit stops shown in Figure 2.15 in the RTP:  *Provide reasonably direct pedestrian connections between transit stops and building entrances and between building entrances and streets adjoining transit stops;  <em>Provide safe, direct and logical pedestrian crossings at all transit stops where practicable.</em></td>
<td>Proposed amendments Development Code requirements meet these RTFP requirements as follows:  In Section 4.177 the proposed Transit Improvements subsection incorporates development requirements related to transit facilities; proposed code language is consistent with Implementation Measure 3.6 from Transit Master Plan and bases required transit amenities on the number of PM peak hour trips expected to be generated by the proposed development. In addition, a new definition for “major transit street” is proposed that is consistent with the definition in the Transit Master Plan. Pursuant to amended code language, improvements at mid-block may include intersection or mid-block traffic management improvements to allow for pedestrian crossings at major transit stops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At major transit stops, require the following:  *Locate buildings within 20 feet of the transit stop, a transit street or an intersection street, or a pedestrian plaza at the stop or a street intersections;  *Transit passenger landing pads accessible to disabled persons to transit agency standards;  *An easement or dedication for a passenger shelter and an underground utility connection to a major transit stop if requested by the public transit provider;  *Lighting to transit agency standards at the major transit stop;  *Intersection and mid-block traffic management improvements as needed and practicable to enable marked crossings at major transit stops.  <em>(Title 1, Transit System Design Sec 3.08.120B(2))</em></td>
<td>The City is proposing to adopt transit supportive code language consistent with RTFP Title 1, Transit System Design Sec 3.08.120B.2 and will not be establishing a pedestrian district as part of the TSP update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Could be in Comprehensive plan or TSP as well)</em> As an alternative to implementing site design standards at major transit stops (section 3.08.120B(2)), a city or county may establish pedestrian districts with the following elements:  *A connected street and pedestrian network for the district;  *An inventory of existing facilities, gaps and deficiencies in the network of pedestrian routes;  *Interconnection of pedestrian, transit and bicycle systems;  *Parking management strategies;  *Access management strategies;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement</td>
<td>Development Code Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sidewalk and accessway location and width; • Landscaped or paved pedestrian buffer strip location and width; • Street tree location and spacing; • Pedestrian street crossing and intersection design; • Street lighting and furniture for pedestrians; • A mix of types and densities of land uses that will support a high level of pedestrian activity. <em>(Title 1, Pedestrian System Design Sec 3.08.130B)</em></td>
<td>A proposed new code section under Section 4.154, On-site Pedestrian Access and Circulation, addresses this requirement. Propose language is adapted from the State’s Model Development Code for Small Cities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require new development to provide on-site streets and accessways that offer reasonably direct routes for pedestrian travel. <em>(Title 1, Pedestrian System Design Sec 3.08.130C)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish parking ratios, consistent with the following: \n• No minimum ratios higher than those shown on Table 3.08-3. \n• Mo maximum ratios higher than those shown on Table 3.08-3 and illustrated in the Parking Maximum Map. If 20-minute peak hour transit service has become available to an area within a one-quarter mile walking distance from bus transit one-half mile walking distance from a high capacity transit station, that area shall be removed from Zone A. Cities and counties should designate Zone A parking ratios in areas with good pedestrian access to commercial or employment areas (within one-third mile walk) from adjacent residential areas.</td>
<td>The City’s existing parking ratios (Section 4.155.03) comply with the minimum and maximum Zone B (for the rest of the region outside of highly transit and pedestrian accessible areas) standards established in the RTFP. Parking standards in the Village Zone (Table V-2) comply with parking ratios established in Zone A in the RTFP. The Development Review Board has authority to grant waivers to the parking, loading, or bicycle parking standards where the resulting development “will have no significant adverse impact on the surrounding neighborhood, and the community, and that the development considered as a whole meets the purposes of this section and is “in keeping with the purposes and objectives set forth in the Comprehensive Plan and this Code (Section 4.155.02).”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a process for variances from minimum and maximum parking ratios that include criteria for a variance.</td>
<td>Code Sections 4.155.02.D and 4.155.02.E require that parking be determined by summing the requirements for each use on a site or in a building. Only if the peak hours of the uses do not overlap and agreements are legally recorded can parking be jointly used and the required number of parking spaces be jointly determined. There is more flexibility for blending parking requirements in the Village Zone (Section 4.125.07).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require that free surface parking be consistent with the regional parking maximums for Zones A and B in Table 3.08-3. Following an adopted exemption process and criteria, cities and counties may exempt parking structures; fleet parking; vehicle parking for sale, lease, or rent; employee car pool parking; dedicated valet parking; user-paid parking; market rate parking;</td>
<td>Existing code does allow for on-street parking to be credited toward parking space requirements (Section 4.155.03.B.7). Landscaping and internal circulation for large parking areas (over 200 parking spaces) is addressed in Section 4.155.03.B.3.; proposed language requires “street-like</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: RTFP Compliance of Wilsonville Development Code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement</th>
<th>Development Code Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and other high-efficiency parking management alternatives from maximum parking standards. Reductions associated with redevelopment may be done in phases. Where mixed-use development is proposed, cities and counties shall provide for blended parking rates. Cities and counties may count adjacent on-street parking spaces, nearby public parking and shared parking toward required parking minimum standards. Use categories or standards other than those in Table 3.08-3 upon demonstration that the effect will be substantially the same as the application of the ratios in the table. Provide for the designation of residential parking districts in local comprehensive plans or implementing ordinances. Require that parking lots more than three acres in size provide street-like features along major driveways, including curbs, sidewalks and street trees or planting strips. Major driveways in new residential and mixed-use areas shall meet the connectivity standards for full street connections in section 3.08.110, and should line up with surrounding streets except where prevented by topography, rail lines, freeways, pre-existing development or leases, easements or covenants that existed prior to May 1, 1995, or the requirements of Titles 3 and 13 of the UGMFP. Require on-street freight loading and unloading areas at appropriate locations in centers. Establish short-term and long-term bicycle parking minimums for: • New multi-family residential developments of four units or more; • New retail, office and institutional developments; • Transit centers, high capacity transit stations, inter-city bus and rail passenger terminals; and • Bicycle facilities at transit stops and park-and-ride lots. (Title 4, Parking Management Sec 3.08.410)</td>
<td>features&quot; along principal drive isles in parking lots more than three acres in size. Proposed Section 4.177.09 (Approach and Driveway Development Standards, includes requiring driveways to align with existing or planned streets on adjacent sites under prescribed conditions. Section 4.155 combines requirements for bicycle parking with requirements for motor vehicle parking. The section establishes the number of bicycle parking spaces required according to type of use (Table 5 Parking Standards). Pursuant to Table 5, a percentage of bicycle parking at park-and-ride facilities and transit stations must be enclosed. Village Zone requirements include standards for short term and long term bicycle parking (Section 4.125.07.D.3). A new proposed Section 4.155.07 addresses short term and long term bicycle parking citywide. These changes in effect expand the detailed bicycle parking standards established in the Village Zone to other zones in the city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Transportation Functional Plan</strong></td>
<td><strong>Local Comprehensive Plan/other Adopted Plan Reference</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Could be located in Development code or Comprehensive Plan)</em></td>
<td>The City is proposing to adopt transit supportive code language consistent with RTFP Title 1,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As an alternative to implementing site design standards at major transit stops (section 3.08.120B(2), a city or county may establish pedestrian districts with the following elements:</td>
<td>Transit System Design Sec 3.08.120B.2 and will not be establishing a pedestrian district as part of the TSP update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A connected street and pedestrian network for the district;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• An inventory of existing facilities, gaps and deficiencies in the network of pedestrian routes;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interconnection of pedestrian, transit and bicycle systems;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parking management strategies;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Access management strategies;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sidewalk and accessway location and width;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Landscaped or paved pedestrian buffer strip location and width;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Street tree location and spacing;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pedestrian street crossing and intersection design;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Street lighting and furniture for pedestrians;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A mix of types and densities of land uses that will support a high level of pedestrian activity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Title 1, Pedestrian System Design Sec 3.08.130B)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When proposing an amendment to the comprehensive plan or to a zoning designation, consider the strategies in subsection 3.08.220A as part of the analysis required by OAR 660-012-0060.</td>
<td>Existing code refers to and requires traffic impact studies or analyses; proposed language in Section 4.197, Zone Changes and Amendments To This Code – Procedures, requires findings of compliance with applicable Statewide Land Use Planning Goals and related administrative rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a city or county adopts the actions set forth in 3.08.230E (parking ratios, designs for street, transit, bicycle, pedestrian, freight systems, TSMO projects and strategies, and land use actions) and section 3.07.630.B of Title 6 of the UGMFP, it shall be eligible for an automatic reduction of 30 percent below the vehicular trip generation rates recommended by the Institute of Transportation Engineers when analyzing the traffic impacts, pursuant to OAR 660-012-0060, of a plan amendment in a Center, Main Street, Corridor or Station Community.</td>
<td>(Title 5, Amendments of City and County Comprehensive and Transportation System Plans Sec 3.08.510A,B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement</td>
<td>Local Comprehensive Plan/other Adopted Plan Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Could be located in TSP or other adopted policy document)</em></td>
<td>The updated TSP addresses transportation needs and includes policies and requirements for the Town Center. Parking Management Plans are addressed in Chapter 6 of the TSP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adopt parking policies, management plans and regulations for Centers and Station Communities. Plans may be adopted in TSPs or other adopted policy documents and may focus on sub-areas of Centers. Plans shall include an inventory of parking supply and usage, an evaluation of bicycle parking needs with consideration of TriMet Bicycle Parking Guidelines. Policies shall be adopted in the TSP. Policies, plans and regulations must consider and may include the following range of strategies:

- By-right exemptions from minimum parking requirements;
- Parking districts;
- Shared parking;
- Structured parking;
- Bicycle parking;
- Timed parking;
- Differentiation between employee parking and parking for customers, visitors and patients;
- Real-time parking information;
- Priced parking;
- Parking enforcement.

*(Title 4, Parking Management Sec 3.08.410I)*
Table 2 includes findings of compliance for the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR), OAR 660-012. The findings address the relevant sections of the TPR including Section -0045 (Implementation of the TSP) and Section -0060 (Plan and Land Use Regulation Amendments). In some cases, there are cross-references to RTFP requirements and associated findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OAR 660-012-0045</th>
<th>Findings of Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of the TSP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Each local government shall amend its land use regulations to implement the TSP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) To the extent, if any, that a transportation facility, service, or improvement concerns the application of a comprehensive plan provision or land use regulation, it may be allowed without further land use review if it is permitted outright or if it is subject to standards that do not require interpretation or the exercise of factual, policy or legal judgment.</td>
<td>Section 4.005, Exclusions from Development Permit Requirement identifies the types of public facilities and improvements allowed outright without a development permit. Revised text identifies transportation facilities within the public right-of-way as exempt from development permit requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (c) Where a transportation facility, service or improvement is determined to have a significant impact on land use or requires interpretation or the exercise of factual, policy or legal judgment regarding the application of a comprehensive plan or land use regulation, the local government shall provide a review and approval process that is consistent with 660-012-0050 (Transportation Project Development). Local governments shall amend regulations to provide for consolidated review of land use decisions required to permit a transportation project. | Proposed amendments to Section 4.012. Public Hearing Notices will ensure that governmental agencies potentially impacted by a local decision will have the opportunity to participate in the review of the proposed amendment. In addition, the following Development Code requirements help ensure a multi-jurisdictional review process as follows:  
- Section 4.035.01.B calls for determination of affected agencies when reviewing site development permit applications.  
- Section 4.210.01.C requires that the Development Review Board consider the reports of other agencies in reviewing land division applications. |
| (2) Local governments shall adopt land use or subdivision ordinance regulations, consistent with applicable federal and state requirements, to protect transportation facilities for their identified functions. | The development code meets this requirement. General street requirements under Section 4.236.01 include the provision that land divisions must conform and “be in harmony” with the TSP. |
| (a) Access control measures. | The updated TSP and supporting existing code language meet this requirement. Block lengths and spacing standards are addressed by the new street design criteria in the TSP (TSP Chapter 3). New development in the city (single-family and two family homes in residential zones and row houses and apartments in the Village zone excepted) is subject to design review pursuant to Section 4.020. |
## Table 2: Findings of Compliance with the TPR (OAR 660-012-0045 and -0060)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OAR 660-012-0045 Implementation of the TSP</th>
<th>Findings of Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design review plans are required to show access to the site as well as vehicle and pedestrian circulation within the site (Section 4.421).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation and connectivity are further supported by land division standards for streets, blocks, and pathways in Sections 4.236 (General Requirements – Streets) and 4.237 (General Requirements – Other).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Standards to protect the future operations of roadways and transit corridors

The existing code language meets this requirement. Mobility standards for roadways in the city are established in the OHP for state roadways, in the RTP and RTFP for regional roadways, and in the City TSP for local roadways (TSP Chapter 2, Policy 5).

Requirements for conditional use permits (Section 4.184(.01)(A)(3)), zone changes (Section 4.197(.02)(D)), and comprehensive plan changes (Section 4.198(.01)(C)) specify that adequate public facilities must be available, or consistency with State goals and regulations (including transportation) must be demonstrated for the proposed actions. Land division application procedures (Section 4.210(.01)(B)(26)) require that a traffic study be submitted as part of the tentative plat application.

All land use and development applications are required to include a traffic study demonstrating that Level of Service standards can be met, unless the traffic study requirement is waived by the Community Development Director (Section 4.008.02.E).

Final Stage Two Approval for Planned Development requires that proposed Planned Development provide a study showing that Level of Service D performance standards can be met at affected intersections (Section 4.140.09.J.2).

Detailed traffic impact analysis requirements are established for the Wilsonville Road Interchange Area Management Plan Overlay Zone (Section 4.133.05.01).

(d) Coordinated review of future land use decisions affecting transportation facilities, corridors or sites

See response and proposed amendments related to -0045(1)(c).
Table 2: Findings of Compliance with the TPR (OAR 660-012-0045 and -0060)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OAR 660-012-0045 Implementation of the TSP</th>
<th>Findings of Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(e) Process to apply conditions to development proposals in order to minimize impacts and protect transportation facilities</td>
<td>City code authorizes decision makers to apply conditions of approval depending on the estimated impacts of the proposed action. Applying conditions of approval is acknowledged and authorized in provisions for general administration (Section 4.015), conditional use permits (Section 4.184), zone changes (Section 4.197), comprehensive plan amendments (Section 4.198), and land divisions (Section 4.210 (.01)(C)(3)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Regulations to provide notice to public agencies providing transportation facilities and services, MPOs, and ODOT of: land use applications that require public hearings, subdivision and partition applications, applications which affect private access to roads, applications within airport noise corridor and imaginary surfaces which affect airport operations.</td>
<td>See response and proposed amendments related to -0045(1)(c).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Regulations assuring amendments to land use designations, densities, design standards are consistent with the function, capacities, and levels of service of facilities designated in the TSP.</td>
<td>Existing Development Code requirements meet this requirement. Zone change proposals require findings that state that “primary public facilities, i.e., roads and sidewalks, water, sewer and storm sewer are available and are of adequate size to serve the proposed development; or, that adequate facilities can be provided in conjunction with project development.” Furthermore, the Planning Commission and Development Review Board “shall utilize any and all means to insure that all primary facilities are available and are adequately sized” (Section 4.197(.02)(D)). Comprehensive plan changes must be supported by findings that the amendment supports applicable Statewide Planning Goals (Section 4.198(.01)(C)) and that the proposed change “will not result in conflicts with any portion of the Comprehensive Plan (Section 4.198(.01)(D).”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Local governments shall adopt land use or subdivision regulations for urban areas and rural communities as set forth in 660-012-0040(3)(a-d):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Provide bicycle parking in multifamily developments of 4 units or more, new retail, office and institutional developments, transit transfer stations and park-and-</td>
<td>Addressed by RTFP, Title 4: Regional Parking Management, 3.08.410.I.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Findings of Compliance with the TPR (OAR 660-012-0045 and -0060)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OAR 660-012-0045 Implementation of the TSP</th>
<th>Findings of Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ride lots</td>
<td>Section 4.155 combines requirements for bicycle parking with requirements for motor vehicle parking. The section establishes the number of bicycle parking spaces required according to type of use. A percentage of bicycle parking at park-and-ride facilities and transit stations must be enclosed. New proposed Section 4.155.07 addresses short term and long term bicycle parking citywide.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (b) Provide “safe and convenient” (per subsection 660-012-0045.3(d)) pedestrian and bicycle connections from new subdivisions/multifamily development to neighborhood activity centers; bikeways are required along arterials and major collectors; sidewalks are required along arterials, collectors, and most local streets in urban areas except controlled access roadways | **Addressed by RTFP, Title 1: Pedestrian System Design, 3.08.130, and Title 1: Bicycle System Design, 3.08.140**  
Pursuant to the draft TSP (Chapter 3.), bikeways are required along arterials and collectors and sidewalks are required along all streets. Roadway cross-sections shown in the 2013 draft TSP include bike lanes for all roads other than local streets and sidewalks for all roads.  
Proposed subsections under 4.177 Street Improvement Standards includes existing code language that requires that bicycle and pedestrian facilities be located “to provide a reasonably direct connection between likely destinations” and describes a “reasonably direct connection” as a route that minimizes out-of-direction travel (existing Section 4.178 Sidewalk and Pathway Standards). New subsection 4.154.01, On-site Pedestrian Access and Circulation, addresses pedestrian connectivity within developments.  
Design review plans are required to show access to the site as well as vehicle and pedestrian circulation within the site (Section 4.421.(01)C. Drives, Parking and Circulation, under Criteria and Application of Design Standards: “With respect to vehicular and pedestrian circulation, including walkways, interior drives and parking, special attention shall be given to location and number of access points, general interior circulation, separation of pedestrian and vehicular traffic, and arrangement of parking areas that are safe and convenient and, insofar as practicable, do not detract from the design of proposed buildings and structures and the neighboring properties.” |
### Table 2: Findings of Compliance with the TPR (OAR 660-012-0045 and -0060)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OAR 660-012-0045 Implementation of the TSP</th>
<th>Findings of Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(c) Off-site road improvements required as a condition of development approval must accommodate bicycle and pedestrian travel, including facilities on arterials and major collectors</td>
<td>Where off-site improvements are required, the existing roadway cross-sections will govern (TSP Chapter 3). The draft TSP currently requires pedestrian and bicycle facilities on arterials and collectors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Provide internal pedestrian circulation within new office parks and commercial developments</td>
<td><strong>Addressed by RTFP, Title 1: Street System Design, 3.08.110E</strong> Site Design Review is required for all new development except for single- and two-family dwellings, and non-residential development in the Village zone; site design review plans are required to show access to the site as well as vehicle and pedestrian circulation within the site (Section 4.421). New subsection 4.154.01, On-site Pedestrian Access and Circulation, addresses pedestrian connectivity within developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) To support transit in urban areas containing a population greater than 25,000, where the area is already served by a public transit system or where a determination has been made that a public transit system is feasible, local governments shall adopt land use and subdivision regulations as provided in (a)-(g) below:</td>
<td><strong>Addressed by RTFP, Title 1: Transit System Design, 3.08.120</strong> The proposed Transit Improvement subsection under Section 4.177 Street Improvement Standards incorporates development requirements related to transit facilities, consistent with the recommendations of the Wilsonville Transit Master Plan and this TPR requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Transit routes and transit facilities shall be designed to support transit use through provision of bus stops, pullouts and shelters, optimum road geometrics, on-road parking restrictions and similar facilities, as appropriate;</td>
<td><strong>Addressed by RTFP, Title 1: Transit System Design, 3.08.120</strong> New subsection 4.154.01, On-site Pedestrian Access and Circulation, addresses pedestrian connectivity within developments consistent with the TPR requirement. Under Street Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) New retail, office and institutional buildings at or near major transit stops shall provide for convenient pedestrian access to transit through the measures listed in (A) and (B) below. (A) Walkways shall be provided connecting building entrances and streets adjoining the site; (B) Pedestrian connections to adjoining properties shall be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: Findings of Compliance with the TPR (OAR 660-012-0045 and -0060)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OAR 660-012-0045 Implementation of the TSP</th>
<th>Findings of Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>provided except where such a connection is impracticable as provided for in OAR 660-012-0045(3)(b)(E). Pedestrian connections shall connect the on site circulation system to existing or proposed streets, walkways, and driveways that abut the property. Where adjacent properties are undeveloped or have potential for redevelopment, streets, accessways and walkways on site shall be laid out or stubbed to allow for extension to the adjoining property;</td>
<td>Standards, Subsections 4.177.03, .04 and .05, includes existing and proposed text that addresses pedestrian and bicycle connectivity between and within proposed developments. Subsection 4.177.06 Transit Improvements, specifies connectivity requirements specific to transit streets and stops.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(C) In addition to (A) and (B) above, on sites at major transit stops provide the following:

(i) Either locate buildings within 20 feet of the transit stop, a transit street or an intersecting street or provide a pedestrian plaza at the transit stop or a street intersection;

(ii) A reasonably direct pedestrian connection between the transit stop and building entrances on the site;

(iii) A transit passenger landing pad accessible to disabled persons;

(iv) An easement or dedication for a passenger shelter if requested by the transit provider; and

(v) Lighting at the transit stop. | Addressed by RTFP Title 1: Pedestrian System Design, 3.08.130B |

Proposed additions to the Street Improvement Standards address transit improvements and access (Section 4.177.06), and include requirements to reasonably direct pedestrian connections between building entrances and transit facilities, as well as between buildings on the site and streets adjoining transit stops. Consistent with the Transit Master Plan, required transit amenities depend on the number of PM peak hour trips the proposed development is expected to generate. | |

(c) Local governments may implement (4)(b)(A) and (B) above through the designation of pedestrian districts and adoption of appropriate implementing measures regulating development within pedestrian districts. Pedestrian districts must comply with the requirement of (4)(b)(C) above; | The City is not proposing to designate a pedestrian district at this time. |

(d) Designated employee parking areas in new developments shall provide preferential parking for carpools and vanpools; | Proposed new Subsection 4.155.06 Carpool and Vanpool Parking Requirements satisfies this requirement. |

(e) Existing development shall be allowed to redevelop a portion of existing parking areas for transit-oriented uses, including bus stops and pullouts, bus shelters, park and ride stations, transit-oriented developments, and similar facilities, where appropriate; | Proposed new Subsection 4.155 (.07 Parking Area Redevelopment satisfies this requirement. |

(f) Road systems for new development shall be provided that can be adequately served by transit, including provision of pedestrian access to existing and identified future transit routes. This shall include, where appropriate, separate accessways to minimize travel distances; | Addressed by RTFP Title 1: Street System Design, 3.08.110E, and Title 1: Transit System Design, 3.08.120, and Title 1: Pedestrian System Design, 3.08.130 |

Proposed new language under Section 4.177 Street Improvement Standards satisfies this requirement. |

(g) Along existing or planned transit routes, designation of | Zoning along transit lines in Wilsonville is generally |

### Table 2: Findings of Compliance with the TPR (OAR 660-012-0045 and -0060)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OAR 660-012-0045 Implementation of the TSP</th>
<th>Findings of Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>types and densities of land uses adequate to support transit.</td>
<td>consistent with this TPR provision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) In MPO areas, local governments shall adopt land use and subdivision regulations to reduce reliance on the automobile:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Allow transit-oriented developments (TODs) on lands along transit routes;</td>
<td>See OAR 660-012-0045(4)(g) above. While not allowed on all land along transit routes in Wilsonville, there is a significant amount of mixed use zoning along the routes that will allow this type of development – in particular within Villebois/ Village Zone and the Town Center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Implements a demand management program to meet the measurable standards set in the TSP;</td>
<td>TDM program elements are included in TSP Chapter 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Implements a parking plan which: (A) Achieves a 10% reduction in the number of parking spaces per capita in the MPO area over the planning period. This may be accomplished through a combination of restrictions on development of new parking spaces and requirements that existing parking spaces be redeveloped to other uses; (B) Aids in achieving the measurable standards set in the TSP in response to OAR 660-012-0035(4) [reducing reliance on the automobile]; (C) Includes land use and subdivision regulations setting minimum and maximum parking requirements in appropriate locations, such as downtowns, designated regional or community centers, and transit oriented-developments; and (D) Is consistent with demand management programs, transit-oriented development requirements and planned transit service. <strong>OR</strong> (d) As an alternative to (c) above, local governments in an MPO may instead revise ordinance requirements for parking as follows: (A) Reduce minimum off-street parking requirements for all non-residential uses from 1990 levels; (B) Allow provision of on-street parking, long-term lease parking, and shared parking to meet minimum off-street parking requirements; (C) Establish off-street parking maximums in appropriate locations, such as downtowns, designated regional or community centers, and transit-oriented developments; (D) Exempt structured parking and on-street parking from parking maximums;</td>
<td>The City will prepare a parking management plan for the Town Center as a future next step after TSP adoption. - Existing Development Code requirements address parking reduction objectives in the following sections: Off-street parking requirements for non-residential uses have been reduced from 1990 levels because Wilsonville adopted RTP parking ratios as part of its last TSP update. - Off-street parking is allowed according to roadway cross-sections and Subsection 4.155 (.02) General Provisions make provisions for shared parking and off-street parking. - Section 4.155 and Table 5 (Parking Standards) establish both minimum and maximum parking space requirements. - Proposed addition to Subsection 4.155(.03) exempts structured parking and on-street parking from parking maximums. - Section 4.155(.03)B sets standards for parking area landscaping; landscaping and internal circulation for large parking areas (over 200 parking spaces) is addressed in Section 4.155.03.B.3. Subsection 4.155.03.B.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAR 660-012-0045 Implementation of the TSP</td>
<td>Findings of Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E) Require that parking lots over 3 acres in size provide street-like features along major driveways (including curbs, sidewalks, and street trees or planting strips); and (F) Provide for designation of residential parking districts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Require all major industrial, institutional, retail and office developments to provide either a transit stop on site or connection to a transit stop along a transit trunk route when the transit operator requires such an improvement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OAR 660-012-0060 Plan and Land Use Regulation Amendments</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amendments to functional plans, acknowledged comprehensive plans, and land use regulations that significantly affect an existing or planned transportation facility shall assure that allowed land uses are consistent with the identified function, capacity, and performance standards of the facility.</td>
<td>All land use and development applications are required to include a traffic study demonstrating that Level of Service standards can be met, unless the traffic study requirement is waived by the Community Development Director (Section 4.008.02.E). Final Stage Two Approval for Planned Development requires that proposed Planned Development provide a study showing that Level of Service D performance standards can be met at applicable intersections (Section 4.140.09.J.2). Zone change proposals require findings that “primary public facilities, i.e., roads and sidewalks, water, sewer and storm sewer are available and are of adequate size to serve the proposed development; or, that adequate facilities can be provided in conjunction with project development.” Furthermore, the Planning Commission and Development Review Board “shall utilize any and all means to insure that all primary facilities are available and are adequately sized” (Section 4.197(.02)(D)). Proposed language in Section 4.197, Zone Changes and Amendments To This Code – Procedures, requires findings of compliance with applicable Statewide Land Use Planning Goals and related administrative rules. The City also has specific traffic impact analysis requirements for development within the vicinity of the Wilsonville Road interchange (Section 4.133.05.01).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Located in the Planning Files:
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• Meeting Minutes Excerpt (Draft)
• Staff Report regarding the Transportation System Plan Development Code Amendments with:
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  Attachment B: Commentary on proposed amendments
  Attachment C: Draft TSP-related Comprehensive Plan amendments
  Attachment D: Matrix of Wilsonville Transportation Policies: Existing and Proposed
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• Proposed Development Code Amendments, Updated March 1, 2013
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• Affidavit of Mailing Notice of Public Hearing in the City of Wilsonville with attached Public Hearing Notice mailed to all property owners in the City of Wilsonville.
• United States Postal Service Form 3602-R1 – Postage Statement – Standard Mail.
• Affidavit of Emailing and Posting Notice of Public Hearing in the City of Wilsonville with attached Public Hearing Notice.
• Community Newspapers Affidavit of Publication with attached Public Hearing Notice
Documents distributed to Planning Commission prior to Public Hearings:

April 10, 2013 Work Session
• Meeting Minutes Excerpt
• Staff Report regarding the Transportation System Plan Development Code Amendments with:
  Attachment A: Draft TSP-related Development Code Amendments
  Attachment B: Commentary on proposed amendments
  Attachment C: Draft TSP-related Comprehensive Plan amendments
  Attachment D: Matrix of Wilsonville Transportation Policies: Existing and Proposed
I. CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL  
Chair Altman called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m. Those present:


City Staff:  Chris Neamtzu, Barbara Jacobson, and Katie Mangle

VI. WORK SESSIONS

B. TSP Code Amendments (Mangle)

Katie Mangle, Long Range Planning Manager, noted the TSP Code hearing would be held next month. A notice had been sent out to every property in the city, which would advertise the whole package of the TSP project -- the plan itself, as well as the related Comprehensive Plan and Development Code amendments. Although some Commissioner's seemed to oppose adopting all the amendments at the same time, the hearings would be opened on the same date in May and the Development Code amendments could be continued, if necessary. She reviewed the major changes made to the TSP Code since the Commission’s March meeting.

Commissioner comments and questions regarding the proposed TSP amendments were as follows:
• The definitions for bikeway and bike lane conflicted in Section 4.001(4) on Page 6 of 64; the language should include bike lanes and shared roads, at present it was too limiting. Most people who ride bikes around the city would prefer a separated path.
• Section 4.125(.09). City Attorney Mike Kohlhoff has pointed out that the amendments were using the new TSP intersection spacing standards in the wrong context. The section addresses intersection spacing, whereas the TSP addresses spacing of the different types of streets. The existing standards, which are based on the urban design plan for Villebois, would remain and would only be updated to make sure the new street names or types of streets names were being used.
  • Section 4.125(.09)(2)(c)(iii) on Page 8 of 64 had an extra zero. Ms. Mangle would verify that the change made to 2.c.iv was correct.
  • This section involves offset intersections, not intersection spacing. If two intersections do not align, they must be 50 ft apart. When intersections are offset, the measurement is made center line to center line.
• Section 4.154(.01)(B) had no direct reference about providing access from the sidewalk to the corner of a corner lot, which was a failure for pedestrian access in the city.
• In Section 4.155(.03)(C) on Page 10 of 64, the noted ODOT standards essentially implemented the design of ADA spaces, which is addressed through the Building Code. The ODOT standards were linked to ADA.

Section 4.155(.03)(B)(3) discussed new development with parking areas of more than 200 spaces, but Section 4.154(.01)(B)(d) on Page 9 of 64, which discussed internal bike and pedestrian pathways, was changed from 200 parking spaces to 3 acres.
  • The standard in (2)(d) was changed because the Metro standard was 3 acres, which was a higher threshold. There are approximately 100 to 150 parking spaces in an acre. Ms. Mangle agreed it was a good question.

• Section 4.155(.01)(B)(5) on Page 9 of 64 stated the pathway width should be no less than 5 ft, which was not consistent with Section 4.155(.03)(B)(3)(c) on the next page which required a minimum width of at least 6 ft.
  • Requirements regarding wheel stops for head in parking were part of the parking standards, but that section was not included in the Staff report.

• Section 4.155(.03)(D) on Page 10 of 64 regarding connecting parking areas on adjacent sites should also be comparable for pedestrian access. If two properties are going to be linked with a driveway, there should be a way for people to walk through as well. While not being excluding, such language often needs to be included so that it actually happens.

• Section 4.155(.03)(F) on Page 10 of 64 about on-street parking being counted seemed too undefined. A qualifier, such as 100 ft, was needed so spaces too far down the street could not be counted. New Section 4.155(.03)(I) which included language regarding motorcycle parking was distributed.

• In response to a question about berths, Planning Staff confirmed that berths, as noted in Section 4.155(.05) on Page 14, have always been interpreted not only to mean loading docks, but also parking spaces. Staff had not recalled this ever being an issue.

With regard to Section 4.177(.02)(D) on Page 16 and 17, a central landscaped island with rainwater management made more sense in the curb line and not in middle of a dead end street because it could interfere with turning maneuvers.
  • Small children at play in the cul-de-sac could also be put in a more dangerous situation due to a narrow area, although traffic would move slower.
  • Having a central island could drive an increase in land area consumed. If a feature was not functional, it should not be encouraged. Experience had shown that encouraging a feature typically meant it was expected, especially before the DRB.
  • The green street element seemed out of context with what was being communicated in the section and should be included elsewhere, not just at the end of a cul-de-sac.
    • This language was already included in the current Code. The use of cul-de-sacs and dead end streets was briefly discussed.

• In Section 4.177(.01), the fourth line of the new text should be corrected to state, "shall be provided".

• Attachment B was the commentary of the Code amendments for readers to get an idea of the changes being made. It would continue to be updated.

Ms. Mangle asked the Commission to email her with any further comments or suggestions. She explained the TSP Code amendments would be seen in two forms at the hearings, which would take place separately but on the same night. The Code amendments would be presented in a table as an attachment to the TSP package and also as a ready-for-adoption version of the Development Code text with its own ordinance. The part in Appendix B would continue on with the TSP if the hearing on the
Code amendments was continued, or it could wait until the TSP was adopted. The Commission could have the hearing and act on the main ordinance simultaneously at the next meeting because there would be two hearings on two ordinances next month, either of which they could act on or continue.

The procedure for the upcoming hearing was reviewed.

Ms. Mangle next presented the Comprehensive Plan Amendments, noting the first page and a half were amendments to the narrative in the transportation section of the Comprehensive Plan. Those amendments updated the narrative with projects and to generally agree with the TSP. Only minimum changes were made to bring the narrative up to date.

- Beginning on Page 31 of 64, the policies and implementation measures from various documents, including the Comprehensive Plan, Bike Plan, Transit Plan and the old TSP, were edited to coordinate with the TSP. The goal was to still follow the format and approach used throughout the Comprehensive Plan, while still making sure the important ideas were included. Whatever was adopted or bought forward for adoption in the Comprehensive Plan would reflect the best state of the amendments to the TSP as well. Staff was still working to make this happen.
- A typo was corrected on the second line of Page 30, (20013)
- Generally, the policies and implementation measures were organized under the goals stated in the Comprehensive Plan, which was different from how they were organized in the TSP.

Commissioner comments and questions regarding the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments were addressed as follows:

- The Comprehensive Plan Amendments would be adopted at the same time as the TSP. The Comprehensive Plan amendments and TSP could be adopted in one resolution recommending that the Council adopt the ordinance to codify the changes.
- The differences seen between the Wilsonville Transportation Policies beginning on Page 39 of 60 was intentional because the Comprehensive Plan was one of four sources used for the TSP update. Also some Comprehensive Plan policies that were not included in the TSP were not intended to be removed from the Comprehensive Plan.
- Strong themes surfaced during Planning Commission discussion about the policies, such as not pitting modes against each other, and some Comprehensive Plan policies could be massaged to ensure they were consistent with the TSP without changing the underlying Comprehensive Plan policy.
  New policies added in the TSP would not all necessarily be added into the Comprehensive Plan. Staff’s approach was to make the documents as consistent as possible, but to have a light footprint on the Comprehensive Plan, and doing that correctly was a delicate matter. Some new policies were important to put in the Comprehensive Plan, but some only belong in the TSP.
- The Development Code would implement the Comprehensive Plan and the TSP, but only the TSP would have to be used as an implementation reference for development applications.
- Chair Altman stated he was always under the operating premise that as long as the ordinance implementing the Comprehensive Plan was followed, the Comprehensive Plan was met. But historically, Wilsonville has always had a structure where the Comprehensive Plan was continually referenced, so when an application is developed, both documents are addressed. Now the criteria for approval would have to be addressed in three documents: the Comprehensive Plan, TSP and Development Code, which should be avoided. Obviously, the entire Development Code could not be fixed, but addressing the issue in the TSP would help.
  Ms. Mangle agreed and offered to work on it, adding it might have more to do with the types of references in the Development Code.
- Implementation Measure 3.3.1.b discussed increasing housing in the Town Center area. Although the Metro was pushing the City to put higher densities at the edge, the language was fine as stated.
• The Town Center lacked a strong development plan. If Town Center never redeveloped that density would never be obtained. The language, “in or near” would address areas near Canyon Creek, for example.
• The Comprehensive Plan showed that the highest densities were in the center. However, the densities in and around the Town Center may need to be revisited to move some of the density.
• Implementation Measure 3.3.1.c on Page 32 of 64 would read better if it stated, "Plan for increased access to for alternative modes…"
• Implementation Measure 3.3.1.f on Page 33 of 64, it was unlikely that TriMet could be encouraged to have extended service on WES since the rail was used as a freight line as well.
  • Having a bus follow the WES route during off hours for people could get back to their vehicles would be more beneficial and likely better received by TriMet. The measure should not be limited just to service on WES; perhaps increasing service on the WES route would be better.
• In Implementation Measures 3.3.1.f and 3.3.1.g, "strongly encourage" was changed to "advocate" because Ms. Mangle believed strongly encourage was very passive. When the City was in a position to speak with TriMet, it would not be a passive discussion. This would also be a way to introduce discussion about high speed rail.
• The need for a Bike and Pedestrian Advocates was not included because this was not the final document. Staff was still in the process of updating the entire TSP to reflect the Planning Commission and City Council edits so the advocate had not been forgotten. Brad Coy of DKS & Associates made a list of questions for Staff, which had included the Bike and Pedestrian Advocate.
• Policy 37 on Page 53 of 64 did not appear in Implementation Measure 3.3.1, although that was not bad. Concern was expressed about the edit creeping into Measure 3.3.1 of the Comprehensive Plan. It seemed unnecessary, more editorial and out of character with how the update project was being done. This change reflects edits DKS had made based on a recommendation from Staff at Metro as a way to acknowledge that encouraging walking and biking was not just about transportation, because other benefits exist. Ms. Mangle agreed the change was not the best way to achieve that and had since edited the policy again.
• Policy 36.a. on Page 53 of 64, advocated for TriMet, but not SMART advocating for Saturday service.
  • The policy was oriented toward WES. It seemed someone should advocate for the City to pay for that additional service. TriMet would do it, but not without funding to expand the present service level.
  • The biggest issue was non work hour transit service.
  • Language could be added to Measure 30.a on Page 51 of 64 about the areas and hours that are not currently served.
  • The Commission had to be careful about what are standard work hours; not everyone works 8:00 am to 5:00 pm Monday through Friday.
    • WES does not accommodate the employee work schedules of some of the largest employers in town. Their work schedules were set to minimize traffic flow.
  • Staff was asked to review the policies and push the envelope in general on transit regarding non normal work days and hours.
  • Increasing service was a matter of funding for both SMART and TriMet. Perhaps advocate was not the best verb to use, or funding sources needed to be explored for transit, which seemed to be the issue.
VI. WORK SESSIONS

B. TSP Code Amendments (Mangle)
Meeting Date: March 10, 2013  

Subject: Transportation System Plan Development Code Amendments

Staff Member: Katie Mangle  
Department: Planning

Action Required
☐ Motion
☐ Public Hearing Date: 
☐ Ordinance 1st Reading Date: 
☐ Ordinance 2nd Reading Date: 
☐ Resolution
☐ Information or Direction
☒ Information Only
☐ Council Direction
☐ Consent Agenda

Advisory Board/Commission Recommendation
☐ Approval
☐ Denial
☐ None Forwarded
☒ Not Applicable

Comments:

Staff Recommendation: Provide direction on how to prepare the draft documents for the public hearing on May 8, 2013.

Recommended Language for Motion: N/A

PROJECT / ISSUE RELATES TO:
☒ Council Goals/Priorities
☒ Adopted Master Plan(s)
☐ Not Applicable

ISSUE BEFORE THE COMMISSION:
Review two types of proposed amendments needed to support the Transportation System Plan. Amendments to the Development Code are needed to coordinate with the Transportation System Plan (TSP) and comply with state and regional policy. Amendments to the Wilsonville Comprehensive Plan are needed to coordinate with the draft TSP.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Development Code Amendments
The draft amendments contained in Attachment A have been updated to reflect the Commission’s discussion at its March meeting. Changes made since the last meeting are shown in colored Tracked Changes. Staff is seeking guidance on further refinements needed to prepare the amendments for public hearing. An updated commentary explaining the amendments is included as Attachment B. Attachment A will be included, in the format presented here, in the Appendix to the TSP document. The amendments will also be prepared to be adoption-ready, as a stand-alone ordinance proposal.

Comprehensive Plan Amendments
Staff is preparing the draft amendments to Comprehensive Plan, shown in Attachment B, for the same hearing as the TSP document. The intent is for Council to adopt both the TSP and the Comprehensive Plan amendments simultaneously. Some of the narrative in the Transportation section is proposed to be edited to reflect current conditions and update references. The Goals, Policies, and Implementation Measures have been edited to be consistent with the TSP policies outlined in Chapter 2 of the TSP. Comments inserted to the right of the text note the relationship of each Comprehensive policy or measure to Chapter 2 of the TSP.

Public Hearings
The hearings on this package of amendments will open on May 8th, and a notice has been mailed to every property in the city. The Planning Commission will hold two hearings on two TSP proposals on May 8. The TSP adoption package will include:

- TSP document with appendices
- Comprehensive Plan text amendments
- Draft Development Code amendments in the appendix

A second hearing will be held on the Development Code amendments that implement the TSP. As indicated by the Commission at its March meeting, the hearing on the Code amendments may be continued to a date certain, after the City Council has made a decision on the TSP itself.

ATTACHMENTS
A. Draft TSP-related Development Code amendments
B. Commentary on proposed amendments
C. Draft TSP-related Comprehensive Plan amendments
D. Matrix of Wilsonville Transportation Policies: Existing and Proposed
This document provides draft implementing ordinances in support of adopting the draft Wilsonville Transportation System Plan. The following includes proposed amendments to the City of Wilsonville Development Code to update City requirements for consistency with the Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP) and State Transportation Planning Rule (TPR). Findings of compliance with these requirements are presented in table-format and are included as Appendix ___ in the draft TSP.

The proposed amendments are outlined in Table 1, with references to corresponding RTFP and TPR requirements. Following the table, draft code language is presented in adoption-ready format; the draft amendments are numbered consistent with the structure of the Development Code and proposed new language is underlined and recommended deletions are struck through. In some cases adopting proposed new text will require re-numbering or re-lettering of subsequent Development Code subsections.

Note: In addition to the proposed amended sections specified in this memorandum, the entire Development Code should be reviewed to ensure correct identification of all references pertaining to new or revised text related to the implementation of the updated Transportation System Plan.

### Table 1: Summary of Proposed Development Code Amendments and Corresponding Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP) and Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) References

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Development Code Amendments</th>
<th>RTFP and/or TPR Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER 4 SECTIONS 4.000 – 4.035 ADMINISTRATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Section 4.001 Definitions.</strong> Definitions of access control strip modified. Definitions under bikeway modified to remove bike/pedestrian path and add cycle track. New definitions for major transit stop, major transit street, multiuse pathway, and through zone added.</td>
<td>Title 1, Street System Design Sec 3.08.110B Title 4, Parking Management Sec 3.08.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Section 4.012. Public Hearing Notices.</strong> New text in subsection (.02) Mailed Notice for Quasi-Judicial Hearings includes noticing governmental agencies potentially impacted by a local decision.</td>
<td>OAR 660-12-0045(1)(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER 4 SECTIONS 4.100 – 4.141 ZONING</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>(New) Section 4.114 Transportation Facilities in Zoning Districts.</strong> New text identifies the types of transportation facilities allowed outright in all zones.</td>
<td>OAR 660-12-0045(1)(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Section 4.125(.09) Street and Access Improvement Standards</strong> Update Village Zone standards to coordinate with new street classifications and spacing standards in TSP.</td>
<td>TSP consistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Development Code Amendments</td>
<td>RTFP and/or TPR Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **CHAPTER 4 SECTIONS 4.154 – 4.199**  
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS | **Title 1, Pedestrian System**  
Design Sec 3.08.130C (on-site pedestrian systems) |
| **5.** Section 4.154. On-site Pedestrian Access and Circulation.  
New section (.01) On-site Pedestrian Access and Circulation; text modified from State’s Model Development Code for Small Cities. | **Title 4, Parking Management**  
Sec 3.08.410  
OAR 660-12-0045(4) |
| **6.** Section 4.155. General Regulations - Parking, Loading and Bicycle Parking.  
Modified Section (.03), Parking Requirements, to include parking location and street features for lots over 3 acres and to exempt structured parking and on-street parking from parking maximums. Proposed renumbering of existing text.  
**New subsections under (.03) include electrical vehicle charging stations and motorcycle parking.**  
New Section (.04), Bicycle Parking, to address quantity, location, and design of short term and long term bicycle parking.  
New Section (0.5)B Exceptions and Adjustments to allow approval of loading areas adjacent to or within a street right-of-way if specific conditions exist.  
New Section (.06) Carpool and Vanpool Parking Requirements to include provisions for preferential location of carpool and vanpool parking  
New Section (.07) Parking Area Redevelopment to allow for the redevelopment of existing parking areas in order to accommodate or provide transit-related amenities or electric vehicle charging stations. | **Title 1, Street System Design**  
Sec 3.08.110B  
Sec 3.08.110G  
**Title 1, Transit System**  
Design Sec 3.08.120B(2)  
OAR 660-012-0045 |
| **7.** Section 4.177. Street Improvement Standards.  
New introduction language; New Section (.01) clarifies applicability and compliance requirements.  
New Section (.02) Street Design Standards includes existing language and a new reference to the street standards in the TSP. Existing requirements for sidewalks have been moved.  
Added text to existing Subsection D includes a (new) requirement to post notification of a street extension.  
New Sections (.03), (.04), and (.05) feature text modified from existing Section 4.178 Sidewalk and Pathway Standards.  
New Section (.06) Transit Improvements includes requirements consistent with Transit Master Plan implementation measures.  
Section (.08) Access Drives and Travel Lanes is relocated from Section 4.177.01.E.  
New Sections (.09), (.10), and (.11) address access and driveway development standards and intersection spacing standards, as well as exception and adjustment procedures. | **Title 1, Street System Design**  
Sec 3.08.110B  
Sec 3.08.110G  
**Title 1, Transit System**  
Design Sec 3.08.120B(2)  
OAR 660-012-0045 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Development Code Amendments</th>
<th>RTFP and/or TPR Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Section 4.178. Sidewalk and Pathway Standards. Recommended deletion of Section; text proposed as part of (new) Section 4.177.03, .04, and .05.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Section 4.197. Zone Changes and Amendments To This Code – Procedures. Added text requires findings of compliance with applicable Statewide Land Use Planning Goals and related administrative rules.</td>
<td>OAR 660-12-0060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER 4 SECTIONS 4.200 – 4.290 LAND DIVISIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Section 4.236. General Requirements - Streets. Added text in (.07) reflects a (new) requirement to post notification of a street extension.</td>
<td>Title 1, Street System Design Sec 3.08.110B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 4.001 Definitions.

4. Access Control Strip Restriction: A reserve area established adjacent to and paralleling a half street improvement or across the end of a street that is to be extended in the future to ensure proper participation by adjoining properties in completion of the required street improvements. See Street, Half.

[New number/renumbering needed.] 32. Bikeway: Bikeway is a general term used to describe any type of travel-way that is designated for use by bicycles— that conforms to City standards and is separated from the street right-of-way. Bikeways may or may not be within a public right-of-way and include the following: Bikeways may include bike lanes, bike paths, shared roadways, shoulder bikeways and other bikeways.

A. Bike Lane: A bike lane facility is a type of bikeway where a section of the roadway is designated for exclusive bicycle use.

B. Bike/Pedestrian Path: A bike/pedestrian path facility is a type of bikeway that is entirely separate from the roadway and is designed and constructed to allow for safe use by both pedestrians and bicyclists.

BC. Recreational Trail: A recreation trail is a type of pedestrian, bicycle, or equestrian facility that is entirely separate from roadways and has unimproved, gravel, or bark dust surface.

CD. Shared Roadway: A shared roadway facility is a type of bikeway where motorists and cyclists occupy the same roadway area.

DE. Shoulder Bikeway: A shoulder bikeway facility is a type of bikeway where cyclists occupy the paved roadway shoulder. Shoulder bikeways are common in rural areas.

E. Cycle Track: A cycle track is a bike lane with a physical barrier between the bike and motor vehicle travel lanes, such as a curb or parking lanes. Cycle tracks must “rejoin” the motor vehicle travel lanes at signalized intersections. Cycle tracks may require a two stage left turn for bicyclists.

F. See also multipurpose pathway or path.

[New number/renumbering needed.] Major transit stop: Transit stops that are located where two or more existing or planned routes intersect or where there are existing or planned transfer locations between transit systems, Park & Ride lots, and shopping centers and other major destinations.

[New number/renumbering needed.] Major transit street: A primary corridor for transit, receiving half-hour or better service during peak traffic hours. Typically, these streets are also arterials or major collectors.

[New number/renumbering needed.] Multiuse pathway or path: A path that is separate from the roadway either in the roadway right-of-way or in an independent right-of-way. It is designed and constructed to allow for safe walking, biking, and other human-powered travel modes.

[New number/renumbering needed.] Through zone: The width of unobstructed space on a sidewalk or pedestrian pathway.
Section 4.005  Exclusions from Development Permit Requirement.

(.05) Except as otherwise required by Sections 4.184 and 4.500 to 4.510, the establishment, construction or termination of an authorized public facility that serves development, including such facilities as a private or public street, transportation facilities within the public right-of-way, sewer, water line, electrical power or gas distribution line, or telephone or television cable system, provided said construction complies with applicable Public Works Standards. This exemption is not intended to apply to buildings used by utility providers.


(.01) Published Notice.

(.02) Mailed Notice for Quasi-Judicial Hearings.

A. For development projects involving Class II Administrative Reviews, or quasijudicial public hearings, the Planning Director shall ensure the following:

1. Public hearing notices shall be mailed to the owners of real property located within 250 feet of the site of the proposed development. The Planning Director shall use the property ownership lists of the County Assessor in determining the recipients of the notices.

2. Notice shall be sent to any governmental agency that is entitled to notice under an intergovernmental agreement entered into with the City and any other affected roadway authority. At a minimum, the Planning Director shall notify the road authority if different than the City of Wilsonville. The failure of another agency to respond with written comments on a pending application shall not invalidate an action or permit approval made by the City under this Code.

B. Notices shall be mailed not less than twenty (20) days nor more than forty (40) days prior to the initial public hearing date. Except, however, in cases where the development proposal will require public hearings before both the City Council and Development Review Board, in which case the notices shall be mailed at least ten (10) days before the initial public hearing.

C. In any case where State law requires different timing or form of notice than that specified in this Code, the standard requiring a broader coverage or duration of notice shall be followed.

D. The City will make a good faith effort to contact property owners whose names do not appear on County ownership records and to contact others who have asked to be contacted for different types of applications.

(.03) Mailed Notice for Legislative Hearings. Where applicable, the Planning Director shall have notices of legislative hearings mailed to individual property owners as specified in State law.
4.114 Transportation Facilities in Zoning Districts.
For the purposes of providing needed public services, transportation facilities shall be permitted outright in City zoning districts. Transportation facilities shall include construction, operation, and maintenance of travel lanes, bike lanes and facilities, curbs, gutters, drainage facilities, sidewalks, transit stops, landscaping, and related improvements located within public rights-of-ways controlled by a public agency, consistent with the City TSP.

Section 4.125(.09) Street and Access Improvement Standards
(.09) Street and Access Improvement Standards
A. Except as noted below, the provisions of Section 4.177 shall apply within the Village zone:
  2. Intersections of streets:
    c. Offsets: Opposing intersections shall be designed so that no offset dangerous to the traveling public is created. Intersections shall be separated by at least:
      i. 1000 ft. (1 mile) for major arterials
      ii. 600 ft. (1 mile) for minor arterials
      iii. 1,320 ft. for major collectors
      iv. 500 ft. (1 mile) for minor collector/local streets

NOTE: Completion of Section 4.154 has been postponed pending the completion of the Transportation Systems Plan.

(.01) On-site Pedestrian Access and Circulation
A. The purpose of this section is to implement the pedestrian access and connectivity policies of the Transportation System Plan. It is intended to provide for safe, reasonably direct, and convenient pedestrian access and circulation.
B. Standards. Development shall conform to all of the following standards:
  1. Continuous Pathway System. A pedestrian pathway system shall extend throughout the development site and connect to adjacent sidewalks, and to all future phases of the development, as applicable.
  2. Safe, Direct, and Convenient. Pathways within developments shall provide safe, reasonably direct, and convenient connections between primary building entrances and all adjacent parking areas, recreational areas/playgrounds, and public rights-of-way based on all of the following criteria:
     a. Pedestrian pathways are designed primarily for pedestrian safety and convenience, meaning they are free from hazards and provides a reasonably smooth and consistent surface and direct route of travel between destinations. The pathway is reasonably direct. A pathway is reasonably direct when it follows a route that does not deviate
unnecessarily from a straight line or it does not involve a significant amount of out-of-direction travel; 

b. Pedestrian pathways are designed primarily for pedestrian safety and convenience, meaning it is free from hazards and provides a reasonably smooth and consistent surface and direct route of travel between destinations. The pathway is reasonably direct. A pathway is reasonably direct when it follows a route that does not deviate unnecessarily from a straight line or it does not involve a significant amount of unnecessary out-of-direction travel; 

c. The pathway connects to all primary building entrances and is consistent with the Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements. 

d. All parking lots larger than three acres in size shall provide an internal bicycle and pedestrian pathway pursuant to Section 4.155.03.B.3.d.

3. Vehicle/Pathway Separation.
   Except as required for crosswalks, per subsection 4, below, where a pathway abuts a driveway or street it shall be vertically or horizontally separated from the vehicular lane. For example, a pathway may be vertically raised six inches above the abutting travel lane, or horizontally separated by a row of bollards.

4. Crosswalks. Where a pathway crosses a parking area or driveway, it shall be clearly marked with contrasting paint or paving materials (e.g., pavers, light-color concrete inlay between asphalt, or similar contrast).

5. Pathway Width and Surface. Primary pathways shall be constructed of concrete, asphalt, brick/masonry pavers, or other durable surface, and not less than five (5) feet wide. Secondary pathways and pedestrian trails may have an alternative gravel, wood chip, or sawdust surface if not intended for all-weather use except as otherwise required by the ADA.

6. All pathways shall be clearly marked with appropriate standard signs.

Section 4.155. General Regulations - Parking, Loading and Bicycle Parking.

(.01) Purpose:
   […] 

(.02) General Provisions:
   A. The provision and maintenance of off-street parking spaces is a continuing obligation of the property owner. The standards set forth herein shall be considered by the Development Review Board as minimum criteria.
   1. The Board shall have the authority to grant variances or planned development waivers to these standards in keeping with the purposes and objectives set forth in the Comprehensive Plan and this Code.
   2. Waivers to the parking, loading, or bicycle parking standards shall only be issued upon a findings that the resulting development will have no significant adverse impact on the surrounding neighborhood, and the community, and that the development considered as a whole meets the purposes of this section.
   […]
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(.03) Minimum and Maximum Off-Street Parking Requirements:

A. Parking and loading or delivery areas shall be designed with access and maneuvering area adequate to serve the functional needs of the site and shall:
   1. Separate loading and delivery areas and circulation from customer and/or employee parking and pedestrian areas. Circulation patterns shall be clearly marked.
   2. To the greatest extent possible, separate vehicle and pedestrian traffic.
   3. Parking lots more than three acres in size shall provide street-like features along private drives, including curbs, sidewalks, street trees or planting strips, and bicycle routes.

B. Parking and loading or delivery areas shall be landscaped to minimize the visual dominance of the parking or loading area, as follows:

3. Due to their large amount of impervious surface, new development with parking areas of more than two hundred (200) spaces that are located in any zone, and that may be viewed from the public right of way, shall be landscaped to the following additional standards:
   a. One (1) tree shall be planted per six (6) parking spaces or fraction thereof. At least twenty-five percent (25%) of the required trees must be planted in the interior of the parking area.
   b. Required trees may be planted within the parking area or the perimeter, provided that a minimum of forty percent (40%) of the canopy dripline of mature perimeter trees can be expected to shade or overlap the parking area. Shading shall be determined based on shadows cast on the summer solstice.
   c. All parking lots in excess of two hundred (200) parking spaces shall provide an internal pedestrian walkway for every six (6) parking aisles. Minimum walkway clearance shall be at least six (6) feet in width. Walkways shall be designed to provide pedestrian access to parking areas in order to minimize pedestrian travel among vehicles. Walkways shall be designed to channel pedestrians to the front entrance of the building.
   d. Parking lots more than three acres in size shall provide street-like features along principal drive isles, including curbs, sidewalks, street trees or planting strips, and bicycle routes.
   d. e. All parking lots viewed from the public right of way shall have a minimum twelve (12) foot landscaped buffer...

[Renumbering of subsequent sections needed.]

C. 4. Off Street Parking shall be designed for safe and convenient access that meets ADA and ODOT standards. All parking areas which contain ten (10) or more parking spaces, shall for every fifty (50) standard spaces, provide one ADA-accessible parking space that is constructed to building code standards, Wilsonville Code 9.000.

D. 5. Where possible, parking areas shall be designed to connect with parking areas on adjacent sites so as to eliminate the necessity of utilizing the public street for multiple accesses or cross movements. In addition, on-site parking shall be designed for efficient on-site circulation and parking.

E. 6. In all multi-family dwelling developments, there shall be sufficient areas established to provide for parking and storage of motorcycles, mopeds and
bicycles. Such areas shall be clearly defined and reserved for the exclusive use of these vehicles.

F. 7. On-street parking spaces, directly adjoining and on the same side of the street as the subject property, may be counted towards meeting the minimum off-street parking standards.

G. 8. Tables 5, below, shall be used to determine the minimum and maximum parking standards for various land uses. The minimum number of required parking spaces shown on Tables 5 shall be determined by rounding to the nearest whole parking space. For example, a use containing 500 square feet, in an area where the standard is one space for each 400 square feet of floor area, is required to provide one off-street parking space. If the same use contained more than 600 square feet, a second parking space would be required. [Amended by Ordinance No. 538, 2/21/02.] Structured parking and on-street parking are exempted from the parking maximums in Table 5.

H. Electrical Vehicle Charging Stations:
   1. Parking spaces designed to accommodate and provide one or more electric vehicle charging stations on site may be counted towards meeting the minimum off-street parking standards.
   2. Redevelopment of existing parking spaces to accommodate electric vehicle charging stations on site does not require approval through Class II Administrative Review or a Planned Development Review application.

(.04) Bicycle Parking:

A. Purpose: Bicycle parking is required for most use categories to provide safe and convenient places to park bicycles for short and long stays.
   1. Short-term bicycle parking is intended to encourage shoppers, customers, and other visitors to use bicycles by providing a convenient and readily accessible place to park bicycles.
   2. Long-term bicycle parking is intended to provide employees, students, residents, commuters, and others who generally stay at a site for several hours a weather-protected place to park bicycles.

BA. Required Bicycle Parking - General Provisions
   1. Required Bicycle Parking:
      a. The required minimum number of bicycle parking spaces for each use category is shown in Table 5, Parking Standards, below.
      b. A minimum of 50% of the bicycle parking spaces shall be provided as long-term bicycle parking in any of the following situations:
         i. When 10% or more of automobile vehicle parking is covered.
         ii. If more than four (4) bicycle parking spaces are required.
         iii. Multifamily residential development with nine or more units.
      c. Bicycle parking spaces are not required for accessory buildings. If a primary use is listed in Table 5, bicycle parking is not required for the accessory use.
      d. When there are two or more primary uses on a site, the required bicycle parking for the site is the sum of the required bicycle parking for the individual primary uses.

CB. Bicycle Parking Standards: Short-term Bicycle Parking
   1. Short-term bicycle parking encourages shoppers, customers, and other visitors to use bicycles by providing a convenient and readily accessible place to park bicycles.
2. **Short-term bicycle parking** - Required short-term bicycle parking shall meet the following standards:
   a. Provide lockers or racks that meet the standards of this section.
   b. Locate within 30 feet of the main entrance to the building or inside a building, in a location that is easily accessible for bicycles.
   c. If 10 or more spaces are required, then at least 50 percent of these shall be covered.
   d. Each space must be at least 2 feet by 6 feet in area and be accessible without moving another bicycle and must provide enough space between the rack and a building or other obstructions to use the rack properly.
   e. There must be an aisle at least 5 feet wide behind all required bicycle parking to allow room for bicycle maneuvering. Where the bicycle parking is adjacent to a sidewalk, the maneuvering area may extend into the right-of-way.

C. **Long-term Bicycle Parking**

1. Long-term bicycle parking provides employees, students, residents, commuters, and others who generally stay at a site for several hours a weather-protected place to park bicycles.

2. **Long-term bicycle parking** - Required long-term bicycle parking shall meet the following standards:
   a. Provide racks, storage rooms, or lockers in areas that are secure or monitored (e.g., visible to employees or monitored by security guards).
   b. Locate the space within 100 feet of the entrance that will be used by the intended users.
   c. At least 50 percent of the spaces shall be covered.

3. **Bicycle Lockers, Racks and Cover (Weather Protection):**
   a. Where required bicycle parking is provided in lockers, the lockers shall be securely anchored.
   b. Covered bicycle parking, as required by this section, shall be provided inside buildings, under roof overhangs or awnings, in bicycle lockers, or within or under other structures. Where required covered bicycle parking is not within a building or locker, the cover must be permanent and designed to protect the bicycle from rainfall and provide seven (7) foot minimum overhead clearance.
Note: In considering proposed waivers to the following standards, the City will consider the potential uses of the site and not just the uses that are currently proposed. For waivers to exceed the maximum standards, applicants shall bear the burden of proving that Metro, State, and federal clean air standards will not be violated.

### TABLE 5: PARKING STANDARDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE</th>
<th>PARKING MINIMUMS</th>
<th>PARKING MAXIMUMS</th>
<th>BICYCLE MINIMUMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Single and attached units and any apartments (9 or fewer units)</td>
<td>1 per D.U., except accessory dwelling units, which have no minimum.</td>
<td>No Limit</td>
<td>0 Apartments – Min. of 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(.045) Minimum Off-Street Loading Requirements:

A. Every building that is erected or structurally altered to increase the floor area, and which will require the receipt or distribution of materials or merchandise by truck or similar vehicle, shall provide off-street loading berths on the basis of minimum requirements as follows:

1. Commercial, industrial, and public utility uses which have a gross floor area of 5,000 square feet or more, shall provide truck loading or unloading berths in accordance with the following tables:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Square feet of Floor Area</th>
<th>Number of Berths Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 - 30,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000 - 100,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 and over</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Restaurants, office buildings, hotels, motels, hospitals and institutions, schools and colleges, public buildings, recreation or entertainment facilities, and any similar use which has a gross floor area of 30,000 square feet or more, shall provide off-street truck loading or unloading berths in accordance with the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Square feet of Floor Area</th>
<th>Number of Berths Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000 - 100,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 and over</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. A loading berth shall contain space twelve (12) feet wide, thirty-five (35) feet long, and have a height clearance of fourteen (14) feet. Where the vehicles generally used for loading and unloading exceed these dimensions, the required length of these berths shall be increased to accommodate the larger vehicles.

4. If loading space has been provided in connection with an existing use or is added to an existing use, the loading space shall not be eliminated if
elimination would result in less space than is required to adequately handle the needs of the particular use.

5. Off-street parking areas used to fulfill the requirements of this Ordinance shall not be used for loading and unloading operations except during periods of the day when not required to meet parking needs.

B Exceptions and Adjustments.

1. The Planning Director or Development Review Board may approve a loading area adjacent to or within a street right-of-way where it finds that loading and unloading operations:
   a. Are short in duration (i.e., less than one hour);
   b. Are infrequent (less than three operations daily);
   c. Do not obstruct traffic during peak traffic hours;
   d. Do not interfere with emergency response services or bicycle and pedestrian facilities; and
   e. Are acceptable to the applicable roadway authority.

(.06) Carpool and Vanpool Parking Requirements:

A. Carpool and vanpool parking spaces shall be identified for the following uses: new commercial and industrial developments with seventy-five (75) or more parking spaces, new institutional or public assembly uses, and transit park-and-ride facilities with fifty (50) or more parking spaces.

B. Of the total spaces available for employee, student, and commuter parking, at least five percent, but not fewer than two, shall be designated for exclusive carpool and vanpool parking.

B. Carpool and vanpool parking spaces shall be located closer to the main employee, student or commuter entrance than all other parking spaces with the exception of handicapped-ADA parking spaces.

C. Required carpool/vanpool spaces shall be clearly marked "Reserved - Carpool/Vanpool Only."

(.07) Parking Area Redevelopment:

The number of parking spaces may be reduced by up to 10% of the minimum required parking spaces for that use when a portion of the existing parking area is modified for the following:

A. To accommodate or provide transit-related amenities such as transit stops, pull-outs, shelters, and park and ride stations.

B. To accommodate and provide one or more electric vehicle charging stations.

Section 4.177. Street Improvement Standards.

Note: This section is expected to be revised after the completion of the Transportation Systems Plan.

This section contains the City’s requirements and standards for pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facility improvements to public streets, or within public easements. The purpose of this section is to ensure that development, including redevelopment, provides transportation facilities that are safe, convenient, and adequate in rough proportion to their impacts.
Except as specifically approved by the Development Review Board, all street and access improvements shall conform to the Transportation Systems Plan and the Public Works Standards, together with the following standards: [Amended by Ord. 682, 9/9/10] Development and related public facility improvements shall comply with the standards in this section, the Wilsonville Public Works Standards, and the Transportation System Plan, in rough proportion to the potential impacts of the development. Such improvements shall be provided at the time of development, in rough proportion to the potential impacts of the development, except as waived by the City Engineer for reasons of safety or traffic operations.

Street Design Standards

A. All street improvements and intersections shall conform to the Public Works Standards and shall provide for the continuation of streets through specific developments to adjoining properties or subdivisions.

1. Development shall be required to provide existing or future connections to adjacent sites through the use of access easements where applicable. Such easements shall be required in addition to required public street dedications as required in Section 4.236(.04).

B. The City Engineering Director shall make the final determination regarding right-of-way and street element widths using the ranges provided in Table x of the Transportation System Plan and the additional street design standards in the Public Works Standards. All streets shall be developed with curbs, utility strips and sidewalks on both sides; or a sidewalk on one side and a bike path on the other side.

1. Within a Planned Development the Development Review Board may approve a sidewalk on only one side. If the sidewalk is permitted on just one side of the street, the owners will be required to sign an agreement to an assessment in the future to construct the other sidewalk if the City Council decides it is necessary.

C. Rights-of-way.

1. Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy Building permits or as a part of the recordation of a final plat, the City shall require dedication of rights-of-way in accordance with the Street System Master Transportation Systems Plan. All dedications shall be recorded with the County Assessor's Office.

2. The City shall also require a waiver of remonstrance against formation of a local improvement district, and all non-remonstrances shall be recorded in the County Recorder’s Office as well as the City's Lien Docket, prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy Building Permit or as a part of the recordation of a final plat.

3. In order to allow for potential future widening, a special setback requirement shall be maintained adjacent to all arterial streets. The minimum setback shall be 55 feet from the centerline or 25 feet from the right-of-way designated on the Master Plan, whichever is greater.

D. Dead-end Streets. New dead-end streets or cul-de-sacs shall not exceed 200 feet in length, unless the adjoining land contains barriers such as existing buildings, railroads or freeways, or environmental constraints such as steep slopes, or major streams or rivers, that prevent future street extension and connection. A central landscaped
island with rainwater management and infiltration are encouraged in cul-de-sac design. No more than 25 dwelling units shall take access to a new dead-end or cul-de-sac street unless it is determined that the traffic impacts on adjacent streets will not exceed those from a development of 25 or fewer units. All other dimensional standards of dead-end streets shall be governed by the Public Works Standards. Notification that the street is planned for future extension shall be posted on the dead-end street. [Amended by Ord. # 674 11/16/09]

E. Access drives and travel lanes.

1. An access drive to any proposed development shall be designed to provide a clear travel lane free from any obstructions.
2. Access drive travel lanes shall be constructed with a hard surface capable of carrying a 23-ton load.
3. Secondary or emergency access lanes may be improved to a minimum 12 feet with an all-weather surface as approved by the Fire District. All fire lanes shall be dedicated easements.
4. Minimum access requirements shall be adjusted commensurate with the intended function of the site based on vehicle types and traffic generation.
5. Where access drives connect to the public right of way, construction within the right of way shall be in conformance to the Public Works Standards.

F. Corner or clear vision area.

1. A clear vision area which meets the Public Works Standards shall be maintained on each corner of property at the intersection of any two streets, a street and a railroad or a street and a driveway. However, the following items shall be exempt from meeting this requirement:
   a. Light and utility poles with a diameter less than 12 inches.
   b. Trees less than 6" d.b.h., approved as a part of the Stage II Site Design, or administrative review.
   c. Except as allowed by b., above, an existing tree, trimmed to the trunk, 10 feet above the curb.
   d. Official warning or street sign.
   e. Natural contours where the natural elevations are such that there can be no cross-visibility at the intersection and necessary excavation would result in an unreasonable hardship on the property owner or deteriorate the quality of the site.

G. Vertical clearance - a minimum clearance of 12 feet above the pavement surface shall be maintained over all streets and access drives.

H. Interim improvement standard. It is anticipated that all existing streets, except those in new subdivisions, will require complete reconstruction to support urban level traffic volumes. However, in most cases, existing and short-term projected traffic volumes do not warrant improvements to full Master Plan standards. Therefore, unless otherwise specified by the Development Review Board

Planning Commission, the following interim standards shall apply.

1. Arterials - 24 foot paved, with standard sub-base. Asphalt overlays are generally considered unacceptable, but may be considered as an interim improvement based on the recommendations of the City Engineer, regarding adequate structural quality to support an overlay.
2. Half-streets are generally considered unacceptable. However, where the Development Review Board finds it essential to allow for reasonable development, a half-street may be approved. Whenever a half-street improvement is approved, it shall conform to the requirements in the Public Works Standards:

3. When considered appropriate in conjunction with other anticipated or scheduled street improvements, the City Engineer may approve street improvements with a single asphalt lift. However, adequate provision must be made for interim storm drainage, pavement transitions at seams and the scheduling of the second lift through the Capital Improvements Plan.

[Section 4.177(.01) amended by Ord. 610, 5/1/06]

(.03) Sidewalks. Sidewalks shall be provided on the public street frontage of all development. Sidewalks shall generally be constructed within the dedicated public right-of-way, but may be located outside of the right-of-way within a public easement with the approval of the City Engineering Director.

A. Sidewalk widths shall include a minimum through zone of at least five feet. The through zone may be reduced pursuant to variance procedures in Section 4.196, a waiver pursuant to Section 4.118, or by authority of the City Engineer for reasons of traffic operations, efficiency, or safety.

B. Within a Planned Development the Development Review Board may approve a sidewalk on only one side. If the sidewalk is permitted on just one side of the street, the owners will be required to sign an agreement to an assessment in the future to construct the other sidewalk if the City Council decides it is necessary.

(.04) Bicycle Facilities. Bicycle facilities shall be provided to implement the Transportation System Plan, and may include on-street and off-street bike lanes, shared lanes, bike boulevards, and cycle tracks. The design of on-street bicycle facilities will vary according to the functional classification and the average daily traffic of the facility.

(.05) Multiuse Pathways. Pathways may be in addition to, or in lieu of, a public street. Paths that are in addition to a public street shall generally run parallel to that street, and shall be designed in accordance with the Public Works Standards or as specified by the City Engineering Director. Paths that are in lieu of a public street shall be considered in areas only where no other public street connection options are feasible, and are subject to the following standards.

A. Paths shall be located to provide a reasonably direct connection between likely pedestrian and bicyclist destinations. Additional standards relating to entry points, maximum length, visibility, and path lighting are provided in the Public Works Standards.

B. To ensure ongoing access to and maintenance of pedestrian/bicycle paths, the City Engineering Director will require dedication of the path to the public and acceptance of the path by the City as public right-of-way; or creation of a public access easement over the path.
(.06) Transit Improvements

A. Development on sites that are adjacent to or incorporate major transit streets shall provide improvements as described in this section to any bus stop located along the site’s frontage, unless waived by the Community Development Director/City Engineer for reasons of safety or traffic operations.

Transit facilities include bus stops, shelters, and related facilities. Required transit facility improvements may include the dedication of land or the provision of a public easement.

B. Development shall at a minimum provide:

1. Reasonably direct pedestrian connections, as defined by Section 4.154, between building entrances and the transit facility and between buildings on the site and streets adjoining transit stops.

32. Improvements at major transit stops. Improvements may include intersection or mid-block traffic management improvements to allow for pedestrian crossings at major transit stops.

C. Developments generating an average of 49 or more pm peak hour trips shall provide bus stop improvements per the Public Works Standards. Required improvements may include provision of benches, shelters, pedestrian lighting; or provision of an easement or dedication of land for transit facilities.

D. In addition to the requirements of 4.154.030.B.32, development generating more than 199 pm peak hour trips on major transit streets shall provide a bus pullout, curb extension, and intersection or mid-block traffic management improvements to allow for pedestrian crossings at major transit stops.

E. In addition to the requirements of 4.154.030.B. and C., development generating more than 500 pm peak-hour trips on major transit streets shall provide on-site circulation to accommodate transit service.

(.027) Residential Private Access Drives shall meet the following standards:

A. Residential Private Access Drives shall provide primary vehicular access to no more than four (4) dwelling units, excluding accessory dwelling units.

B. The design and construction of a Residential Private Access Drive shall ensure a useful lifespan and structural maintenance schedule comparable, as determined by the City Engineer or City’s Authorized Representative, to a local street constructed in conformance to current public works standards.

1. The design of residential private access drives shall be stamped by a professional engineer registered in the state of Oregon and shall be approved by the City Engineer or City’s Authorized Representative to ensure the above requirement is met.

2. Prior to issuing a certificate of occupancy for any residential dwelling unit whose primary vehicular access is from a Residential Private Access Drive the City Engineer or City’s Authorized Representative shall certify construction of the Residential Private Access Drive substantially conforms the design approved by the City Engineer or City’s Authorized Representative.

C. Residential Private Access Drives shall be named for addressing purposes. All Residential Private Access Drives shall use the suffix “Lane”, i.e. SW Oakview Lane.

D. Residential Private Access Drives shall meet or exceed the standards for access drives and travel lanes established in Subsection (.01) G. of this Section.

[Section 4.177(.02) added by Ord. 682, 9/1/10]
Access Drives and Travel Lanes
A. An access drive to any proposed development shall be designed to provide a clear travel lane free from any obstructions.
B. Access drive travel lanes shall be constructed with a hard surface capable of carrying a 23-ton load.
C. Secondary or emergency access lanes may be improved to a minimum 12 feet with an all-weather surface as approved by the Fire District. All fire lanes shall be dedicated easements.
D. Minimum access requirements shall be adjusted commensurate with the intended function of the site based on vehicle types and traffic generation.
E. Where access drives connect to the public right-of-way, construction within the right-of-way shall be in conformance to the Public Works Standards.

Approach and Driveway Development Standards. Approaches and Driveways and associated approaches shall conform to all of the following development standards:
A. The number of approaches on higher classification streets (e.g., collector and arterial streets) shall be minimized; where practicable, access shall be taken first from a lower classification street;
B. The City may limit the number or location of connections to a street, or impose access restrictions where the roadway authority requires mitigation to alleviate safety or traffic operations concerns;
C. The City may require a driveway to extend to one or more edges of a parcel and be designed to allow for future extension and inter-parcel circulation as adjacent properties develop. The City may also require the owner(s) of the subject site to record an access easement for future joint use of the approach and driveway as the adjacent property(ies) develop(s);
D. Where emergency vehicle access is required, approaches and driveways shall be designed and constructed to accommodate emergency vehicle apparatus and shall conform to applicable fire protection requirements. The City may restrict parking, require signage, or require other public safety improvements pursuant to the recommendations of an emergency service provider;
E. Driveways shall accommodate all projected vehicular traffic on-site without vehicles stacking or backing up onto a street;
F. Driveways shall be designed so that vehicle areas, including but not limited to drive-up and drive-through facilities and vehicle storage and service areas, do not obstruct any public right-of-way;
G. Approaches and driveways shall not be wider than necessary to safely accommodate projected peak hour trips and turning movements, and shall be designed to minimize crossing distances for pedestrians;
H. As it deems necessary for pedestrian safety, the City, in consultation with the roadway authority, may require traffic-calming features, such as speed tables, textured driveway surfaces, curb extensions, signage or traffic control devices, or other features, be installed on or in the vicinity of a site;
I. Approaches and driveways shall be located and designed to allow for safe maneuvering in and around loading areas, while avoiding conflicts with pedestrians, parking, landscaping, and buildings;
J. Where a proposed driveway crosses a culvert or drainage ditch, the City may require the developer to install a culvert extending under and beyond the edges of the driveway on both sides of it, pursuant applicable Public Works standards;

K. Except as otherwise required by the applicable roadway authority or waived by the City Engineer, temporary driveways providing access to a construction site or staging area shall be paved or graveled to prevent tracking of mud onto adjacent paved streets;

L. Unless constrained by topography, natural resources, rail lines, freeways, existing or planned or approved development, or easements or covenants, driveways proposed as part of a residential or mixed-use development shall meet local street spacing standards and shall be constructed to align with existing or planned streets, if the driveway:

1. Intersects with a public street that is controlled, or is to be controlled in the planning period, by a traffic signal;
2. Intersects with an existing or planned arterial or collector street; or
3. Would be an extension of an existing or planned local street, or of another major driveway.

(.10) Minimum street intersection spacing standards.

A. New streets shall intersect at existing street intersections so that centerlines are not offset. Where existing streets adjacent to a proposed development do not align properly, conditions shall be imposed on the development to provide for proper alignment.

B. Minimum and maximum intersection spacing standards are provided in Transportation System Plan Table x.

(.11) Exceptions and Adjustments. The City may approve adjustments to the spacing standards of subsections (.05) and (.06) above through a Class II process, or as a waiver per Section 4.118(0.3)A, where an existing connection to a City street does not meet the standards of the roadway authority, the proposed development moves in the direction of code compliance, and mitigation measures alleviate all traffic operations and safety concerns. Mitigation measures may include consolidated access (removal of one access), joint use driveways (more than one property uses same access), directional limitations (e.g., one-way), turning restrictions (e.g., right in/out only), or other mitigation.

Section 4.178. Sidewalk and Pathway Standards.

(.01) Sidewalks. All sidewalks shall be concrete and a minimum of five (5) feet in width, except where the walk is adjacent to commercial storefronts. In such cases, they shall be increased to a minimum of ten (10) feet in width. Sidewalk widths shall include a minimum through zone of at least five feet. The clear zone may be reduced pursuant to variance procedures in Section 4.196.

(.02) Pathways

A. Bicycle facilities shall be provided using a bicycle lane as the preferred facility design. Other facility designs described in the Public Works Standards shall only be
used if the bike lane standard cannot be constructed due to physical or financial constraints. The order of preference for bicycle facilities is:

1. Bike lane.
2. Shoulder bikeway.
3. Shared roadway.

B. Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities located within the public right-of-way or public easement shall be constructed in conformance with the Public Works Standards.

C. To increase safety, all street crossings shall be marked and should be designed with a change of pavement such as brick or exposed aggregate. Arterial crossings may be signalized at the discretion of the City Engineer.

D. All pathways shall be clearly posted with standard bikeway signs.

E. Pedestrian and equestrian trails may have a gravel or sawdust surface if not intended for all-weather use.

(.03) Bicycle and pedestrian paths shall be located to provide a reasonably direct connection between likely destinations. A reasonably direct connection is a route which minimizes out-of-direction travel considering terrain, physical barriers, and safety. The objective of this standard is to achieve the equivalent of a 1/4-mile grid of routes.

(.04) Pathway Clearance.

A. Vertical and horizontal clearance for bicycle and pedestrian paths is specified in the Public Works Standards. The clearance above equestrian trails shall be a minimum of ten feet. [Section 4.178 amended by Ord. 610, 5/1/06]

Section 4.197. Zone Changes and Amendments To This Code – Procedures.

(.01) The following procedure shall be followed in applying for an amendment to the text of this Chapter:

A. The Planning Commission shall conduct a public hearing on the proposed amendment at its earliest practicable meeting after it is proposed and shall, within forty (40) days after concluding the hearing, provide a report and recommendation to the City Council regarding the proposed amendment. The findings and recommendations of the Commission shall be adopted by resolution and shall be signed by the Chair of the Commission.

B. In recommending approval of a proposed text amendment, the Planning Commission shall, at a minimum, adopt findings relative to the following:

1. That the application was submitted in compliance with the procedures set forth in Section 4.008; and
2. The amendment substantially complies with all applicable goals, policies and objectives set forth in the Comprehensive Plan; and
3. The amendment does not materially conflict with, nor endanger, other provisions of the text of the Code; and
4. If applicable, the amendment is in compliance with applicable Statewide Land Use Planning Goals and related administrative rules; and
4. If applicable, the amendment is necessary to ensure that the City's Land Use and Development Ordinance complies with mandated requirements of State or Federal laws and/or statutes.
(.02) In recommending approval or denial of a proposed zone map amendment, the Planning Commission or Development Review Board shall at a minimum, adopt findings addressing the following criteria:

A. That the application before the Commission or Board was submitted in accordance with the procedures set forth in Section 4.008, Section 4.125 (.18)(B)(2) or, in the case of a Planned Development, Section 4.140; and [Amended by Ord 557, adopted 9/5/03]

B. That the proposed amendment is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan map designation and substantially complies with the applicable goals, policies and objectives, set forth in the Comprehensive Plan text; and

C. In the event that the subject property, or any portion thereof, is designated as "Residential" on the City's Comprehensive Plan Map; specific findings shall be made addressing substantial compliance with Implementation Measures 4.1.4.b, d, e, q, and x of Wilsonville's Comprehensive Plan text; and [Amended by Ordinance No. 538, 2/21/02.]

D. That the existing primary public facilities, i.e., roads and sidewalks, water, sewer and storm sewer are available and are of adequate size to serve the proposed development; or, that adequate facilities can be provided in conjunction with project development. The Planning Commission and Development Review Board shall utilize any and all means to insure that all primary facilities are available and are adequately sized; and

E. That the proposed development does not have a significant adverse effect upon Significant Resource Overlay Zone areas, an identified natural hazard, or an identified geologic hazard. When Significant Resource Overlay Zone areas or natural hazard, and/or geologic hazard are located on or abut the proposed development, the Planning Commission or Development Review Board shall use appropriate measures to mitigate and significantly reduce conflicts between the development and identified hazard or Significant Resource Overlay Zone and

F. That the applicant is committed to a development schedule demonstrating that development of the property is reasonably expected to commence within two (2) years of the initial approval of the zone change; and

G. That the proposed development and use(s) can be developed in compliance with the applicable development standards or appropriate conditions are attached that insure that the project development substantially conforms to the applicable development standards.

H. Adequate public facilities, services, and transportation networks are in place, or are planned to be provided concurrently with the development of the property. The applicant shall demonstrate compliance with the Transportation Planning Rule, specifically by addressing whether the proposed amendment has a significant effect on the transportation system pursuant to OAR 660-012-0060. If required, a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) shall be prepared pursuant to the requirements in Section 4.133.05.(01).
Section 4.236. General Requirements - Streets.

(.01) Conformity to the Master Plan or Map: Land divisions shall conform to and be in harmony with the Transportation Master Plan (Transportation Systems Plan), the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, the Parks and Recreation Master Plan, the Official Plan or Map and especially to the Master Street Plan.

(.02) Relation to Adjoining Street System.

[…]

(.03) All streets shall conform to the standards set forth in Section 4.177 and the block size requirements of the zone.

(.04) Creation of Easements: […]

(.05) Topography: […]

(.06) Reserve Strips: […]

(.07) Future Expansion of Street: When necessary to give access to, or permit a satisfactory future division of, adjoining land, streets shall be extended to the boundary of the land division and the resulting dead-end street may be approved without a turn-around. Reserve strips and street plugs shall be required to preserve the objective of street extension. Notification that the street is planned for future extension shall be posted on the stub street.
Commentary on Proposed TSP Code Amendments

April 2, 2013

The purpose of this document is to explain the changes proposed in the accompanying draft of amendments to the Development Code.

Administration (Chapter 4, Sections 4.000-4.035)

Section 4.001 Definitions.

Amendments are proposed to the following definitions:

- New definitions for terms introduced to the Code with this package of amendments: "major transit stop", "major transit street", "multiuse pathway", "bikeway - cycle track," and "through zone."
- Definition modifications are proposed for: "access control strip," as requested by the County surveyor.
- Deletion of "Bikeway - bike/pedestrian path," to be replaced with the "multiuse pathway or path" definition.

Section 4.005 Exclusions from Development Permit Requirement.

The State Transportation Planning Rule (OAR 660, Division 12) requires that local codes explicitly permit transportation facilities. Proposed text largely codifies existing City practice but ostensibly clarifies and simplifies the land use approval process by clarifying that all transportation improvements are allowed outright, without additional land use approval.


Proposed modifications to public notice requirements reflect current City practice. Proposed text ensures that other public agencies are provided notice of Class II Administrative Reviews and Quasi-Judicial Hearings, specifically agencies with jurisdiction over roadways. Necessary to comply with OAR 660-12-0045(1)(c).

Zoning (Chapter 4, Sections 4.100-4.141)
These proposed changes to the Village Zone street and access standards reflect standards and functional classifications proposed in the updated TSP.

Section 4.125(.09) Street and Access Improvement Standards

References to street classifications have been updated to coordinate with the TSP.

General Development Regulations (Chapter 4, Sections 4.154 – 4.199)

Section 4.154. (.01) On-site Pedestrian Access and Circulation. Related to (draft) Transportation Policies 1, 4, 9, 10, 16, 30, 35, 37, 38, 39, and 42

This section would require proposed new development to provide for pedestrian pathways through the development site, connecting to adjacent sidewalks and future phases of the development, as applicable. This increases the connectivity and viability of transportation options in the city. The proposed language is based on that from Oregon’s Model Development Code for Small Cities. The amendments would comply with Metro Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP) Title 1, Pedestrian System Design Sec 3.08.130C (on-site pedestrian systems).

Section 4.155. Parking, Loading and Bicycle Parking. Related to (draft) Transportation Policies 14, 37, and 42; also see Transportation Demand Management (TDM) in draft TSP Chapter 6

A proposed provision under (.03) Minimum and Maximum Off-Street Parking Requirements, the proposed policy would require that proposals that include parking lots larger than three acres provide street-like features along driveways, including curbs, sidewalks, street trees or planting strips, and bicycle routes in order to make large parking lots safer and more attractive to walk and/or bike around. A minor, more procedural amendment under this same subsection would exempt structured parking and on-street parking from the parking maximums in Table 5, Parking Standards. The amendments would comply with Metro RTFP Title 4, Parking Management Sec 3.08.410, and OAR 660-12-0045(4). Proposed new Subsections .03.H and 03.I address electric vehicle parking and motorcycle parking.

Section (.04) Bicycle Parking is a new section that borrows its purpose statement and bicycle parking standards from existing Village Zone requirements in the City code (Section 4.125.07.D). Based on City of Milwaukie code, 50% of the total required bicycle
parking spaces would be for “long-term” use under specified conditions, rather than having to provide individual requirements for the number of long-term spaces by use. Long-term bicycle parking is targeted for users such as employees and students, and designed to be secure, weather-protected, and located within a reasonable distance of the proposed use. The new bicycle parking standards in this section are industry standard, but absent in current City policy. In the past staff has been able to require that minimum number of bicycle parking spaces be provided, but unable to enforce if the racks are placed too close to a building or blocked by shopping cart storage.

(.05) Minimum Off-Street Loading Requirements

The current policy is revised (existing Section (.04), renumbered to (.05)) to include a new provision allowing the Planning Director or Development Review Board to approve on-street loading and unloading operations under certain circumstances. This adds some flexibility to the requirements and could allow approval of a proposal where the future use has limited needs for loading/unloading and where such activity in the public right-of-way would not interfere with the operations of the roadway. This allowance will likely be most relevant and useful in Town Center and mixed-use areas.

(.06) Carpool and Vanpool Parking Requirements

This new Section would require that there be parking spaces identified as reserved for employee, student, and commuter use for new commercial and industrial developments (those with 75 or more parking spaces), and new institutional or public assembly uses, and transit park-and-ride facilities (those with 50 or more parking spaces). A percentage of those parking spaces (no less than 2) should be reserved for exclusive carpool and vanpool parking. These proposed requirements include locating the carpool/vanpool spaces closest to the main employee, student or commuter entrance of the proposed building(s). This “preferential parking” is designed to more strongly support and promote carpooling and vanpooling. Note that the requirements only apply to larger employers or public assembly uses. The assumption is that the relatively small amount of vanpool or carpool spaces required could be accommodated without negatively impacting the number of spaces available for visitor parking. The language of this section is from model code for complying with state Transportation Planning Rule section 0045(4).

(.07) Parking Area Redevelopment
This new Section encourages addition of transit-related amenities and electric vehicle charging stations by allowing an outright reduction in the minimum required parking spaces (up to 10% reduction). This provision would allow modification of an existing lot. Transit-related site improvements should improve access to the site for transit users and increase transit usage, thereby reducing the need for parking spaces.

Section 4.177. Street Improvement Standards

Changes to this section make it clearer when the street improvement standards apply and include a reference in Section (.02) to street standards in the TSP. New sections (.03), (.04), and (.05) consist of existing requirements for sidewalks and pathways moved from Section 4.178. New Section (.06) Transit Improvements is a new set of requirements that implement the City's adopted Transit Master Plan implementation measures, as well as the RTFP and TPR.

New Sections (.09), (.10), and (.11) address approach and driveway development standards and street intersection spacing standards. They implement RTFP and State Transportation Planning Rule requirements related to access management. Section (.09) language is based on Oregon's Model Development Code for Small Cities. Access management seeks to balance accessibility, safety, and mobility; providing access to sites while limiting potential conflicts and traffic flow interruptions presented by vehicles that are slowing, stopping, and turning. New language also allows the City to approve exceptions or deviations from the driveway and spacing standards through Class II or waiver procedures in special situations.

The amendments would comply with Metro RTFP Title 1, Street System Design Sec 3.08.110B and Sec 3.08.110G, Transit System Design Sec 3.08.120B(2), and OAR 660-012-0045.

Section 4.178. Sidewalk and Pathway Standards.

The proposed deletion of text under this section is administrative. This section has been incorporated into Section 4.177.

Section 4.197. Zone Changes and Amendments To This Code – Procedures Related to (draft) Transportation Policy 17
Proposed additions to this section codify existing City practice, ensuring that findings of fact address applicable Statewide Land Use Planning Goals and related administrative rules, in particular the Transportation Planning Rule. This amendment is needed to comply with OAR 660-12-0060.

**Site Design Review (Chapter 4, Sections 4.400 – 4.450)**

**Section 4.236. General Requirements - Streets. Related to (draft) Transportation Policy 10**

Modifications under subsection (.07) Future Expansion of Street require posted notice on the stub street where a street is planned for future extension. Proposed language is similar to (new) Section 4.167(.04)(B) addressing street connectivity. Posting a stub street is a formal way of informing the community, in particular existing and future residents in the vicinity, that a connected street system is planned for this area. The amendment would comply with Metro RTFP Title 1, Street System Design Sec 3.08.110B.
Proposed Amendments
Wilsonville Comprehensive Plan
Draft April 3, 2013

PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES

TRANSPORTATION

... p. C-20

The Wilsonville Comprehensive Plan includes, as sub-elements of the Plan, the City’s Transportation Systems Plan (20013), the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan (2006) and the Transit Master Plan (2008). There are no airports or marine transportation facilities within the city. The City has adopted 1-Year and 5-Year Capital Improvement Plans which provide for the construction of transportation facilities, improvements and services necessary to support the City’s Transportation Systems Plan, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan and the Transit Master Plan.

... p. C-21

In the late 1990s, substantial public improvements were made to upgrade both interchanges. Ten years later, both interchanges again had capacity limitations. A major modernization project completed in 2012 reconstructed the I-5/Wilsonville Road interchange in 2010, following the City’s completion of improvements on Boones Ferry Road which connects to Wilsonville Road within the interchange management area. The I-5/Wilsonville Road project includes creating elevated bike/pedestrian pathways on both sides of the street, expansion of the travel way to eight lanes under the I-5 Bridge, and wider and longer on and off ramps.

Capacity limitations also existed at the 95th/Commerce Circle/Boones Ferry Road intersections. The planned improvements there within 2012 added an additional right-turn lane southbound off I-5 to Boones Ferry Road, and an additional left-turn lane from Boones Ferry Road to 95th Avenue, and an additional right-turn lane from 95th Avenue to Boones Ferry Road, as well as making Commerce Circle a right-in / right-out intersection with 95th Ave thereby minimizing congestion at this intersection.

The City has a network of streets which serve the east side or the west side, with only three connection points east–west across I-5. These are Wilsonville Road, Boeckman Road and Elligsen Road. The recent extension of Boeckman Road to Grahams Ferry Road has provided an alternative east-west route resulting in a reduction of the trip levels on both Wilsonville and Elligsen Roads.

April 3, 2013
City street standards require provision of bike lanes, bicycle facilities, and sidewalks on all new streets. Developments in areas without bike lanes, bicycle facilities, and sidewalks are required to provide them as part of the development of their site. The City also maintains a sidewalk infill fund for construction of missing sidewalk segments in older neighborhoods. The Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan provides greater detail about the existing system and its deficiencies and identifies planned improvements and financial resources.

Local and regional trails and community pathways traverse the community and connect neighborhoods with other destinations. The City is a partner in the 2013 Master Plan for the Ice Age Tonquin Trail, which will connect the communities of Tualatin, Sherwood, and Wilsonville.

The City operates a transit system, SMART, which provides local service, and connects with WES, Cherriots in Salem and Tri-Met in the Portland area. WES, the Westside Express Service Commuter Rail, operates during weekday commuter hours in the morning and evening, connecting Wilsonville with the Beaverton Transit Station and the MAX system. The Transit Master Plan provides greater detail about the existing system and its deficiencies and identifies planned improvements and financial resources.

...
Attachment C

Implementation Measure 3.2.1.b. Provide safe and efficient multi-modal travel between the connecting roadways (and the surface street network, if applicable).

Policy 3.2.2 To provide for a mix of planned transportation facilities and services that are sufficient to ensure economic, sustainable and environmentally sound mobility and accessibility for all residents and employees in the city.

Policy 3.2.3 If adequate regional transportation services, including I-5 interchange modification or additions, and high capacity public transportation, cannot be provided, then the City shall reevaluate and reduce the level of development and/or timing of development anticipated by other elements of this Plan. Such reductions shall be consistent with the capacity of the transportation system at the time of re-evaluation.

Goal 3.3 To achieve adopted standards for increasing transportation choices and reducing reliance on the automobile by changing land use patterns and transportation systems so that walking, cycling and use of transit are highly convenient and so that, on balance, people need to and are likely to drive less than they do today.

Policy 3.3.1 The City shall adopt standards for provide facilities that allow people to reduce reliance on single occupant automobile use, particularly during peak periods.

Implementation Measure 3.3.1.a. Improve the balance between housing, employment, and commercial activities within the City so more people are able to live and work within Wilsonville, thereby reducing cross-jurisdictional commuting, in order to reduce commuting.

Implementation Measure 3.3.1.b. Increase densities and intensities of development in or near the Town Center area and in other locations where transportation systems can meet those needs.

Implementation Measure 3.3.1.c. Plan for increased access to alternative modes of transportation, such as bicycling, transit and walking.

Implementation Measure 3.3.1.d. Continue use of the Planned Development/ Master Plan process to encourage developments that make it more convenient for people to use transit, to walk, to bicycle, and to drive less to meet daily needs.

Implementation Measure 3.3.1.e. Take steps to improve connectivity between existing neighborhoods and between residential areas and traffic generator locations. Work to provide more and better options for travel from one side of the freeway, the railroad, and the Willamette River to the other.

Comment [MK4]: Merged with 3.2.1.a in TSP to become TSP policy 1.

Comment [MK5]: Not in TSP, similar to proposed TSP Policy 2 above, which is based on CP Policy 3.5.1

Comment [MK6]: Not in TSP verbatim, but idea is captured in Agency Coordination and IMA section

Comment [MK7]: Goals not included in the TSP

Comment [MK8]: TSP policy 37

Comment [MK9]: TSP measure 37.a

Comment [MK10]: TSP measure 37.b

Comment [MK11]: Not in TSP - policy intent captured in other TSP implementation measures.

Comment [MK12]: TSP measure 37.c

Comment [MK13]: TSP measure 37.d
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3.1.f.</td>
<td><strong>Strongly encourage Advocate for TriMet to provide full day and Saturday service for WES.</strong></td>
<td>[MK14]: TSP measure 36.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.1.g.</td>
<td><strong>Continue to support Advocate for the extension of WES to Salem.</strong></td>
<td>[MK15]: TSP measure 36.b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.1.h.</td>
<td><strong>Continue to comply with Metro parking standards. Consider reducing parking requirements where it can be shown that transit and/or bicycle pedestrian access will reduce vehicular trips.</strong></td>
<td>[MK16]: TSP measure 37.f</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy 3.3.2** The City shall work to improve accessibility for all citizens to all modes of transportation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3.2.a.</td>
<td>The City’s Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan identifies the general alignment of primary routes for pedestrian and bicycle travel. It has been designed to provide connections between residential neighborhoods and major commercial, industrial and recreational activity centers throughout the City. The system has been coordinated with pathways planned in adjacent jurisdictions to allow for regional travel. Provide pedestrian and bicycle connections between residential neighborhoods and major commercial, industrial, and recreational activity centers throughout the city, as shown in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. Coordinate the system of pathways planned by adjacent jurisdictions to allow for regional travel.</td>
<td>[MK18]: TSP Policy 4.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.2.b.</td>
<td>City street standards require concrete sidewalks will be provided on both sides of all streets. This standard can be unless waived only in cases where alternative provisions are found to adequately address pedestrian needs.</td>
<td>[MK19]: Not in TSP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.2.c.</td>
<td>Transportation facilities shall be ADA-compliant.</td>
<td>[MK20]: Not in TSP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.2.d.</td>
<td>The City will prepare an implementation schedule and continue to provide funding for infilling gaps in the sidewalk system. Fill gaps in the existing sidewalk and off-street pathway systems to create a continuous network of safe and accessible bicycle and pedestrian facilities.</td>
<td>[MK21]: TSP measure 4.b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal 3.4:** To facilitate the safe, efficient and economic flow of freight and other goods and services within the city and the region.

**Policy 3.4.1** The City will continue to upgrade and/or complete the street network on the west side of I-5, including in the Coffee Creek and Basalt Creek areas, to serve the warehousing, distribution, and other industrial uses located there.

Comment [MK22]: Goals not included in TSP

Comment [MK23]: TSP Policy 27
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Implementation Measure 3.4.1.a Where the City Council officially designates truck routes, these streets shall be developed to arterial street construction standards and be posted as truck routes.

Policy 3.4.2 The City will work with ODOT, Metro, and neighboring communities to maintain the capacity of I-5 through a variety of techniques, including requirements for concurrency, continued development of a local street network within and connecting cities along I-5, access management, and completion of targeted improvements on I-5 such as auxiliary lanes, improvements at interchanges, etc.

Implementation Measure 3.4.2.a Consistent with the City’s policy that needed public facilities and services are provided in advance of, or concurrently with, development, proposed land use changes within the I-5/Wilsonville Road IMA shall be consistent with planned future transportation projects.

Goal 3.5 To protect existing and planned transportation facilities, corridors and sites for their identified functions, including protection of the function and operation of the I-5/Wilsonville Road Interchange and the I-5/Elligen Road Interchange, together with the local street network within the Interchange Areas.

Policy 3.5.1 The Transportation Systems Plan (TSP) shall establish policies and implementation measures to fulfill the City’s transportation needs through the Year 2020, provides details to guide transportation investment for the future and determine how land use and transportation needs can be balanced to bring the most benefit to the city. Develop and maintain a transportation system that balances land use and transportation needs in a manner that enhances the livability and economic vitality of the city.

Implementation Measure 3.5.1.a The Transportation Systems Plan shall be used to establish the design standards for each arterial and major collector street. The conceptual location of proposed new major streets will also be identified. However, actual alignments may vary from the conceptual alignments based on detailed engineering specifications, design considerations, and consideration of the impacts of the road alignments on neighborhoods and natural resources, provided that the intended function of the street is not altered. Establish and maintain design standards for each arterial and major collector street, in accordance with the Functional Street Classification System. The conceptual location of proposed new major streets identified in the TSP will be refined based on detailed engineering specifications, design considerations, and consideration of local impacts.

Implementation Measure 3.5.1.b While local residential streets are considered a part of the Transportation Systems Plan, they are not typically shown in detail in the Plan. The alignment of local streets shall be evaluated on a project-by-project basis, but must function in coordination with the overall purposes of the Transportation Systems Plan. Other streets not shown on the

Comment [MK24]: Not included in TSP, updated TSP will include a system of freight routes
Comment [MK25]: TSP policy 18
Comment [MK26]: TSP policy 19.a
Comment [MK27]: Goals not included in TSP
Comment [MK28]: TSP policy 2
Comment [MK29]: TSP measure 2.a and 2b
Comment [MK30]: TSP measure 2.c
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Plan may also be considered, if determined necessary for safe and convenient traffic circulation or increased connectivity. Evaluate the alignment and design of local streets on a project-by-project basis in coordination with the overall purposes of the TSP.

Implementation Measure 3.5.1.c. The Transportation Systems Plan shall be used to establish the Functional Street Classification System and the physical design characteristics (right-of-way and pavement width, curbs, sidewalks, etc.) of the various street classifications.

Implementation Measure 3.5.1.d. All streets shall be designed and developed in accordance with the Transportation Systems Plan and street standards, except that The Development Review Board or City Council may approve specific modifications through the planned development process. Such modifications shall be made in consideration of existing traffic volumes and the cumulative traffic generation potential of the land uses being developed. At a minimum, all streets must be developed with sufficient pavement width to provide two lanes of traffic, unless designated for one-way traffic flow. However, adequate emergency vehicle access and circulation must be provided.

Implementation Measure 3.5.1.e. All arterial and collector streets shall be dedicated public streets. To insure adequate protection of potential future right-of-way needs, minimum setbacks shall be retained adjacent to arterial streets. In addition, to maintain efficient traffic flows, intersections with arterial streets shall be minimized, and property owners shall be encouraged and, where feasible, may be required to consolidate driveways.

Policy 3.5.2 Review all land use/development proposals with regards to consistency with the TSP transportation impacts.

Implementation Measure 3.5.2.a. All development proposals shall be required to provide for a transportation impact analysis by payment to the City for completion of such study by the city’s traffic consultant unless specifically waived by the City’s Community Development Director because the scale of the proposed development will have very limited impacts.

Implementation Measure 3.5.2.b. Through the Planned Development process, local streets may be approved as private streets, provided that adequate emergency access is available and that appropriate deed restrictions, homeowners’ association requirements, etc. are established to assure proper maintenance. The City may approve local private streets through the Planned Development process, provided that adequate emergency access is available and that proper maintenance by private entities is ensured.

Implementation Measure 3.5.2.c. Any proposed change to the Comprehensive Plan or Zoning Maps or existing zoning that would result in additional trips above that allowed under the city’s concurrency policies may be denied unless mitigation measures are identified and provided.
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Policy 3.5.3 Provide for an adequate system of local roads and streets for access and circulation within I-5 Interchange Management Areas that minimize local traffic through the interchanges and on the interchange cross roads.

I-5/Wilsonville Road IMA

Implementation Measure 3.5.3.a The City will require future development to plan for and develop local roadway connections consistent with the I-5/Wilsonville Road IAMP as part of the development permit approval process.

Implementation Measure 3.5.3.b Bicycle and pedestrian connections within the IMA will be required for new development consistent with the City’s Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.

Implementation Measure 3.5.3.e System operational improvements, including signal synchronization, transportation demand management measures and incident management shall be implemented within the vicinity of the interchange to maximize the efficiency of the local street network and minimize the impact of local traffic on the interchange.

Implementation Measure 3.5.3.d The City will require future development to adhere to access management spacing standards for private and public approaches on statewide highways as adopted in the Wilsonville Road IAMP.

Implementation Measure 3.5.3.e The City will approve development proposals in the I-5/Wilsonville Road Interchange Management Area (IMA) only after it is demonstrated that proposed access and local circulation are consistent with the Access Management Plan in the I-5/Wilsonville Road IAMP.

Implementation Measure 3.5.3.f Ensure that future changes to the planned land use system are consistent with protecting the long-term function of the interchange and the surface street system.

Implementation Measure 3.5.3.g Any proposed change to the Comprehensive Plan Map or existing zoning that would result in additional trips above that allowed under the current zoning and assumed in the I-5/Wilsonville Road IAMP must include a review of transportation impacts consistent with OAR 660-12-0060.

Implementation Measure 3.5.3.h The City will provide notice to ODOT for any land use actions proposed within the I-5/Wilsonville Road IAMP Overlay Zone.

I-5/Elligsen Road Interchange

Implementation Measure 3.5.3.i The City will require future development to adhere to access management spacing standards for private and public approaches on statewide highways as required by the Oregon Highway Plan.
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Implementation Measure 3.5.3.j. Ensure that future changes to the planned land use system are consistent with protecting the long-term function of the interchange and the surface street system.

Implementation Measure 3.5.3.k. Bicycle and pedestrian connections within the Interchange Area will be required for new development consistent with the City’s Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.

Implementation Measure 3.5.3.l. System operational improvements, including signal synchronization, transportation demand management measures and incident management shall be implemented within the vicinity of the interchange to maximize the efficiency of the local street network and minimize the impact of local traffic on the interchange.

Goal 3.6 To provide for the construction and implementation of transportation facilities, improvements and services necessary to support the TSP, the Transit Master Plan and the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan.

Policy 3.6.1 The City is responsible for will planning, scheduling, and coordinating implementation of all street improvements through the ongoing five-year Capital Improvements Plan. A priority is given to eliminating existing deficiencies and in upgrading the structural quality of the existing arterial system.

Implementation Measure 3.6.1.a. Complete the major street system improvements shown in the Transportation Systems Plan. The City may not be able to finance all of these improvements. Some may be financed by other entities, or a combination of public and private funds.

Implementation Measure 3.6.1.b. Maintenance of the developed City Street System is a public responsibility. The City shall coordinate routine and necessary maintenance with the appropriate State or County agencies.

Policy 3.6.2 Require each individual development shall be responsible for providing all collector and local streets. However, there may be cases where collector streets are found to unless the benefit to the entire community to a degree that warrants public participation in funding those collector streets.

Goal 3.7 To maintain a transportation financing program for the construction and implementation of transportation facilities, improvements and services necessary to support the TSP, the Transit Master Plan and the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan.
Policy 3.7.1  The City is responsible for planning, scheduling, and coordinating all street improvements through the on-going Capital Improvements Plan. A priority is given to eliminating existing deficiencies and in upgrading the structural quality of the existing arterial system.

Policy 3.7.2  To ensure development of an adequate street system, the City shall collect a Systems Development Charge as development occurs. Funds collected shall be allocated through the Capital Improvements Plan as needed to provide extra capacity service.

Goal 3.8:  To maintain coordination with neighboring cities, counties, Metro, ODOT local businesses, residents and transportation service providers regarding transportation planning and implementation.

Policy 3.8.1  The City shall continue to work with the State, Metro, Clackamas and Washington Counties and adjacent jurisdictions to develop and implement a Regional Transportation Plan that is complementary to and supportive of the City's Plan while addressing regional concerns. The City expects a reciprocal commitment from the other agencies. This policy recognizes that there is a need for a collective and cooperative commitment from all affected agencies to solve existing and future transportation problems. The City will do its part to minimize transportation conflicts, but it must also have the support of County, regional, State and Federal agencies to effectively implement this Plan.

Implementation Measure 3.8.1.a  The City shall actively encourage the State to provide improvements to regional transportation facilities which, due to inadequate carrying capacities, frustrate implementation of the City's Transportation Plan. The City shall advocate for the State, Metro, and Counties to improve regional transportation facilities which, due to inadequate carrying capacities, limits frustrate implementation of the City's Transportation Plan.
Wilsonville Transportation Policies: Existing and Proposed

*Updated: April 2013*

The following table presents the draft Transportation policies in the context of existing adopted Wilsonville policy direction.

- “Existing Adopted Policies” = Verbatim existing adopted policy.
- “Source” = Source of the existing adopted policy, or source of new policy (i.e., outcome of 2012 TSP planning process, Metro requirement, etc.).
- “Proposed 2013 Policies” = Proposed updated policies. Underline / strikeout notations reflect editing to the existing policies in the first column.
- “Related Goals” = List of related proposed Transportation Goals that support the proposed policy.
- All existing transportation policies that are not proposed to be included in the 2013 TSP are listed at the end.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>System Design</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 1.</td>
<td>To provide for safe and efficient vehicular, transit, pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation.</td>
<td>Policy 3.2.1.a, Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element (updated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 1.a.</td>
<td>New; outcome of Planning Commission discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 2.</td>
<td>The Transportation Systems Plan (TSP) shall establish policies and implementation measures to fulfill the City’s transportation needs through the Year 2020, provides details to guide transportation investment for the future and determine how land use and transportation needs can be balanced to bring the most benefit</td>
<td>Policy 3.5.1, Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element (same concept, updated to eliminate unnecessary information)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 2.a</td>
<td>The Transportation Systems Plan shall be used to establish the design standards for each arterial and major collector street. The conceptual location of proposed new major streets will also be identified. However, actual alignments may vary from the conceptual alignments based on detailed engineering specifications, design considerations, and consideration of the impacts of the road alignments on neighborhoods and natural resources, provided that the intended function of the street is not altered.</td>
<td>Implementation Measure 3.5.1.a.; policy updated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 2.b</td>
<td>See above.</td>
<td>Modified language from Implementation Measure 3.5.1.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 2.c</td>
<td>While local residential streets are considered a part of the Transportation Systems Plan, they are not typically shown in detail in the Plan. The alignment of local streets shall be evaluated on a project-by-project basis, but must function in coordination with the overall purposes of the Transportation Systems Plan. Other streets not shown on the Plan may also be considered, if determined necessary for safe and convenient traffic circulation or increased connectivity.</td>
<td>Implementation Measure 3.5.1.b.; updated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 2.d</td>
<td>All arterial and collector streets shall be dedicated public streets. To insure adequate protection of potential future right-of-way needs, minimum setbacks shall be retained adjacent to arterial streets. In addition, to</td>
<td>Implementation Measure 3.5.1.e.; deleted text covered in System Management policies and/or has been implemented in code or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maintain efficient traffic flows, intersections with arterial streets shall be minimized, and property owners shall be encouraged and, where feasible, may be required to consolidate driveways.</td>
<td><em>public works standards.</em></td>
<td>adjacent to arterial streets. In addition, to maintain efficient traffic flows, intersections with arterial streets shall be minimized, and property owners shall be encouraged and, where feasible, may be required to consolidate driveways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td><em>New concept.</em></td>
<td>Support the use of alternative fuels by providing, or encouraging the provision of, needed infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 3.a.</td>
<td><em>New.</em></td>
<td>Facilitate private sector exploration of alternative fuel technologies, including shared use of compressed natural gas fueling stations, and electric vehicle charging stations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td><em>Policy 3.3.2, Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element (same concept, updated for clarity/conciseness)</em></td>
<td>Provide a robust transportation system that provides all members of the community access to multiple travel mode choices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 4.a</td>
<td><em>Implementation Measure 3.3.2.a.; updated.</em></td>
<td>Provide pedestrian and bicycle connections between residential neighborhoods and major commercial, industrial, and recreational activity centers throughout the city, as shown in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. Coordinate the system of pathways planned by adjacent jurisdictions to allow for regional travel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 4.b</td>
<td><em>Implementation Measure 3.3.2.d.; updated.</em></td>
<td>Fill gaps in the existing sidewalk and off-street pathway systems to create a continuous network of safe and accessible bicycle and pedestrian.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Design the City street system per the street standards set forth in this TSP and to meet (LOS) D, which is the standard in the City. As may be approved by the City Council, possible exceptions to the LOS D standard are a change to LOS E on Boones Ferry Road and/or Elligsen Road, and on Wilsonville Road between and including the intersections with Boones Ferry Road and Town Center Loop West. Other capacity improvements intended to allow continued development without exceeding LOS E may also be approved by the City Council in permitted locations.</td>
<td>Policy 4.1.1, 2003 TSP; policy updated for clarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Evaluate and minimize the environmental impacts of all new public road projects.</td>
<td>Policy 4.3.1, 2003 TSP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>The City shall prioritize the implementation of Low Impact Development techniques and habitat-friendly development practices throughout the City for new development, redevelopment, and retrofitting existing development. The City shall incorporate Low Impact Development techniques into all new street and public works improvements as practicable.</td>
<td>Policy LID-1, specifically measure LID-1c, 2012 Stormwater Master Plan. ¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td>New policy, needed to comply with RTFP, Title 2, Transportation Needs Sec 3.08.210.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Complies with RTFP, Title 1, Street System Design Sec 3.08.110A, B, and E.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>identify targets and improvements to meet the specific needs of these populations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>New policy, from Planning Commission discussion.</strong> Enhance transportation connections and choices in and between all parts of the city as a means for preserving the function and capacity of the existing system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connectivity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Connect the existing motor vehicle system within the City and across Interstate 5 (I-5) where appropriate. All connections shall be evaluated for their impacts to future operations of the City’s road network.</td>
<td><strong>Policy 4.1.4, 2003 TSP, updated to address all modes. Similar to Comp Plan Implementation Measures 3.3.1.e and 3.3.2.a.</strong> Add system connections for all modes throughout the city’s transportation system to improve access between neighborhoods, serve new development, and manage system performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 10.a</td>
<td><strong>New. Outcome of community involvement process.</strong></td>
<td>Promote the concept of a “walkable neighborhood” when advising developers and other agencies to ensure that logical connections are made to activity centers (e.g., schools, retail, and parks), and that such destinations can be reached on foot or by bicycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 10.b</td>
<td><strong>New; Needed to meet RTFP, Title 1, Street System Design Sec 3.08.110E</strong></td>
<td>Where street connections are not possible, provide bicycle and pedestrian linkages to connect neighborhoods with each other and with surrounding destinations, except if prevented by physical barriers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 10.c</td>
<td><strong>New; outcome of Planning Commission discussion</strong></td>
<td><strong>Where streets lack pedestrian and bicycle facilities, explore opportunities to fill these gaps.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2 Complies with Street System Design Sec 3.08.110C, D, E, F, and G; Title 1, Transit System Design Sec 3.08.120A; Title 1, Pedestrian System Design Sec 3.08.130A; Title 1, Bicycle System Design Sec 3.08.140; Title 1, Freight System Design Sec 3.08.150; Title 2, Sec 3.08.220 Transportation Solutions, RTFP, Title 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Design a transportation system that accounts for adjacent land uses, including accessibility and access management.</td>
<td>Policy 3.2, 2003 TSP</td>
<td>Manage the transportation system to improve reliability and maximize efficient use of existing facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 11.a</td>
<td><strong>New solution.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Continue to implement Transportation Demand Management measures through the South Metro Area Regional Transit's SMART Options Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 11.b</td>
<td><strong>New.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manage access to improve safety and mobility in the city by applying access spacing standards, limiting access on arterials and at key identified intersections, and by preparing access management plans for interchanges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Develop a system of signal coordination and tie in with the I-5 ITS system providing a system of integrated parallel arterials and collectors.</td>
<td>Policy 4.1.6, 2003 TSP, updated to reflect more current regional coordinating plan.</td>
<td>Implement Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) improvements as identified in the Clackamas County ITS Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>New policy needed to address the regional nature of implementing transportation system management and operations (TSMO) on arterials and highways. Similar to CP goal 3.8.</td>
<td><strong>For more background see Solutions Analysis and Proposed Funding Program Technical Memorandum, Improvement Priorities, p. 3</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Complies with RTFP, Title 1, Transportation System Management and Operations Sec 3.08.160; Title 2, Transportation Needs Sec 3.08.210; Title 2, Performance Targets and Standards Sec 3.08.230; Title 1, Transportation System Management and Operations Sec 3.08.160; Title 2, Sec 3.08.220 Transportation Solutions</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>RTFP, Title 2, Performance Targets and Standards Sec 3.08.230. Solutions Analysis and Proposed Funding Program Technical Memorandum, Transportation Demand Management (TDM) p. 9-10.</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>RTFP, Title 1, Transportation System Management and Operations Sec 3.08.160.</strong></td>
<td>Coordinate with Clackamas County, Washington County, and the Oregon Department of Transportation to implement system management and operations strategies on arterials and highways.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On- and off-street parking facilities are part of the transportation system, and will be managed and regulated to ensure sufficient parking is provided, maximize efficiency, minimize impacts to traffic in the right-of-way, and reduce environmental impacts. Over time as new development is planned in the Town Center, area and the Westside Express Service (WES) commuter rail station area, the City will work with property owners to prepare parking management plans that manage supply and demand for parking areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Land Development Coordination

| Measure 15.a. | Review all land use/development proposals with regards to consistency with the TSP transportation impacts. |
|---|
| Policy 3.5.2, Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element; updated. |
| Review all land use/development proposals with regards to for consistency with the TSP transportation impacts. |
| Implementation Measure 3.5.2.b.; updated. |
| The City may approve local private streets through the Planned Development process, provided that adequate emergency access is available and that appropriate deed restrictions, homeowners' association requirements, etc. are established to insure proper maintenance. |

| Measure 15.b. | Any proposed change to the Comprehensive Plan Map or existing zoning that would result in additional trips above that allowed under the city’s concurrency policies may be denied unless mitigation measures are identified and provided. |
|---|
| Implementation Measure 3.5.2.c. |
| Any proposed change to the Comprehensive Plan or Zoning Maps or existing zoning that would result in additional trips above that allowed under the City’s concurrency policies may be denied unless mitigation measures are identified and provided. |

---

7 RTFP, Title 2, Performance Targets and Standards Sec 3.08.230; Title 4, Parking Management Sec 3.08.410. Solutions Analysis and Proposed Funding Program Technical Memorandum, Transportation Demand Management (TDM), p. 11.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.c.</td>
<td>New; complies with state OAR 660-12-0060 (the Transportation Planning Rule)</td>
<td>The City will consider only improvements listed in the Financially Constrained funding scenario of the Regional Transportation Plan, and/or in the City’s Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), in determining the planned capacity, function and level of service of transportation facilities and services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.d.</td>
<td>All streets shall be designed and developed in accordance with the Transportation Systems Plan and street standards, except that the Development Review Board or City Council may approve specific modifications through the planned development process. Such modifications shall be made in consideration of existing traffic volumes and the cumulative traffic generation potential of the land uses being developed. At a minimum, all streets must be developed with sufficient pavement width to provide two lanes of traffic, unless designated for one-way traffic flow. However, adequate emergency vehicle access and circulation must be provided.</td>
<td>Implementation Measure 3.5.1.d.; updated.</td>
<td>All streets shall be designed and developed in accordance with the Transportation Systems Plan and street standards, except that the Development Review Board or City Council may approve specific street design and alignment modifications through the planned development process. Such modifications shall be made in consideration of existing traffic volumes and the cumulative traffic generation potential of the land uses being developed. At a minimum, all streets must be developed with sufficient pavement width to provide two lanes of traffic, unless designated for one-way traffic flow. However, adequate emergency vehicle access and circulation must be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Promote land use patterns and development standards that support alternatives to the single-occupant vehicle and reduce reliance on the</td>
<td>2003 TSP Policy 8.1.1; related to Policy 3, 2008 Transit Master Plan.</td>
<td>Ensure that new development and redevelopment provide connections to transit streets and facilities, providing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

8 RTFP, Title 1, Transit System Design Sec 3.08.120A and B; Title 1, Pedestrian System Design Sec 3.08.130A and B; Note: define transit streets in TSP and code.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>automobile.</td>
<td></td>
<td>protected street crossings and bus stop amenities, if needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Agency Coordination**

17. The City shall continue to work with the State, Metro, Clackamas and Washington Counties, and adjacent jurisdictions to develop and implement a Regional Transportation Plan that is complementary to and supportive of the City's Plan while addressing regional concerns. The City expects a reciprocal commitment from the other agencies. This policy recognizes that there is a need for a collective and cooperative commitment from all affected agencies to solve existing and future transportation problems. The City will do its part to minimize transportation conflicts, but it must also have the support of County, regional, State and Federal agencies to effectively implement this Plan.

**Policy 3.8.1, Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element.**

17.a. The City shall actively encourage the State to provide improvements to regional transportation facilities which, due to inadequate carrying capacities, frustrate implementation of the City's Transportation Plan.

**Implementation Measure 3.8.1.a.; updated.**

18. The City will work with ODOT, Metro and neighboring communities to maintain the capacity of I-5 through a variety of techniques, including requirements for concurrency.

**Policy 3.4.2, Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element.**

The City will continue to work with ODOT, Metro, Clackamas and Washington Counties, and adjacent jurisdictions and transit agencies to develop and implement a Regional Transportation Plan that is complementary to and supportive of the City's Plan while addressing regional concerns. The City expects a reciprocal commitment from the other agencies. This policy recognizes that there is a need for a collective and cooperative commitment from all affected agencies to solve existing and future transportation problems. The City will do its part to minimize transportation conflicts, but it must also have the support of County, regional, State and Federal agencies to effectively implement this Plan.

The City shall advocate for the State, Metro, and Counties to improve regional transportation facilities which, due to inadequate carrying capacities, frustrate implementation of the City's Transportation Plan.

The City will work with ODOT, TriMet, Cherriots, and neighboring communities to maintain the capacity of I-5 through a variety of techniques, including...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Existing Adopted Policies/ Impl. Msrs.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Source</strong></th>
<th><strong>Proposed 2013 Policies/ Impl. Msrs.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>continued development of a local street network within and connecting cities along I-5, access management, and completion of targeted improvements on I-5 such as auxiliary lanes, improvements at interchanges, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>requirements for concurrency, transit connections, continued development of a local street network within and connecting cities along I-5, access management, and completion of targeted improvements on I-5 such as auxiliary lanes, improvements at interchanges, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19.</strong></td>
<td>Actively encourage the Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration, Oregon Department of Transportation, and Metro to provide improvements to regional transportation facilities.</td>
<td><strong>Policy 7.1.1, 2003 TSP.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measure 19.a</strong></td>
<td>Consistent with the city’s policy that needed public facilities and services are provided in advance of, or concurrently with, development, proposed land use changes within the I-5/Wilsonville Road IMA shall be consistent with planned future transportation projects.</td>
<td><strong>Implementation Measure 3.4.2.a.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measure 19.b</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>New; outcome of Planning Commission discussion.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Measure 19.c** | | **New; outcome of Planning Commission discussion.** | The City will collaborate with Metro and surrounding jurisdictions to plan, and advocate for completion of, trails that link Wilsonville with neighboring jurisdictions as identified on the Planning Commission - April 10, 2013 TSP Code Amendments Page 48 of 64
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>New. Related to Basalt Creek Transportation Refinement Plan.</td>
<td>Work with neighboring jurisdictions to plan, fund, and implement a phased transportation network that serves southwest employment area growth while reserving I-5 interchange capacity for access to and from Wilsonville destinations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Recognize the Aurora State Airport as a component of the state’s transportation system and an economic asset to Wilsonville, while advocating that any expansion of the airport to consider potential impacts (e.g., noise, pollution, and safety) to Wilsonville neighborhoods, area roadways, I-5 interchanges, agricultural operations, and the environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goods Movement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Provide an adequate motor vehicle system that serves commercial vehicle/truck traffic to and from land uses requiring the use of commercial vehicles/trucks.</th>
<th>Existing Policy 4.2.2, 2003 TSP⁹</th>
<th>Provide an adequate motor vehicle system that serves commercial vehicle/truck traffic to and from the land uses they serve requiring the use of commercial vehicles/trucks.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>New.</td>
<td>Consider the requirements for truck movement when designing all improvements in the public right of way on designated truck routes. Requirements include turn radii, sight distance, lane widths, turn pocket lengths, and pavement design.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>New.</td>
<td>Ensure that the needs of other transportation users are considered in the design and construction of freight improvements. Improvements that reduce freight vehicle impacts to bicyclists and pedestrians (particularly along identified bikeways and walkways) will be considered, including buffered bike lanes, enhanced pedestrian crossings, and other safety improvements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Maintain access to the Willamette River so that the river may be used for transportation purposes in the future. Acquire or improve access to Willamette River for public docking.</td>
<td>Policy 7.2.1, 2003 TSP</td>
<td>Maintain access to the Willamette River so that the river may be used for transportation purposes in the future. Acquire or improve access to Willamette River for public docking purposes and consider the potential development of a new port or ports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Assist in efforts to improve the viability of the railroad, not only for freight, but for passenger service as well.</td>
<td>Policy 7.2.2, 2003 TSP</td>
<td>Assist in efforts to improve the viability of the railroad, not only for freight, but for passenger service as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>The City will continue to upgrade and/or complete the street network on the west side of I-5, including the Coffee Creek area, to serve the warehousing, distribution, and other industrial uses located there.</td>
<td>Policy 3.4.1, Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element</td>
<td>The City will continue to upgrade and/or complete the street network on the west side of I-5, including the Coffee Creek and Basalt Creek areas, to serve the warehousing, distribution, and other industrial uses located there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>New policy needed to reinforce the newly-designated freight routes within Wilsonville.</td>
<td>Coordinate with adjacent jurisdictions and the freight community to ensure that regional freight traffic is directed only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

10 For more background see Solutions Analysis and Proposed Funding Program Technical Memorandum, Freight Routes and Improvements, p. 40
11 Passenger rail/service moved to implementation measures under “Active Transportation.”
12
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>toward the City’s freight routes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Increase public awareness of transit and other transportation options, so that customers can make informed decisions.</td>
<td>Policy 1, 2008 Transit Master Plan; updated.</td>
<td>Increase public awareness of transit and other transportation options, such as walking and bicycling, so that customers individuals can make informed decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Provide service which is coordinated, convenient, comfortable, and safe.</td>
<td>Policy 2, 2008 Transit Master Plan; modified for clarity.</td>
<td>Provide transit service which is coordinated, convenient, comfortable, and safe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 30.a.</td>
<td>Expand service to meet the demands of a growing population and employment base in Wilsonville.</td>
<td>Policy 4, 2008 Transit Master Plan.</td>
<td>Maintain transit service and expand as necessary to meet the demands of a growing population and employment base in Wilsonville.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 30.b.</td>
<td></td>
<td>New.</td>
<td>Perform ongoing transit service updates, based on demand and available financial resources. Service updates will be considered following major roadway improvements, pedestrian and bicycle system completion, and master planned, or other major, development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 30.c.</td>
<td></td>
<td>New.</td>
<td>Construct transit stop amenities and implement technology improvements, as funding is available. Prioritize improvements in activity centers and when they can be constructed in coordination with land use development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Create a sense of community ownership of the</td>
<td>Policy 6, 2008 Transit Master Plan;</td>
<td>Create a sense of community ownership of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 For more background see Solutions Analysis and Proposed Funding Program Technical Memorandum, Freight Routes and Improvements, p. 40.
13
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>transit system by encouraging citizen.</td>
<td>policy updated.</td>
<td>the transit system by encouraging citizen involvement in the planning and development of transit facilities and services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>New.</td>
<td>Develop a process for responding to public feedback regarding transit services, including additional service requests, bus routing and transit stop amenities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>New.</td>
<td>Guided by a transit-specific public feedback process, provide transit routes throughout the city so that all residents and businesses who desire transit stop service are located within one-quarter mile walking distance from residents and businesses a transit stop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>New.</td>
<td>Establish a Transit Advisory Board comprised of interested stakeholders, including residents and employers, to guide future planning and decision-making regarding transit service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Strive to improve air quality and traffic congestion by increasing transit efficiency, promoting transportation options, and implementing transportation systems management.</td>
<td>Policy 5, 2008 Transit Master Plan; policy updated.</td>
<td>Strive to improve air quality and traffic congestion by increasing transit efficiency, promoting transportation options, and implementing transportation systems management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>New.</td>
<td>Coordinate with other transit districts, including TriMet and Cheriot, to strengthen the efficiency and performance of the Wilsonville transit network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 36.a.</td>
<td>Strongly encourage full day and Saturday service for WES.</td>
<td>Implementation Measure 3.3.1.f.; updated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 36.b.</td>
<td>Continue to support the extension of WES to Salem.</td>
<td>Implementation Measure 3.3.1.g.; updated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Active Transportation: Pedestrians and Bicyclists**

<p>| Measure 37.a. | Improve the balance between housing, employment, and commercial activities within the City in order to reduce commuting. | Implementation Measure 3.3.1.a.; updated. | Improve the Encourage a balance between housing, employment, and commercial activities within the City so more people desire to live and work within Wilsonville, thereby reducing cross-jurisdictional commuting. |
| Measure 37.b. | Increase densities and intensities of development in or near the Town Center area and in other locations where transportation systems can meet those needs. | Implementation Measure 3.3.1.b. | Increase densities and intensities of development in or near the Town Center area and in other locations where a multimodal transportation system can meet those needs. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure 37.c.</th>
<th>Continue use of the Planned Development process to encourage developments that make it more convenient for people to use transit, to walk, to bicycle, and to drive less to meet daily needs.</th>
<th>Implementation Measure 3.3.1.d.; updated.</th>
<th>Continue use of the Planned Development/Master Plan process to encourage developments that make it more convenient for people to use transit, to walk, to bicycle, and to drive less to meet daily needs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Take steps to improve connectivity between existing neighborhoods and between residential areas and traffic generator locations. Work to provide more and better options for travel from one side of the freeway, the railroad, and major drainage courses to the other.</td>
<td>Implementation Measure 3.3.1.e.; updated.</td>
<td>Take steps to improve connectivity between existing neighborhoods and between residential areas and traffic generator locations. Work to provide more and better options for travel from one side of the freeway, the railroad, and the Willamette River major drainage courses to the other.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assist in efforts to improve the viability of the railroad, not only for freight, but for passenger service as well.</td>
<td>Policy 7.2.2, 2003 TSP; updated.</td>
<td>Assist in efforts to improve the viability of rail for passenger service.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continue to comply with Metro parking standards. Consider reducing parking requirements where it can be shown that transit and/or bicycle pedestrian access will reduce vehicular trips.</td>
<td>Implementation Measure 3.3.1.h.; updated.</td>
<td>Continue to comply with Metro parking standards. Consider reducing parking requirements where it can be shown that transit and/or bicycle pedestrian access will reduce vehicular trips.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New.¹³</td>
<td></td>
<td>Require new development to include sufficient and convenient bicycle parking, and encourage improvements to bicycle parking facilities throughout the community. Allow a range of bicycle parking solutions to address the specific needs of different users.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New</td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct stand-alone improvements to fill key gaps in the pedestrian and bicycle network, including Safe Routes to School projects and connections to transit stops, prioritizing low-cost and safety-related projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

¹³ RTFP, Title 1, Bicycle System Design Sec 3.08.140; Title 2, Performance Targets and Standards Sec 3.08.230; Title 4, Parking Management Sec 3.08.410.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37.i.</td>
<td>New; outcome of Planning Commission discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td>Improve the quality of the pedestrian environment by ensuring new public and private development meets a pedestrian quality standard that encourages walking for short trips and is fitting for the specific location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Continue to improve and expand pedestrian and bicycle facilities, as needed throughout the community, with a focus on improved connectivity both within the City and with the Metro Regional Bicycle System.</td>
<td>Policy 1, 2006 Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan; policy updated.</td>
<td>Continue to improve and expand pedestrian and bicycle facilities, as needed throughout the community, with a focus on improved connectivity both within the City and with the Metro Regional Bicycle and trails systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Ensure that pedestrian and bicycle networks provide direct connections between major activity centers (e.g., civic, employment, and retail centers) and minimize conflicts with other modes of transportation.</td>
<td>Policy 2, 2006 Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan.</td>
<td>Ensure that pedestrian and bicycle networks provide direct connections between major activity centers (e.g., civic, recreation, employment, and retail centers) and minimize conflicts with other modes of transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Improve pedestrian and bicycle connectivity and amenities to ensure they are viable commuting options.</td>
<td>2003 TSP Policy 8.1.2. Replaced, resulting from Commission discussion.</td>
<td>The planning, design, and construction of transportation projects should maintain or improve the accessibility and quality of existing and planned pedestrian and bicycle facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td></td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Provide more enhanced pedestrian crossings (which may include pedestrian flashers, a median refuge, or other treatments) as a way to improve safety and connectivity in Wilsonville’s transportation system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

14 Complies with RTFP, Title 1, Street System Design Sec 3.08.110G; Title 1, Pedestrian System Design Sec 3.08.130A and B; Title 1, Transit System Design Sec 3.08.120B.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Participate in local and regional trip reduction strategies.</td>
<td>2003 TSP Policy 8.1.3. Also relates to Policy 1 and Policy 5, 2008 Transit Master Plan</td>
<td>Develop more transportation options within the city, increasing transportation demand management programming and improving walking, biking, and transit facilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interchange Management Areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Provide for an adequate system of local roads and streets for access and circulation within I-5 Interchange Management Areas that minimize local traffic through the interchanges and on the interchange cross roads.</th>
<th>Policy 3.5.3, Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element.</th>
<th>Provide for an adequate system of local roads and streets for access and circulation within I-5 Interchange Management Areas (IMAs) that minimize local traffic through the interchanges and on the interchange cross roads.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>I-5/Wilsonville Road IMA, subject to Interchange Access Master Plan (IAMP)</td>
<td>Implementation Measure 3.5.3.a, Comprehensive Plan.</td>
<td>The City will require future development to plan for and develop local roadway connections consistent with the I-5/Wilsonville Road IAMP as part of the development permit approval process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 43.a</td>
<td>The City will require future development to plan for and develop local roadway connections consistent with the I-5/Wilsonville Road IAMP as part of the development permit approval process.</td>
<td>Implementation Measure 3.5.3.b, Comprehensive Plan.</td>
<td>Require bicycle and pedestrian connections within the IMA will be required for new development consistent with the City’s Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 43.b</td>
<td>Bicycle and pedestrian connections within the IMA will be required for new development consistent with the City’s Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.</td>
<td>Implementation Measure 3.5.3.c, Comprehensive Plan.</td>
<td>Implement system operational improvements, including signal synchronization, transportation demand management measures and incident management shall be implemented within the vicinity of the interchange to maximize the efficiency of the local street network and minimize the impact of local traffic on the interchange.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 43.d</td>
<td>The City will require future development to adhere to access management spacing standards for private and public approaches on statewide highways as adopted in the Wilsonville Road IAMP.</td>
<td>Implementation Measure 3.5.3.d, Comprehensive Plan.</td>
<td>The City will require future development to adhere to access management spacing standards for private and public approaches on statewide highways as adopted in the Wilsonville Road IAMP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 43.e</td>
<td>The City will approve development proposals in the I-5/Wilsonville Road Interchange Management Area (IMA) only after it is demonstrated that proposed access and local circulation are consistent with the Access Management Plan in the I-5/Wilsonville Road IAMP.</td>
<td>Implementation Measure 3.5.3.e, Comprehensive Plan.</td>
<td>The City will approve development proposals in the I-5/Wilsonville Road Interchange Management Area (IMA) only after it is demonstrated that proposed access and local circulation are consistent with the Access Management Plan in the I-5/Wilsonville Road IAMP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 43.f</td>
<td>Ensure that future changes to the planned land use system are consistent with protecting the long-term function of the interchange and the surface street system.</td>
<td>Implementation Measure 3.5.3.f, Comprehensive Plan.</td>
<td>Ensure that future changes to the planned land use system are consistent with protecting the long-term function of the interchange and the surface street system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 43.g</td>
<td>Any proposed change to the Comprehensive Plan Map or existing zoning that would result in additional trips above that allowed under the current zoning and assumed in the I-5/Wilsonville Road IAMP must include a review of transportation impacts consistent with OAR 660-12-0060.</td>
<td>Implementation Measure 3.5.3.g, Comprehensive Plan.</td>
<td>Any proposed change to the Comprehensive Plan Map or existing zoning that would result in additional trips above that allowed under the current zoning and assumed in the I-5/Wilsonville Road IAMP must include a review of transportation impacts consistent with OAR 660-12-0060.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 43.h</td>
<td>The City will provide notice to ODOT for any land use actions proposed within the I-5/Wilsonville Road IAMP Overlay Zone.</td>
<td>Implementation Measure 3.5.3.h, Comprehensive Plan.</td>
<td>The City will provide notice to ODOT for any land use actions proposed within the I-5/Wilsonville Road IAMP Overlay Zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 43.i</td>
<td>New.</td>
<td>New.</td>
<td>Eliminate or consolidate accesses on Wilsonville Road within one-quarter mile of the I-5 interchange as opportunities arise. Specific access management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 43.j</td>
<td>The City will require future development to adhere to access management spacing standards for private and public approaches on statewide highways as required by the Oregon Highway Plan.</td>
<td>Implementation Measure 3.5.3.i, Comprehensive Plan.</td>
<td>The City will require future development to adhere to access management spacing standards for private and public approaches on statewide highways as required by the Oregon Highway Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 43.k</td>
<td>Ensure that future changes to the planned land use system are consistent with protecting the long-term function of the interchange and the surface street system.</td>
<td>Implementation Measure 3.5.3.j, Comprehensive Plan.</td>
<td>Ensure that future changes to the planned land use system are consistent with protecting the long-term function of the interchange and the surface street system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 43.l</td>
<td>Bicycle and pedestrian connections within the Interchange Area will be required for new development consistent with the City’s Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.</td>
<td>Implementation Measure 3.5.3.k, Comprehensive Plan.</td>
<td>Bicycle and pedestrian connections within the Interchange Area will be required for new development consistent with the City’s Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 43.m</td>
<td>System operational improvements, including signal synchronization, transportation demand management measures and incident management shall be implemented within the vicinity of the interchange to maximize the efficiency of the local street network and minimize the impact of local traffic on the interchange.</td>
<td>Implementation Measure 3.5.3.l, Comprehensive Plan.</td>
<td>System operational improvements, including signal synchronization, transportation demand management measures and incident management shall be implemented within the vicinity of the interchange to maximize the efficiency of the local street network and minimize the impact of local traffic on the interchange.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 43.n</td>
<td>Eliminate or consolidate accesses on Elligsen Road and Boones Ferry Road within one-quarter mile of the I-5 interchange as opportunities arise.</td>
<td>New.</td>
<td>Eliminate or consolidate accesses on Elligsen Road and Boones Ferry Road within one-quarter mile of the I-5 interchange as opportunities arise.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transportation Funding**

deficiencies were identified as part of the I-5/Wilsonville Road Interchange Area Management Plan (IAMP).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Individual developments shall be responsible for providing all collector and local streets. However, there may be cases where collector streets are found to benefit the entire community to a degree that warrants public participation in funding those collector streets.</td>
<td>Policy 3.6.2, Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element.</td>
<td>Require each Individual developments shall be responsible for providing all collector and local streets. However, there may be cases where collector streets are found to benefit the entire community to a degree that warrants public participation in funding those collector streets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>The City is responsible for planning, scheduling, and coordinating all street improvements through the on-going Capital Improvements Plan. A priority is given to eliminating existing deficiencies and in upgrading the structural quality of the existing arterial system.</td>
<td>Policy 3.6.1, Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element; policy updated.</td>
<td>The City is responsible for planning, scheduling, and coordinating implementation of all street improvements through the on-going five-year Capital Improvements Plan. A priority is given to eliminating existing gaps and deficiencies and in upgrading the structural quality of the existing arterial system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 45.a</td>
<td>Maintenance of the developed City Street System is a public responsibility. The City shall coordinate routine and necessary maintenance with the appropriate State or County agencies.</td>
<td>Implementation Measure 3.6.1.b.; updated.</td>
<td>Maintenance of the developed City Street System is a public responsibility. The City shall coordinate routine and necessary maintenance with the appropriate State or County agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 45.b</td>
<td>New.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The City shall pursue grants and other funding resources to assist the City with constructing infrastructure improvements, buying new transit buses, and making other transportation investments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 45.c</td>
<td>To insure development of an adequate street system, the City shall collect a Systems Development Charge as development occurs. Funds collected shall be allocated through the Capital Improvements Plan as needed to provide extra capacity service.</td>
<td>Policy 3.7.2, Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element; updated.</td>
<td>To insure development of an adequate street system, the City shall collect a System Development Charge as development occurs. Funds collected shall be allocated through the Capital Improvements Plan as needed to provide extra capacity service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Maintain a transportation financing program for the construction and implementation of transportation facilities, improvements and services necessary to support the TSP, the Transit Master Plan, and the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.</td>
<td>Goal 3.7, Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element</td>
<td>Maintain a transportation financing program for the construction and implementation of transportation facilities, improvements and services necessary to support the TSP, the Transit Master Plan, and the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Existing policies not to be included in 2013 TSP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy 3.2.2, Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element; similar to proposed Policy 2 above.</td>
<td>To provide for a mix of planned transportation facilities and services that are sufficient to ensure economic, sustainable and environmentally sound mobility and accessibility for all residents and employees in the city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 3.2.3, Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element; policy captured in Agency Coordination and Interchange Management Areas sections.</td>
<td>If adequate regional transportation services, including I-5 interchange modification or additions, and high capacity public transportation, cannot be provided, then the City shall reevaluate and reduce the level of development and/or timing of development anticipated by other elements of this Plan. Such reductions shall be consistent with the capacity of the transportation system at the time of re-evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 4.2.1, 2003 TSP; reflected in Comprehensive Plan Policy 3.6.1.</td>
<td>Continue to plan, schedule, and coordinate all public street improvements through a Capital Improvements Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 7.3.1, 2003 TSP; reflected in Goals and emphasized in more detail in other policies.</td>
<td>Minimize conflicts and facilitate connections between modes of transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 TSP policy 4.1.2. broad policy intent already included elsewhere</td>
<td>Require developers to provide transportation improvements as may be required or conditioned by a land use decision, expedited land division, or limited land use decision, on a roughly proportional bases of the developer’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement</td>
<td>Policy Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require bicycle and pedestrian linkages for all cul-de-sacs and encourage similar linkages between neighborhoods that would otherwise be separated.</td>
<td>Policy 4.1.3, 2003 TSP; addressed under related to connectivity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote other existing routes and/or provide connections to other regional roadways that provide alternative routes into and out of the City to reduce the reliance on I-5 and its interchanges within the City.</td>
<td>Policy 4.1.5, 2003 TSP; reflected in Comprehensive Plan Policy 3.5.3. Similar to IAMP policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with ODOT to improve the general community awareness of its access permitting authority.</td>
<td>Policy 4.4.1, 2003 TSP; reflected in proposed Transportation Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require that the TSP be reviewed no more than five years after the date of adoption.</td>
<td>Policy 4.4.2, 2003 TSP; policy not necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to work in concert with the State, Metro, Clackamas and Washington Counties, and adjacent jurisdictions to develop and implement a regional transportation plan that is complementary to and supportive of the City’s Plan while addressing regional concerns. The City expects a reciprocal commitment from other agencies.</td>
<td>Policy 7.1.2, 2003 TSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the bicycle share mode throughout the City and improve bicycle access to the City's transportation system.</td>
<td>Policy 4, 2006 Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan; this will incorporated in to the TSP as a performance measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Measures to be Deleted</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide safe and efficient multi-modal travel between the connecting roadways (and the surface street network, if applicable).</td>
<td>Comp Plan Implementation Measure 3.2.1.b. Redundant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Transportation Systems Plan shall be used to establish the Functional Street Classification System and the physical design characteristics (right-of-way and pavement width, curbs, sidewalks, etc.) of the various street classifications.</td>
<td>Comp Plan (Implementation Measure 3.5.1.c.; Functional Classification System found in the TSP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider revising the existing land use plan and implementing changes that respond to the capacity constraints of the future transportation system.</td>
<td>Policy 3.1, 2003 TSP; action has been carried out as part of the TSP update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require that the TSP be reviewed no more than five years after the date of adoption.</td>
<td>Policy 4.4.2, 2003 TSP; policy not necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City street standards require concrete sidewalks on both sides of all streets. This standard can be waived only in cases where alternative provisions are found to adequately address pedestrian needs.</td>
<td>Comp Plan Implementation Measure 3.3.2.b; too detailed and not necessary to include.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Measure 3.3.2.c. Transportation facilities shall be ADA-compliant.</td>
<td>Comp Plan Implementation Measure 3.3.2.c; too detailed and not necessary to include.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a program to implement Intelligent Transportation Systems and tie in with the ODOT I-5 ITS system. ITS projects will be prioritized and included in the Capital Improvement Program.</td>
<td>Policy 4.1.6, 2003 TSP; updated with proposed Implementation Measure 11.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All development proposals shall be required to provide for a transportation impact analysis by payment to the City for completion of such study by the city’s traffic consultant unless specifically waived by the City’s Community Development Director because the scale of the proposed development will have very limited impacts.</td>
<td>Implementation Measure 3.5.2.a; already codified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where the City Council officially designates truck routes, these streets shall be developed to arterial street construction standards and be posted as truck routes.</td>
<td>Implementation Measure 3.4.1.a; updated TSP will include a system of freight routes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan for increased access to alternative modes of transportation, such as bicycling, transit and walking.</td>
<td>Implementation Measure 3.3.1.c.; policy intent captured in other implementation measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation Measure 3.6.1.a.; not necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy 3, 2008 Transit Master Plan; duplicative.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Documents distributed to Planning Commission prior to Public Hearings:

March 13, 2013 Work Session
- Meeting Minutes Excerpt
- Commentary on Proposed TSP Code Amendments
- Proposed Development Code Amendments, Updated March 1, 2013
I. CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

Chair Altman called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m. Those present:

Planning Commission: Ben Altman, Eric Postma, Ray Phelps, Marta McGuire, Peter Hurley, Al Levit, and City Councilor Julie Fitzgerald. Phyllis Millan was absent.

City Staff: Chris Neamtzu, Barbara Jacobson, Katie Mangle, and Jen Massa Smith

VI. WORK SESSIONS

B. TSP Code Amendments (Mangle/APG)

Katie Mangle, Long Range Planning Manager, explained that the draft Transportation System Plan (TSP) Code Amendments did not have to go forward in the TSP package. The Commission could determine whether more time is needed to work on the amendments following tonight’s discussion. The TSP projects are implemented through the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) but the proposed Development Code amendments implement the TSP policies or big ideas in private development. The Code amendments would facilitate getting projects done and also address the need for City compliance with regional and state policies. Staff has been collaborating on the draft Code Amendments with Darci Rudzinski of Angelo Planning Group and sought the Commission’s input about the current draft.

Darci Rudzinski, Angelo Planning Group, overviewed the package of proposed TSP Code Amendments, noting that the Commentary on Proposed TSP Code Amendments document on Page 1 of 30 in the Staff report overviewed the amendments and why they were being proposed. The TSP policies and standards are implemented through the development requirements to bring the Code into better compliance with the Transportation Planning Rule, the State requirements for implementing TSPs locally. The amendments also attempt to reflect some of the new goals and policies of the Regional Transportation Functional Plan, which has more detail than the State plan. Some proposed changes would help clarify or cleanup Code items associated with transportation requirements.

- Also included in the packet was the actual Development Code language formatted to show the proposed and deleted language as well as some of the rest of the text to give context. A table summarized which sections were being amended, as well as the corresponding requirement related to compliance.
- The bulk of the changes regarded general development requirements. The large sections of new text were primarily placeholders that would be completed once the TSP was adopted. Much of that language addressed internal pedestrian circulation.
- Similar to some of the new TSP policies, the amendments focused on the multi modal system. Historically, codes have done a good job making sure roadways and anything within the right of way is planned appropriately and consistently with the TSP, so not many visible changes were proposed there as the Development Code defers to the TSP. For example, Staff or a developer would use the TSP to find requirements regarding the updated cross-sections.
The new language predominantly addressed some things that have not been in the Code historically.

She noted Commissioner Levit had provided some comments which might bear some discussion.

Some comment boxes were left in the draft that were predominantly between those that have been working on the plan. Most were placeholders for Staff and the consultants, many of which had already been addressed but a couple should not be forgotten as this was still a working draft. Although consultants are good at coming up with great model language, they really rely on local staff and commissioners to help them understand how they are implemented locally and where the appropriate language fits appropriately in the Code. It took a bit of back and forth and several drafts to get to the point where the document started to make sense.

Comments and questions regarding the TSP Code Amendments were addressed as follows:

- Using the term “shall” without appropriate contingency plans in place was a concern. It was important to be mindful of using “shall” when development or other circumstances might make it impractical or simply not cost effective. The concern regarded the fact that alternatives were not being provided for something other than the “shall”.
  - Ms. Rudzinski noted Staff has been sensitive to that as well when working on the Code language. There were areas where references to waiver provisions had been provided.
  - While waivers or variance processes might be a solution, the preference was to avoid locking the City into things that could not be abided by. The Development Review Board often found themselves trying to fit square pegs into round holes simply because there were many “shall” without a way to bail out on them.

- The definition section of the Development Code included the dimensions for a standard parking space, which is 9 ft by 18 ft. Developers are allowed to increase the standard size if they desire, such as was done at Costco. A compact space had a definition as well. Whether a definition was captured for motorcycle spaces was uncertain, but including such a standard, if available, might be beneficial to accommodate motorcycles and scooters.
  - The City relied on standard architectural practices, rather than setting its own parking space sizes. Reducing the size of compact spaces was discussed with City Council several years ago and was not well received. The revisions that would have resulted in a small reduction in the length of a compact space were rejected. The realization was that car models tend to get larger and almost never become smaller, which was a trend that lead to a reassessment of the proposal to Council.
    - Regardless of the model of car driven, many people believe that parking spaces are far too small because getting in and out of the vehicle was too difficult.
  - Land is expensive and parking standards take up a large amount of land. Having too many compact spaces causes people to be unhappy and results in less people frequenting certain locations. People have said they will not go to certain places in the community because it is too difficult to get in and out.
    - Wilsonville’s 9 ft x18 ft size is large compared to many other city codes, and seldom seen anymore; many cities have 8½ ft wide spaces.

Chair Altman believed addressing the proposed TSP Code amendments should follow fairly closely to the TSP’s adoption or there would be implementation problems. He has been troubled for some time that a section in the Development Code directs one to the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Postma suggested the Commission’s work on the amendments should follow Council’s adoption of the TSP by a month or two because any Council changes could cause further revisions of the Development Code.

The Commission reviewed and provided feedback about the proposed TSP Code Amendments with these key comments:

- Section 4.001 Definitions on Page 9 of 30 included new definitions to explain some of the proposed Code language; one such definition was “cycle track”.

• It was recommended that multi modal be added to the section. However, if multi modal is used only in the TSP and not in the Development Code, it should not be defined in here.
• It was unclear whether an “access drive” would be equivalent to or different from an “alley” or if the term “alley” is defined in the Code. If so, the two terms should be differentiated.
• “Bikeway-multiuse pathway”, noted on Page 1 of 30, was not defined in the Code draft, but would be defined as “Multiuse pathway”.
• The “bikeway” definition included the word “bikeway” to define it. Staff would consider changing this existing language.
• Section 4.012(.02) Public Hearing Notices, the added language of (.02)(A.)(2) was procedural. The City did this anyway, but the language was seen consistently in codes and was advised as it offers comfort to the City’s partners that they are also notified when changes are proposed to the transportation system.
• Providing notice to tenants, not just property owners, was discussed. According to the current Code, the average citizen is not considered part of the City’s landscape for noticing purposes. A Code provision should be added about tenants receiving equal consideration with regard to notice.
  • The City regularly goes above and beyond minimum State requirements for notice. The City’s radius for notice is 250-ft, while many places are only at 100-ft. The requirement is to send notice to the property owner, but Staff considers the impact of a project and takes the initiative to notice a resident or uses a more generic approach for an apartment building. Consideration for notice was done on project-by-project and planner-by-planner. Currently, the City uses signs on the public right-of-way that give notice to general public.
  • The City uses four methods to post notice, but none of it was in the Development Code. Determining what is or is not a rental property was difficult and cumbersome to track. One way to capture some tenants is to send notice to the local address as well as the registered owner’s address.
  • The City’s current policy should be reflected in the Development Code.
• Section 4.114 Transportation Facilities in Zoning Districts includes the Significant Resource Overlay Zone (SROZ). A specific exemption category outlines all the various exemptions allowed to occur in a Significant Resource Overlay Zone (SROZ) and construction of roadways and utility work in SROZs are exempt from the regulation.
  • Discussion included whether Old Town was exempt due to the neighborhood’s desire to not have sidewalks and curbs, which was addressed in the Old Town Neighborhood Plan. Last year, Staff held a community meeting to look at cross-sections that would be embedded into the Public Works’ standards. Staff is proposing to design a rural roadway cross-section without curbs or sidewalks that would include a gravel edge for parking. The curbless section is internal to the residential section of Old Town, not along Boones Ferry Rd
  • Staff would consider whether the exemption needs to be referenced in this Code section.
  • This was a provision to make sure that public facilities are allowed in any zone. In other cities, the zone only extends to the right-of-way. The language states that whatever the type of facility, if it meets the requirements, the facility is allowed in that zone without additional process or land use approval.
• Section 4.125 Intersection Spacing was unclear about the spacing where collectors connect in intersection. The arterial to arterial spacing made sense, but intersection collectors come between that and it was not clear how that is laid out.
  • This TSP standard was in the Code already and is just being updated to reflect the TSP update.
  • The provision for the adjustments was discussed, but what was missing was the reality that on an arterial, a collector might connect to that arterial in less than one mile, which was not necessarily wanted. Staff would review it.
• Section 4.154 On-Site Pedestrian Access and Circulation
  • The Development Code should require a direct pedestrian connection to the corner when development occurs on a corner property.
• Some type of transition, such as a concrete block, should be used so pedestrians do not have to walk through mud to access the road when the intermediate sidewalk dead ends because the adjacent property is not developed. The Code should make it convenient for the pedestrian.
  • The issue was similar to dead end streets and involved offsite site improvements. Staff would consider what could be universally applied as a standard. The challenge was figuring out how to connect a pedestrian facility to something not designed for pedestrians. Requiring someone to lead one down a path toward a street might not be the best option and could potentially be a liability. Staff would consider and work on the issue.
• Section 4.154(.01)(B.) included a “shall” with many different requirements and subparts afterward.
  • This was also tricky because there would be interpretations about what is reasonably direct and convenient. The language came from model code and has been modified and tweaked over the years to fit within the Wilsonville’s TSP Code. More flexibility was available than the “shall” might imply as there would be ways to meet the standard without the provision being completely prescriptive.
  • Referencing some method of maximizing the ability to comply with each section would be especially beneficial when speaking with developers. The City should not appear unfriendly to those the City wants to create development in Wilsonville.
  • Removing the numerous requirements and subparts, such as those regarding a reasonably direct and continuous pathway, would result in more dead end streets, no sidewalks and lack of connectivity.
    • Telling the developer to pay for a temporary improvement, such as a connection to a roadway that may not be in a safe place, potentially creates a liability issue. The system needs to have flexibility to avoid certain situations should they arise.
• Ms. Rudzinski clarified the subject section addressed onsite access and circulation. The requirement was to have a safe system. The language was developed so that connections to buildings internal to a site or to transit or a public roadway or right-of-way would not just be perfunctory. If they are not safe or do not make sense, these provisions point to the fact that the connections need to be reasonably direct. Have an internal system that was not logical and did not get pedestrians where they might want to go was not helpful. While wordy, the provision makes internal circulation for pedestrians a reasonable requirement and has some specificity to make it practical, safe, usable and logical.
  • However, in some instances, the subparts conflict; continuity might conflict with safety in some situations and then what happens.
    • The Type II Administrative Review was added to the address specific circumstances (Page 22). Cross referencing the provision to waiver sections or other review provisions might address the problem.
    • Reordering Items 4.154(.01)(B.)(2.)(a), (b) and (c) could be to set the priorities. Having (b) “Pedestrian pathways are designed primarily for pedestrian safety…” first would make safety the first criteria to consider, and then (c) “The pathway connects all primary building entrances…” would be second, and (a) regarding reasonably direct pathways, third. Structure the provisions so the order states the priorities as mentioned in first sentence “provide for safe, reasonably direct, and convenient pedestrian access…”
    • Citing the waiver provision would then provide a mechanism to consider that hierarchy.
• The word “shall” provides the flexibility needed and this section is of critical importance in terms of the future transportation system, because some existing developments have significant issues with internal circulation onsite. The language was a great step forward in addressing such circulation for future development.
  • The preference was not to remove all “shall”, but “shall” are an issue when potentially conflicting provisions exist and no contingencies allow for alternatives.
  • If “shall” are used, why allow a waiver, which seems to be a contradiction. Providing a waiver for a “shall” undoes the “shall”. Using “should” rather than “shall” ought to be considered because this practice was inconsistent.
• In Section 4.155 General Regulations – Parking, Loading and Bicycle Parking.
  • In Section 4.155(.03)(C.), was at least one ADA accessible parking space required when providing
    50 parking spaces or was there an option for more? The City might want to require additional ADA
    spaces for certain businesses, but would not want to take up too much space either. In terms of
    policy, would the City want to allow the option for more?
    • Staff would confirm whether the City was implementing the federal ADA standard.
    • As noted by Commissioner Levit, Staff would consider whether something was missing with
      regard to, “Parking shall be designed for safe and convenient access to building entrances.” A
      citizen had noted that the ADA parking spot at LA Fitness is quite a distance from the entrance.
      Adding more language to be more specific about where to locate ADA spaces made sense and
      Staff would look into that.
  • Section 4.155(.03)(A.)(3.), Staff confirmed the provision regarded private drives internal to a
    development.
    • Creating more of a street-like system rather than typical parking lot driving lanes would
      improve areas like the Town Center should it redevelop.
      • The Town Center was not the best example because a three-acre parking lot was not
        desired there. The provision regarded three-acre industrial-like parking lots and treating
        the access way like the through route it is and defining where cars go and people walk or
        bike.
      • Something similar was done at Argyle Square, which was a terrible place to walk and
        drive.
      • The language, “street-like features” was unclear; including graphic examples might provide
        further explanation. The idea seemed to emphasize pedestrian flow versus just straight parking
        and drive lanes.
  • Section 4.155(.04)(B.)(1)(b)(i) regarded automobile parking and was one of three possible triggers.
  • Section 4.155(.04)(B.)(1)(c) regarded accessory building, which is defined in the Code definitions
    under accessory building or use. The provision used standard planning language.
    • The Commission discussed what buildings are considered to be accessory or primary buildings.
      Mentor Graphics communications building was an accessory building to the main campus
      building. The Jory Trail Apartment Complex is the primary building and the club house would be
      an accessory-use building. Parking garages are clearly accessory buildings.
  • In Section 4.155(.04)(C.)(1)(d) the language “or other obstruction” should be added.
    • Language regarding long term bike parking geared toward employees versus short term bike
      parking should be made clearer. For example, people would not go to Rockwell Collins on a
      short term basis, so providing Code language regarding office building-type environments
      would be beneficial. Covered bicycle parking should be provided to the side of the building
      rather than right at the front door, resulting in more parking for the company, while not tripping
      up pedestrians. At Goodwill, parking was provided in the rear for employees and also in front
      for patrons/visitors.
      • Covered bike parking or possibly lockers should be provided for employees, leaving the front
        bike spaces for the coming and going patrons/visitors.
        • In Section 4.155(.04)(C.)(2), the duplicate (a) on Page 14 of 30 required that bike parking
          be within 100-ft of an entrance that would be used by intended users.
      • Section 4.155(.04)(C.)(1) states, “bicycle parking shall meet” and subsection (b) states, “Locate
        within 30-ft of main entrance to the building or inside a building.” Some reference to the waiver
        section might be needed for some semblance of flexibility.
    • Purpose sections seem to invite additional understandings of definitions, rather than what is in the
      definition section. Substantially trimming the purpose section was suggested, placing the definitions
      in Section 4.155(.04)(C.) in the front along with the small purpose sections. Give the definition and
      then address the requirements and standards following that. Structurally, it would eliminate excess
      language which could be an invitation for unwanted interpretations. Combining Section
4.155(.04)(C.) with Section 4.155(.04)(A.) and then proceeding to the requirements was the suggestion.

- While new language was available defining the standards for long term bicycle parking, Section 4.155(.04) Bicycle Parking was structured the same as the Village Zone. The purpose, general provisions and bicycle parking standards were all in the Village section of the Code for the Village Zone, which might be why it reads differently. Changing the structure of Section 4.155(.04) would result in changes to the Village Zone. The purpose statement, in working to describe what was happening in Villebois, may have been expeditious at the time those amendments were made. Keeping Wilsonville's Code updated in a coordinated comprehensive way was difficult.

- This section was modeled off of an existing Code section. That needs to be kept in mind and it would be looked at again. Changing the purpose statement and the definitions to a definitions section could be done. Having the general provisions before the specific short term/long term provisions made sense.

- Staff has struggled with the new concept of long-term bicycle parking. Bicycle parking standards and codes have existed in the Metro area for a while, but this refinement was new, and while it seemed to bear explanation, not including that explanation in the Code made sense.

- The intent of the purpose statement was that it applied to the intended user, such as how the spaces would be used or who they would be used by, whether long or short term, and then it speaks to where they are located because that makes a difference.

- Section 4.155(.04)(C.)(2) on Page 14 included two letter (a)s; however both (a)s might be incompatible.

- The required number of short-term bicycle spaces was provided in the table. Of those requirements, 50% of the total must be long term as described and referenced under Section 4.155(.04)(B.)(1)(b).

- Concern was expressed about the security of bike parking 100 ft away but the options to provide lockers or a detached bike garage were available.

- Table 5 Parking Standards on Page 15 of 30 had only two changes. The first set a minimum of two bicycle spaces for apartment buildings in the first line; otherwise the number standards start at nine units. The bicycle parking minimum was also changed for churches on Page 16 of 20.

- Section 4.155(.045) on Page 20 of 30 should include an option for smaller facilities that do not require a loading dock. Smaller facilities do not use truck docks at all; offices have UPS type deliveries. A recently approved fast food restaurant was approved where the delivery trucks park in the drive lane and work around parking for a short period of time. Offering a clear option for situations where a truck dock is not needed would be beneficial.

- Adding the Type II adjustment option was helpful.

- Section 4.155(.045)(B.) on Page 21 of 30 regarded exceptions and adjustments specific to off street loading. The required off street loading language included an option of not having to provide that physical space onsite, but rather to use the right-of-way for loading.

- Section 4.155(.06) included two subsection (B.)s. The second subsection (B.) did not provide an option for short-term visitor parking closest to the door. Concern was expressed about a building owner balking at that or trying to do something different. While premium carpool and vanpool parking was encouraged, flexibility should be available for building owners.

- The phrase “employee, student or commuter” is not intended to exclude visitors, so a clarification would be made.

- Section 4.155(.07)(B.). Electric vehicle charging stations are to be encouraged, but reducing the parking that might be needed for a site by 10% was questioned. Ways should be found to encourage electric vehicle charging without congesting parking lots. Having a charging station would not reduce the number of other cars. Typically, parking is reduced where transit exists because fewer cars are expected. Subsection (B.) did not make sense, but Subsection (A.) was fine.

- Section 4.155(.07) (A.) was included partially because only a certain amount of space is available for parking and providing a transit option like a bus stop would reduce that total area. In addition,
amenities were being provided that would encourage a different mode of transportation. The language was incentivizing people to charge vehicles.

- The electric vehicle charging station still requires a parking space. It did not make sense to reduce parking for one electric vehicle station and penalize another person without a parking space.
  - Developers might install the charging stations because the incentive to the developer is to reduce the cost of providing more physical parking. It is incentivizing providing a charging station even if there is no direct correlation to minimizing people driving to the site.
  - Incentivizing electric vehicles over other forms of transportation was questioned and involved a more philosophical discussion, but it did reflect the TSP and regional goals to reduce vehicle miles traveled, greenhouse gas emissions, etc. A correlation does exist and the provision creates an opportunity for a different type of amenity, as well as encouraging people to use it. If the charging station is there, people would be thinking about it and it would be convenient so they might purchase a hybrid electric car.

- State requirements would begin to require local governments to address greenhouse gas emissions reductions, which will be addressed, in part, through transportation planning, so this was an opportunity to get a head start on that.

- As written, Section 4.155(.07) would provide no incentive for redevelopment if the parking lot had more than the minimum number of parking spots for the intended use and either (A.) or (B.) occurred. The minimum parking requirement could be reduced by 10% and the project could still have more than the minimum requirement. No net gain would be realized as far as the Code is concerned.
  - If a larger building or another pad site is planned that could not be done because of parking requirements, this might offer more flexibility to create more spaces.

- The incentive was only one angle of looking at the provision, the other was how to deal with new charging stations in existing parking lots, and whether a site design review was needed to modify the parking site plan to put the facility in. The current Code was not clear about how that would count against their parking ratio.

- Rather than framing this as an incentive, perhaps there as a better way for addressing the issue. Encouraging private and public citing of alternative fueling stations is a TSP policy, and this was one ways to allow for it. In that case, it belonged under (.07), but maybe not under the reduction.

- Another approach would be to allow existing parking lots to add electric charging stations without a re-review of parking standards, minimums and maximums, parking space locations or bike parking as long as an electrical permit is acquired. The City should penalize someone wanting to install electric charging stations if nothing else is changed.
  - This would be almost like an exemption, which made sense and would be a more direct way to address it.

- Section 4.177 Street Improvement Standards. Section 4.177(.02) referenced the TSP for the actual widths so the flexibility in the TSP is implemented through the Development Code.

- Section 4.177(.02)(A.)(1) was a big piece that had been missing in the Town Center in particular, because no connection exists between Frye’s and the theater so one has to go back out onto the street to get across the lot. Adding a provision for cross easements was important.
  - There was no (A.)(2); perhaps (A.)(1) should be numbered accordingly.

- Section 4.177(.05) on Page 24 of 30, Public Works’ standards would dictate the construction of the multiuse pathways and whether they were to be paved, though it was not stated directly. Staff was working to separate the onsite improvements and right-of-way improvements currently combined in the current Code. This provision addressed facilities in the public rights-of-way and the responsibility of private development in the right-of-way when the improvements could not be accommodated. For example, if a pedestrian/bicycle connection was still needed, it could be separated from the roadway.

  - Although the definition was not clear about whether multiuse paths needed to be paved, Ms. Rudzinski believed they would be because they are supposed to function as if they were in the public right-of-way.
• Section 4.177(.06) Transit Improvements had some typos that needed to be addressed.
  • Adding “to” the second line of Section 4.177(.06)(A.) to state, “provide improvements as described in this section to any bus stop,” should clarify any confusion regarding the proximity of bus stops.
  • Major transit streets and major transit stops are defined, so it was not every street or every bus stop.
  • The Transit Director can decide whether a connection or stop is required, which would tie it all back together.
  • The missing item (2) in Section 4.177(.06)(B.) was inadvertently placed under Section 4.177(.06)(E.) and would be corrected.
• Section 4.177(.07) regarding residential private access drives and Section 4.177(.08) regarding access drives and travel lanes needed clarification regarding whether alleys were included.
• Section 4.177(.11) on Page 27 of 30 might incorrectly reference subsections (.05) and (.06). Staff would confirm the correct references were included.
• Section 4.178 on Page 27 of 30 had been moved and modified, it was not deleted.

Ms. Mangle thanked the Commission for their detailed and philosophical comments and questions. Staff would continue working on the draft and return for another work session. She confirmed that the Commission was comfortable getting the TSP Code amendments done soon after the adoption of the TSP to allow time for any needed changes from Council. The best available draft would become an appendix of the TSP because it was important to make findings on compliance headed in that direction. The draft would just be an appendix, not adopted as ordinance. Staff would return to the Commission with it so Council could see it in that form.
Commentary on Proposed TSP Code Amendments

The purpose of this document is to explain the changes proposed in the accompanying draft of amendments to the Development Code.

Administration (Chapter 4, Sections 4.000-4.035)

Section 4.001 Definitions.

Amendments are proposed to the following definitions:

- new definitions for terms introduced to the Code with this package of amendments: “major transit stop”, “major transit street”, “multiuse pathway”, “bikeway - cycle track”, and “through zone”
- Definition modifications are proposed for: “access control strip,” as requested by the County surveyor,
- Deletion of “Bikeway - bike/pedestrian path,” to be replaced with the “bikeway - multiuse pathway”


Proposed modifications to public notice requirements reflect current City practice. Proposed text ensures that other public agencies are provided notice of Class II Administrative Reviews and Quasi-Judicial Hearings, specifically agencies with jurisdiction over roadways. Necessary to comply with OAR 660-12-0045(1)(c).

Zoning (Chapter 4, Sections 4.100-4.141)

Section 4.114 Transportation Facilities in Zoning Districts. (New Section)

The State Transportation Planning Rule (OAR 660, Division 12) requires that local codes explicitly permit transportation facilities. Proposed text largely codifies existing City practice but ostensibly clarifies and simplifies the land use approval process by identifying what types of transportation improvements are allowed outright, without additional land use approval. A “blanket” allowance in Section 4.114 is proposed so that permitted use lists in every base zone do not have to be modified. Section 4.125(.09) Street and Access Improvement Standards
These proposed changes to the Village Zone street and access standards reflect standards and functional classifications proposed in the updated TSP.

**General Development Regulations (Chapter 4, Sections 4.154 – 4.199)**

**Section 4.154. (.01) On-site Pedestrian Access and Circulation.** Related to (draft) Transportation Policies 1, 4, 9, 10, 16, 30, 35, 37, 38, 39, and 42

This section would require proposed new development to provide for pedestrian pathways through the development site, connecting to adjacent sidewalks and future phases of the development, as applicable. This increases the connectivity and viability of transportation options in the city. The proposed language is based on that from Oregon’s *Model Development Code for Small Cities*. The amendments would comply with Metro Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP) Title 1, Pedestrian System Design Sec 3.08.130C (on-site pedestrian systems).

**Section 4.155. Parking, Loading and Bicycle Parking.** Related to (draft) Transportation Policies 14, 37, and 42; also see Transportation Demand Management (TDM) in draft TSP Chapter 6

A proposed provision under (.03) Minimum and Maximum Off-Street Parking Requirements, the proposed policy would require that proposals that include parking lots larger than three acres provide street-like features along driveways, including curbs, sidewalks, street trees or planting strips, and bicycle routes in order to make large parking lots safer and more attractive to walk and/or bike around. A minor, more procedural amendment under this same subsection would exempt structured parking and on-street parking from the parking maximums in Table 5, Parking Standards. The amendments would comply with Metro RTFP Title 4, Parking Management Sec 3.08.410, and OAR 660-12-0045(4).

**Section (.04) Bicycle Parking** is a new section that borrows its purpose statement and bicycle parking standards from existing Village Zone requirements in the City code (Section 4.125.07.D). Based on City of Milwaukie code, 50% of the total required bicycle parking spaces would be for “long-term” use under specified conditions, rather than having to provide individual requirements for the number of long-term spaces by use. Long-term
bicycle parking is targeted for users such as employees and students, and designed to be secure, weather-protected, and located within a reasonable distance of the proposed use. The new bicycle parking standards in this section are industry standard, but absent in current City policy. In the past staff has been able to require that minimum number of bicycle parking spaces be provided, but unable to enforce if the racks are placed too close to a building or blocked by shopping cart storage.

(.05) Minimum Off-Street Loading Requirements

The current policy is revised (existing Section (.04), renumbered to (.05)) to include a new provision allowing the Planning Director or Development Review Board to approve on-street loading and unloading operations under certain circumstances. This adds some flexibility to the requirements and could allow approval of a proposal where the future use has limited needs for loading/unloading and where such activity in the public right-of-way would not interfere with the operations of the roadway. This allowance will likely be most relevant and useful in Town Center and mixed-use areas.

(.06) Carpool and Vanpool Parking Requirements

This new Section would require that there be parking spaces identified as reserved for employee, student, and commuter use for new office and industrial developments (those with 75 or more parking spaces), and new institutional or public assembly uses, and transit park-and-ride facilities (those with 50 or more parking spaces). A percentage of those parking spaces (no less than 2) should be reserved for exclusive carpool and vanpool parking. These proposed requirements include locating the carpool/vanpool spaces closest to the main employee, student or commuter entrance of the proposed building(s). This “preferential parking” is designed to more strongly support and promote carpooling and vanpooling. The language of this section is from model code for complying with state Transportation Planning Rule section 0045(4).

(.07) Parking Area Redevelopment

This new Section encourages addition of transit-related amenities and electric vehicle charging stations by allowing an outright reduction in the minimum required parking spaces (up to 10% reduction). This provision would allow modification of an existing lot. Transit-related site improvements should improve access to the site for transit users and increase transit usage, thereby reducing the need for parking spaces.
Section 4.177. Street Improvement Standards

Changes to this section make it clearer when the street improvement standards apply and include a reference in Section (.02) to street standards in the TSP. New sections (.03), (.04), and (.05) consist of existing requirements for sidewalks and pathways moved from Section 4.178. New Section (.06) Transit Improvements is a new set of requirements that implement the City’s adopted Transit Master Plan implementation measures, as well as the RTFP and TPR.

New Sections (.09), (.10), and (.11) address approach and driveway development standards and street intersection spacing standards. They implement RTFP and State Transportation Planning Rule requirements related to access management. Section (.09) language is based on Oregon’s Model Development Code for Small Cities. Access management seeks to balance accessibility, safety, and mobility; providing access to sites while limiting potential conflicts and traffic flow interruptions presented by vehicles that are slowing, stopping, and turning. New language also allows the City to approve exceptions or deviations from the driveway and spacing standards through Class II or waiver procedures in special situations.

The amendments would comply with Metro RTFP Title 1, Street System Design Sec 3.08.110B and Sec 3.08.110G, Transit System Design Sec 3.08.120B(2), and OAR 660-012-0045.

Section 4.178. Sidewalk and Pathway Standards.

The proposed deletion of text under this section is administrative. This section has been incorporated into Section 4.177.

Section 4.197. Zone Changes and Amendments To This Code – Procedures Related to (draft) Transportation Policy 17

Proposed additions to this section codify existing City practice, ensuring that findings of fact address applicable Statewide Land Use Planning Goals and related administrative rules, in particular the Transportation Planning Rule. This amendment is needed to comply with OAR 660-12-0060.
Site Design Review (Chapter 4, Sections 4.400 – 4.450)

Section 4.236. General Requirements - Streets. Related to (draft) Transportation Policy 10

Modifications under subsection (.07) Future Expansion of Street require posted notice on the stub street where a street is planned for future extension. Proposed language is similar to (new) Section 4.167(.04)(B) addressing street connectivity. Posting a stub street is a formal way of informing the community, in particular existing and future residents in the vicinity, that a connected street system is planned for this area. The amendment would comply with Metro RTFP Title 1, Street System Design Sec 3.08.110B.
This document provides draft implementing ordinances in support of adopting the draft Wilsonville Transportation System Plan. The following includes proposed amendments to the City of Wilsonville Development Code to update City requirements for consistency with the Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP) and State Transportation Planning Rule (TPR). Findings of compliance with these requirements are presented in table-format and are included as Appendix ___ in the draft TSP.

The proposed amendments are outlined in Table 1, with references to corresponding RTFP and TPR requirements. Following the table, draft code language is presented in adoption-ready format; the draft amendments are numbered consistent with the structure of the Development Code and proposed new language is underlined and recommended deletions are struck through. In some cases adopting proposed new text will require re-numbering or re-lettering of subsequent Development Code subsections.

Note: In addition to the proposed amended sections specified in this memorandum, the entire Development Code should be reviewed to ensure correct identification of all references pertaining to new or revised text related to the implementation of the updated Transportation System Plan.

### Table 1: Summary of Proposed Development Code Amendments and Corresponding Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP) and Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) References

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Development Code Amendments</th>
<th>RTFP and/or TPR Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER 4 SECTIONS 4.000 – 4.035</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Section 4.001 Definitions.</td>
<td>Title 1, Street System Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitions of access control strip modified. Definitions under bikeway modified to remove bike/pedestrian path and add cycle track. New definitions for major transit stop, major transit street, multiuse pathway, and through zone added.</td>
<td>Sec 3.08.110B Title 4, Parking Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Section 4.012. Public Hearing Notices.</td>
<td>OAR 660-12-0045(1)(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New text in subsection (.02) Mailed Notice for Quasi-Judicial Hearings includes noticing governmental agencies potentially impacted by a local decision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER 4 SECTIONS 4.100 – 4.141</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. [New] Section 4.114 Transportation Facilities in Zoning Districts.</td>
<td>OAR 660-12-0045(1)(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New text identifies the types of transportation facilities allowed outright in all zones.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Section 4.125(.09) Street and Access Improvement Standards</td>
<td>TSP consistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Village Zone standards to coordinate with new street classifications and spacing standards in TSP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed Development Code Amendments
Updated March 1, 2013
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Development Code Amendments</th>
<th>RTFP and/or TPR Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER 4 SECTIONS 4.154 – 4.199</strong></td>
<td><strong>GENERAL DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.</strong> Section 4.154. On-site Pedestrian Access and Circulation.</td>
<td>Title 1, Pedestrian System Design Sec 3.08.130C (on-site pedestrian systems)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New section (.01) On-site Pedestrian Access and Circulation; text modified from State’s <em>Model Development Code for Small Cities</em>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.</strong> Section 4.155. General Regulations - Parking, Loading and Bicycle Parking.</td>
<td>Title 4, Parking Management Sec 3.08.410 OAR 660-12-0045(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modified Section (.03), Parking Requirements, to include parking location and street features for lots over 3 acres and to exempt structured parking and on-street parking from parking maximums. Proposed renumbering of existing text.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Section (.04), Bicycle Parking, to address quantity, location, and design of short term and long term bicycle parking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Section (0.5)B Exceptions and Adjustments to allow approval of loading areas adjacent to or within a street right-of-way if specific conditions exist.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Section (.06) Carpool and Vanpool Parking Requirements to include provisions for preferential location of carpool and vanpool parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Section (.07) Parking Area Redevelopment to allow for the redevelopment of existing parking areas in order to accommodate or provide transit-related amenities or electric vehicle charging stations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.</strong> Section 4.177. Street Improvement Standards.</td>
<td>Title 1, Street System Design Sec 3.08.110B Title 1,Street System Design Sec 3.08.110G Title 1, Transit System Design Sec 3.08.120B(2) OAR 660-012-0045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New introduction language; New Section (.01) clarifies applicability and compliance requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Section (.02) Street Design Standards includes existing language and a new reference to the street standards in the TSP. Existing requirements for sidewalks have been moved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added text to existing Subsection D includes a (new) requirement to post notification of a street extension.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Sections (.03), (.04), and (.05) feature text modified from existing Section 4.178 Sidewalk and Pathway Standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Section (.06) Transit Improvements includes requirements consistent with Transit Master Plan implementation measures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section (.08) Access Drives and Travel Lanes is relocated from Section 4.177.01.E.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Sections (.09), (.10), and (.11) address access and driveway development standards and intersection spacing standards, as well as exception and adjustment procedures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.</strong> Section 4.178. Sidewalk and Pathway Standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended deletion of Section; text proposed as part of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Proposed Development Code Amendments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Development Code Amendments</th>
<th>RTFP and/or TPR Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(new) Section 4.177.03, .04, and .05.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. **Section 4.197. Zone Changes and Amendments To This Code – Procedures.**
   Added text requires findings of compliance with applicable Statewide Land Use Planning Goals and related administrative rules.
   
   **OAR 660-12-0060**

#### CHAPTER 4 SECTIONS 4.200 – 4.290 LAND DIVISIONS

10. **Section 4.236. General Requirements - Streets.**
    Added text in (.07) reflects a (new) requirement to post notification of a street extension.
    
    **Title 1, Street System Design Sec 3.08.110B**
Section 4.001 Definitions.

4. **Access Control Strip Restriction**: A reserve area established adjacent to and paralleling a half street improvement or across the end of a street that is to be extended in the future to ensure proper participation by adjoining properties in completion of the required street improvements. See Street, Half.

[New number/renumbering needed.] 32. **Bikeway**: Bikeway is a general term used to describe any type of travel way that is designated for use by bicycles. Bikeways may include bike lanes, bike paths, shared roadways, shoulder bikeways and other bikeways.

A. **Bike Lane**: A bike lane facility is a type of bikeway where a section of the roadway is designated for exclusive bicycle use.

B. **Bike/Pedestrian Path**: A bike/pedestrian path facility is a type of bikeway that is entirely separate from the roadway and is designed and constructed to allow for safe use by both pedestrians and bicyclists.

Bc. **Recreational Trail**: A recreation trail is a type of pedestrian, bicycle, or equestrian facility that is entirely separate from roadways and has unimproved, gravel, or bark dust surface.

C-D. **Shared Roadway**: A shared roadway facility is a type of bikeway where motorists and cyclists occupy the same roadway area.

D-E. **Shoulder Bikeway**: A shoulder bikeway facility is a type of bikeway where cyclists occupy the paved roadway shoulder. Shoulder bikeways are common in rural areas.

E. **Cycle Track**: A cycle track is a bike lane with a physical barrier between the bike and motor vehicle travel lanes, such as a curb or parking lanes. Cycle tracks must “rejoin” the motor vehicle travel lanes at signalized intersections. Cycle tracks may require a two stage left turn for bicyclists.

[New number/renumbering needed.] **Major transit stop**: Transit stops that are located where two or more existing or planned routes intersect or where there are existing or planned transfer locations between transit systems, Park & Ride lots, and shopping centers and other major destinations.

[New number/renumbering needed.] **Major transit street**: A primary corridor for transit, receiving half-hour or better service during peak traffic hours. Typically, these streets are also arterials or major collectors.

[New number/renumbering needed.] **Multiuse pathway or path**: A path that is separate from the roadway either in the roadway right-of-way or in an independent right-of-way. It is designed and constructed to allow for safe walking, biking, and other human-powered travel modes.

[New number/renumbering needed.] **Through zone**: The width of unobstructed space on a sidewalk or pedestrian pathway.

(01) Published Notice. […]

(02) Mailed Notice for Quasi-Judicial Hearings.

A. For development projects involving Class II Administrative Reviews, or quasijudicial public hearings, the Planning Director shall ensure the following:

1. Public hearing notices shall be mailed to the owners of real property located within 250 feet of the site of the proposed development. The Planning Director shall use the property ownership lists of the County Assessor in determining the recipients of the notices.

2. Notice shall be sent to any governmental agency that is entitled to notice under an intergovernmental agreement entered into with the City and any other affected agencies. At a minimum, the Planning Director shall notify the road authority if different than the City of Wilsonville. The failure of another agency to respond with written comments on a pending application shall not invalidate an action or permit approval made by the City under this Code.

B. Notices shall be mailed not less than twenty (20) days nor more than forty (40) days prior to the initial public hearing date. Except, however, in cases where the development proposal will require public hearings before both the City Council and Development Review Board, in which case the notices shall be mailed at least ten (10) days before the initial public hearing.

C. In any case where State law requires different timing or form of notice than that specified in this Code, the standard requiring a broader coverage or duration of notice shall be followed.

D. The City will make a good faith effort to contact property owners whose names do not appear on County ownership records and to contact others who have asked to be contacted for different types of applications.

(03) Mailed Notice for Legislative Hearings. Where applicable, the Planning Director shall have notices of legislative hearings mailed to individual property owners as specified in State law.

4.114 Transportation Facilities in Zoning Districts.

For the purposes of providing needed public services, transportation facilities shall be permitted outright in City zoning districts. Transportation facilities shall include construction, operation, and maintenance of travel lanes, bike lanes and facilities, curbs, gutters, drainage facilities, sidewalks, transit stops, landscaping, and related improvements located within public rights-of-ways controlled by a public agency, consistent with the City TSP.

Section 4.125(.09) Street and Access Improvement Standards

A. Except as noted below, the provisions of Section 4.177 shall apply within the Village zone:
2. Intersections of streets:
   c. Offsets: Opposing intersections shall be designed so that no offset dangerous to the traveling public is created. Intersections shall be separated by at least:
      i. 4000 ft.1 mile for major arterials
      ii. 600 ft.1 mile for minor arterials
      iii. 13200 ft. for major collectors
      iv. 50300 ft. for minor collector local streets


NOTE: Completion of Section 4.154 has been postponed pending the completion of the Transportation Systems Plan.

(.01) On-site Pedestrian Access and Circulation
   A. The purpose of this section is to implement the pedestrian access and connectivity policies of the Transportation System Plan. It is intended to provide for safe, reasonably direct, and convenient pedestrian access and circulation.
   B. Standards. Development shall conform to all of the following standards:
      1. Continuous Pathway System. A pedestrian pathway system shall extend throughout the development site and connect to adjacent sidewalks, and to all future phases of the development, as applicable.
      2. Safe, Direct, and Convenient. Pathways within developments shall provide safe, reasonably direct, and convenient connections between primary building entrances and all adjacent parking areas, recreational areas/playgrounds, and public rights-of-way based on all of the following criteria:
         a. The pathway is reasonably direct. A pathway is reasonably direct when it follows a route that does not deviate unnecessarily from a straight line or it does not involve a significant amount of out-of-direction travel;
         b. Pedestrian pathways are designed primarily for pedestrian safety and convenience, meaning it is free from hazards and provides a reasonably smooth and consistent surface and direct route of travel between destinations.
         c. The pathway connects to all primary building entrances and is consistent with the Americans With Disabilities Act requirements.
         d. All parking lots in excess of two hundred (200) parking spaces shall provide an internal bicycle and pedestrian pathway pursuant to Section 4.155.03.B.3.
      3. Vehicle/Pathway Separation.  
         Except as required for crosswalks, per subsection 4, below, where a pathway abuts a driveway or street it shall be vertically or horizontally separated from the vehicular lane. For example, a pathway may be vertically raised six inches above the abutting travel lane, or horizontally separated by a row of bollards.

Comment [MK3]: Allow this to be eligible for waiver
4. Crosswalks. Where a pathway crosses a parking area or driveway, it shall be clearly marked with contrasting paint or paving materials (e.g., pavers, light-color concrete inlay between asphalt, or similar contrast).

5. Pathway Width and Surface. Primary pathways shall be constructed of concrete, asphalt, brick/masonry pavers, or other durable surface, and not less than five (5) feet wide. Pedestrian trails may have a gravel, wood chip, or sawdust surface if not intended for all weather use.

6. All pathways shall be clearly marked with standard signs.

Section 4.155. General Regulations - Parking, Loading and Bicycle Parking.

(.01) Purpose:

(.02) General Provisions:

A. The provision and maintenance of off-street parking spaces is a continuing obligation of the property owner. The standards set forth herein shall be considered by the Development Review Board as minimum criteria.

1. The Board shall have the authority to grant variances or planned development waivers to these standards in keeping with the purposes and objectives set forth in the Comprehensive Plan and this Code.

2. Waivers to the parking, loading, or bicycle parking standards shall only be issued upon a findings that the resulting development will have no significant adverse impact on the surrounding neighborhood, and the community, and that the development considered as a whole meets the purposes of this section.

(.03) Minimum and Maximum Off-Street Parking Requirements:

A. Parking and loading or delivery areas shall be designed with access and maneuvering area adequate to serve the functional needs of the site and shall:

1. Separate loading and delivery areas and circulation from customer and/or employee parking and pedestrian areas. Circulation patterns shall be clearly marked.

2. To the greatest extent possible, separate vehicle and pedestrian traffic.

3. Parking lots more than three acres in size shall provide street-like features along private drives, including curbs, sidewalks, street trees or planting strips, and bicycle routes.

B. Parking and loading or delivery areas shall be landscaped to minimize the visual dominance of the parking or loading area, as follows:

C. Off Street Parking shall be designed for safe and convenient access that meets ADA and ODOT standards. All parking areas which contain ten (10) or more parking spaces, shall for every fifty (50) standard spaces, provide one ADA-accessible parking space that is constructed to building code standards, Wilsonville Code 9.000.

D. Where possible, parking areas shall be designed to connect with parking areas on adjacent sites so as to eliminate the necessity of utilizing the public street for multiple accesses or cross movements. In addition, on-site parking shall be designed for efficient on-site circulation and parking.

E. In all multi-family dwelling developments, there shall be sufficient areas established to provide for parking and storage of motorcycles, mopeds and bicycles. Such areas shall be clearly defined and reserved for the exclusive use of these vehicles.
F. On-street parking spaces, directly adjoining and on the same side of the street as the subject property, may be counted towards meeting the minimum off-street parking standards.

G. Tables 5, below, shall be used to determine the minimum and maximum parking standards for various land uses. The minimum number of required parking spaces shown on Tables 5 shall be determined by rounding to the nearest whole parking space. For example, a use containing 500 square feet, in an area where the standard is one space for each 400 square feet of floor area, is required to provide one off-street parking space. If the same use contained more than 600 square feet, a second parking space would be required. [Amended by Ordinance No. 538, 2/21/02.] Structured parking and on-street parking are exempted from the parking maximums in Table 5.

(04) Bicycle Parking:
A. Purpose: Bicycle parking is required for most use categories to provide safe and convenient places to park bicycles for short and long stays.
1. Short-term bicycle parking is intended to encourage shoppers, customers, and other visitors to use bicycles by providing a convenient and readily accessible place to park bicycles.
2. Long-term bicycle parking is intended to provide employees, students, residents, commuters, and others who generally stay at a site for several hours a weather-protected place to park bicycles.

B. General Provisions
1. Required Bicycle Parking:
   a. The required minimum number of bicycle parking spaces for each use category is shown in Table 5, Parking Standards, below.
   b. A minimum of 50 percent of the bicycle parking spaces shall be provided as long-term bicycle parking in any of the following situations:
      i. When 10% or more of vehicle parking is covered.
      ii. If more than four (4) bicycle parking spaces are required.
      iii. Multifamily residential development with nine or more units.
   c. Bicycle parking spaces are not required for accessory buildings. If a primary use is listed in Table 5, bicycle parking is not required for the accessory use.
   d. When there are two or more primary uses on a site, the required bicycle parking for the site is the sum of the required bicycle parking for the individual primary uses.

C. Bicycle Parking Standards:
1. Short-term bicycle parking. Required short-term bicycle parking shall meet the following standards:
   a. Provide lockers or racks that meet the standards of this section.
   b. Locate within 30 feet of the main entrance to the building or inside a building, in a location that is easily accessible for bicycles.
   c. If 10 or more spaces are required, then at least 50 percent of these shall be covered.
   d. Each space must be at least 2 feet by 6 feet in area and be accessible without moving another bicycle and must provide enough space between the rack and a building to use the rack properly.
e. There must be an aisle at least 5 feet wide behind all required bicycle parking to allow room for bicycle maneuvering. Where the bicycle parking is adjacent to a sidewalk, the maneuvering area may extend into the right-of-way.

2. Long-term bicycle parking. Required long-term bicycle parking shall meet the following standards:
   a. Provide racks, storage rooms, or lockers in areas that are secure or monitored (e.g., visible to employees or monitored by security guards).
   b. Locate the space within 100 feet of the entrance that will be used by the intended users.
   b. At least 50 percent of the spaces shall be covered.

3. Bicycle Lockers, Racks and Cover (Weather Protection):
   a. Where required bicycle parking is provided in lockers, the lockers shall be securely anchored.
   b. Covered bicycle parking, as required by this section, shall be provided inside buildings, under roof overhangs or awnings, in bicycle lockers, or within or under other structures. Where required covered bicycle parking is not within a building or locker, the cover must be permanent and designed to protect the bicycle from rainfall and provide seven (7) foot minimum overhead clearance.
Note: In considering proposed waivers to the following standards, the City will consider the potential uses of the site and not just the uses that are currently proposed. For waivers to exceed the maximum standards, applicants shall bear the burden of proving that Metro, State, and federal clean air standards will not be violated.

### TABLE 5: PARKING STANDARDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE</th>
<th>PARKING MINIMUMS</th>
<th>PARKING MAXIMUMS</th>
<th>BICYCLE MINIMUMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a. Residential</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Single and attached units and any apartments (9 or fewer units)</td>
<td>1 per D.U., except accessory dwelling units, which have no minimum.</td>
<td>No Limit</td>
<td>0 Apartments – Min. of 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Apartments of ten (10) or more units</td>
<td>1 per D.U. (less than 500 sq. ft.)</td>
<td>No Limit</td>
<td>1 per D.U.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.25 per D.U. (1 bdrm)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 per D.U. (2 bdrm)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.75 per D.U. (3 bdrm)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Manufactured or mobile home park</td>
<td>2 spaces/unit</td>
<td>No Limit</td>
<td>1 per D.U.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Manufactured or mobile home subdivision</td>
<td>1 per D.U.</td>
<td>No Limit</td>
<td>1 per D.U.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b. Commercial Residential</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Hotel</td>
<td>1 per 1000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>No Limit</td>
<td>1 per 5 units Min. of 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Motel</td>
<td>1 per 1000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>No Limit</td>
<td>1 per 5 units Min. of 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE</th>
<th>PARKING MINIMUMS</th>
<th>PARKING MAXIMUMS</th>
<th>BICYCLE MINIMUMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Clubs, Lodges</td>
<td>Spaces to meet the combined requirements of the uses being conducted such as hotel, restaurant, auditorium, etc.</td>
<td>No Limit</td>
<td>1 per 20 parking spaces Min. of 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c. Institutions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Welfare or correctional institution</td>
<td>1 space/3 beds for patients or inmates</td>
<td>No Limit</td>
<td>1 per 50 beds Min. of 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Convalescent hospital, nursing home, sanitarium, rest home, home for the aged</td>
<td>1 space/2 beds for patients or residents</td>
<td>No Limit</td>
<td>1 per 6000 sq. ft. Min. of 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hospital</td>
<td>2 spaces/bed                                                                                                              1 per 20 parking spaces Min. of 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>d. Places of Public Assembly</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Church</td>
<td>1 space/4 seats, or 8 ft of bench length in the main auditorium                                                                                                                                       .8 per seat</td>
<td>1 per 50 seats 1 per 10,000 sq ft Min. of 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Library, reading room, museum, art gallery</td>
<td>2.5 per 1000 sq. ft.                                                                                                              No Limit</td>
<td>1 per 1000 sq. ft. Min. of 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Preschool nursery, kindergarten</td>
<td>.2 per student and staff                                                                                                         .3 per student and staff</td>
<td>1 per 3500 sq. ft. Min. of 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Elementary or Middle School</td>
<td>.2 per student and staff                                                                                                         .3 per student and staff</td>
<td>8 per class (above 2nd grade)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE</th>
<th>PARKING MINIMUMS</th>
<th>PARKING MAXIMUMS</th>
<th>BICYCLE MINIMUMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K – 2nd grade: 1 per 3500 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. High School</td>
<td>.2 per student and staff</td>
<td>.3 per student and staff</td>
<td>4 per class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. College, commercial school for adults</td>
<td>.2 per student and staff</td>
<td>.3 per student and staff</td>
<td>1 per class Min. of 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Other auditorium, meeting rooms</td>
<td>.3 per seat</td>
<td>.5 per seat</td>
<td>1 per 50 seats Min. of 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Stadium, arena, theater</td>
<td>.3 per seat</td>
<td>.5 per seat</td>
<td>1 per 40 seats Min. of 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Bowling alley</td>
<td>4 spaces/lane</td>
<td>No Limit</td>
<td>1 per 10 lanes Min. of 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Dance hall, skating rink, gym, swim or fitness center</td>
<td>4.3 per 1000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>6.5 per 1000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>1 per 4000 sq. ft. Min. of 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Tennis or racquetball facility</td>
<td>1 per 1000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>1.5 per 1000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>1 per court Min. of 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**e. Commercial**

<p>| | | | |
|                                          |                  |                  |                 |
| 1. Retail store except supermarkets and stores selling bulky merchandise and grocery stores 1500 sq. ft. gross floor area or less | 4.1 per 1000 sq. ft. | 6.2 per 1000 sq. ft. | 1 per 4000 sq. ft. Min. of 2 |
| 2. Commercial retail, 1501 sq. ft. or more | 4.1 per 1000 sq. ft. | 6.2 per 1000 sq. ft. | 1 per 4000sq. ft. Min. of 2 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE</th>
<th>PARKING MINIMUMS</th>
<th>PARKING MAXIMUMS</th>
<th>BICYCLE MINIMUMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Service or repair shops</td>
<td>4.1 per 1000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>6.2 per 1000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>1 per 4000sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Retail stores and outlets selling furniture, automobiles or other bulky merchandise where the operator can show the bulky merchandise occupies the major areas of the building</td>
<td>1.67 per 1000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>6.2 per 1000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>1 per 8000sq. ft. Min. of 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Office or flex space (except medical and dental)</td>
<td>2.7 per 1000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>4.1 per 1000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>1 per 5000sq. ft Min. of 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank with drive-thru</td>
<td>4.3 per 1000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>6.5 per 1000 sq. ft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Medical and dental office or clinic area</td>
<td>3.9 per 1000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>5.9 per 1000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>1 per 5000 sq. ft. Min. of 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Eating or drinking establishments</td>
<td>15.3 per 1000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>23 per 1000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>1 per 4000 sq. ft. Min. of 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast food (with drive-thru)</td>
<td>9.9 per 1000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>14.9 per 1000 sq. ft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Mortuaries</td>
<td>1 space/4 seats, or 8ft. of bench length in chapels</td>
<td>No Limit</td>
<td>Min. of 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE</th>
<th>PARKING MINIMUMS</th>
<th>PARKING MAXIMUMS</th>
<th>BICYCLE MINIMUMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f. Industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Manufacturing establishment</td>
<td>1.6 per 1000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>No Limit</td>
<td>1 per 10,000 sq. ft. Min. of 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Storage warehouse, wholesale establishment, rail or trucking freight terminal</td>
<td>.3 per 1000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>.5 per 1000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>1 per 20,000 sq. ft. Min. of 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Park &amp; Ride or Transit Parking</td>
<td>As needed</td>
<td>No Limit</td>
<td>10 per acre, with 50% in lockable enclosures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Comment [MK4]: For further discussion: Need standards for parks & sports*
.045 Minimum Off-Street Loading Requirements:
A. Every building that is erected or structurally altered to increase the floor area, and
which will require the receipt or distribution of materials or merchandise by truck
or similar vehicle, shall provide off-street loading berths on the basis of minimum
requirements as follows:
1. Commercial, industrial, and public utility uses which have a gross floor area
of 5,000 square feet or more, shall provide truck loading or unloading berths
in accordance with the following tables:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Square feet of Floor Area</th>
<th>Number of Berths Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 - 30,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000 - 100,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 and over</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Restaurants, office buildings, hotels, motels, hospitals and institutions, schools
and colleges, public buildings, recreation or entertainment facilities, and any
similar use which has a gross floor area of 30,000 square feet or more, shall
provide off-street truck loading or unloading berths in accordance with the
following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Square feet of Floor Area</th>
<th>Number of Berths Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000 - 100,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 and over</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. A loading berth shall contain space twelve (12) feet wide, thirty-five (35) feet
long, and have a height clearance of fourteen (14) feet. Where the vehicles
generally used for loading and unloading exceed these dimensions, the
required length of these berths shall be increased to accommodate the larger
vehicles.
4. If loading space has been provided in connection with an existing use or is
added to an existing use, the loading space shall not be eliminated if
elimination would result in less space than is required to adequately handle the needs of the particular use.

5. Off-street parking areas used to fulfill the requirements of this Ordinance shall not be used for loading and unloading operations except during periods of the day when not required to meet parking needs.

B Exceptions and Adjustments.

1. The Planning Director or Development Review Board, may approve a loading area adjacent to or within a street right-of-way where it finds that loading and unloading operations:
   a. Are short in duration (i.e., less than one hour);
   b. Are infrequent (less than three operations daily);
   c. Do not obstruct traffic during peak traffic hours;
   d. Do not interfere with emergency response services or bicycle and pedestrian facilities; and
   e. Are acceptable to the applicable roadway authority.

(06) Carpool and Vanpool Parking Requirements

A. Carpool and vanpool parking spaces shall be identified for the following uses: new commercial and industrial developments with seventy-five (75) or more parking spaces, new institutional or public assembly uses, and transit park-and-ride facilities with fifty (50) or more parking spaces.

B. Of the total spaces available for employee, student, and commuter parking, at least five percent, but not fewer than two, shall be designated for exclusive carpool and vanpool parking.

B. Carpool and vanpool parking spaces shall be located closer to the main employee, student or commuter entrance than all other parking spaces with the exception of handicapped parking spaces.

C. Required carpool/vanpool spaces shall be clearly marked "Reserved - Carpool/Vanpool Only."

(07) Parking Area Redevelopment

The number of parking spaces may be reduced by up to 10% of the minimum required parking spaces for that use when a portion of the existing parking area is modified for the following:

A. To accommodate or provide transit-related amenities such as transit stops, pull-outs, shelters, and park and ride stations.

B. To accommodate and provide one or more electric vehicle charging stations.

Section 4.177. Street Improvement Standards.

Note: This section is expected to be revised after the completion of the Transportation Systems Plan.

This section contains the City’s requirements and standards for pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facility improvements to public streets, or within public easements. The purpose of this section is to ensure that development, including redevelopment, provides transportation facilities that are safe, convenient, and adequate in rough proportion to their impacts.
(01) Except as specifically approved by the Development Review Board, all street and access improvements shall conform to the Transportation Systems Plan and the Public Works Standards, together with the following standards: [Amended by Ord. 682, 9/9/10] Development and related public facility improvements shall comply with the standards in this section, the Wilsonville Public Works Standards, and the Transportation System Plan. Development shall provide transportation improvements and mitigation at the time of development in rough proportion to the potential impacts of the development except as waived by the City Engineer or Development Review Board.

(02) Street Design Standards

A. All street improvements and intersections shall conform to the Public Works Standards and shall provide for the continuation of streets through specific developments to adjoining properties or subdivisions.

1. Development shall be required to provide existing or future connections to adjacent sites through the use of access easements where applicable. Such easements shall be required in addition to required public street dedications as required in Section 4.236(.04).

B. The Engineering Director shall make the final determination regarding right-of-way and street element widths using the ranges provided in Table x of the Transportation System Plan and the additional street design standards in the Public Works Standards. All streets shall be developed with curbs, utility strips and sidewalks on both sides; or a sidewalk on one side and a bike path on the other side.

1. Within a Planned Development the Development Review Board may approve a sidewalk on only one side. If the sidewalk is permitted on just one side of the street, the owners will be required to sign an agreement to an assessment in the future to construct the other sidewalk if the City Council decides it is necessary.

C. Rights-of-way.

1. Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy Building permits or as a part of the recordation of a final plat, the City shall require dedication of rights-of-way in accordance with the Street System Master Transportation Systems Plan. All dedications shall be recorded with the County Assessor's Office.

2. The City shall also require a waiver of remonstrance against formation of a local improvement district, and all non-remonstrances shall be recorded in the County Recorder's Office as well as the City's Lien Docket, prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy Building Permit or as a part of the recordation of a final plat.

3. In order to allow for potential future widening, a special setback requirement shall be maintained adjacent to all arterial streets. The minimum setback shall be 55 feet from the centerline or 25 feet from the right-of-way designated on the Master Plan, whichever is greater.

D. Dead-end Streets. New dead-end streets or cul-de-sacs shall not exceed 200 feet in length, unless the adjoining land contains barriers such as existing buildings, railroads or freeways, or environmental constraints such as steep slopes, or major streams or rivers, that prevent future street extension and connection. A central landscaped island with rainwater management and infiltration are encouraged in cul-de-sac
design. No more than 25 dwelling units shall take access to a new dead-end or cul-de-sac street unless it is determined that the traffic impacts on adjacent streets will not exceed those from a development of 25 or fewer units. All other dimensional standards of dead-end streets shall be governed by the Public Works Standards. Notification that the street is planned for future extension shall be posted on the dead-end street. [Amended by Ord. # 674 11/16/09]

E. Access drives and travel lanes.
1. An access drive to any proposed development shall be designed to provide a clear travel lane free from any obstructions.
2. Access drive travel lanes shall be constructed with a hard surface capable of carrying a 22-ton load.
3. Secondary or emergency access lanes may be improved to a minimum 12 feet with an all-weather surface as approved by the Fire District. All fire lanes shall be dedicated easements.
4. Minimum access requirements shall be adjusted commensurate with the intended function of the site based on vehicle types and traffic generation.
5. Where access drives connect to the public right-of-way, construction within the right-of-way shall be in conformance to the Public Works Standards.

F. Corner or clear vision area.
1. A clear vision area which meets the Public Works Standards shall be maintained on each corner of property at the intersection of any two streets, a street and a railroad, or a street and a driveway. However, the following items shall be exempt from meeting this requirement:
   a. Light and utility poles with a diameter less than 12 inches.
   b. Trees less than 6” d.b.h., approved as a part of the Stage II Site Design, or administrative review.
   c. Except as allowed by b., above, an existing tree, trimmed to the trunk, 10 feet above the curb.
   d. Official warning or street sign.
   e. Natural contours where the natural elevations are such that there can be no cross-visibility at the intersection and necessary excavation would result in an unreasonable hardship on the property owner or deteriorate the quality of the site.

G. Vertical clearance - a minimum clearance of 12 feet above the pavement surface shall be maintained over all streets and access drives.

H. Interim improvement standard. It is anticipated that all existing streets, except those in new subdivisions, will require complete reconstruction to support urban level traffic volumes. However, in most cases, existing and short-term projected traffic volumes do not warrant improvements to full Master Plan standards. Therefore, unless otherwise specified by the Planning Commission, the following interim standards shall apply.
1. arterials - 24 foot paved, with standard sub-base. Asphalt overlays are generally considered unacceptable, but may be considered as an interim improvement based on the recommendations of the City Engineer, regarding adequate structural quality to support an overlay.
2. Half-streets are generally considered unacceptable. However, where the Development Review Board finds it essential to allow for reasonable development, a half-street may be approved. Whenever a half-street improvement is approved, it shall conform to the requirements in the Public Works Standards:

3. When considered appropriate in conjunction with other anticipated or scheduled street improvements, the City Engineer may approve street improvements with a single asphalt lift. However, adequate provision must be made for interim storm drainage, pavement transitions at seams and the scheduling of the second lift through the Capital Improvements Plan.

[Section 4.177(.01) amended by Ord. 610, 5/1/06]

(.03) Sidewalks. Sidewalks shall be provided on the public street frontage of all development. Sidewalks shall generally be constructed within the dedicated public right-of-way, but may be located outside of the right-of-way within a public easement with the approval of the Engineering Director.
   A. Sidewalk widths shall include a minimum through zone of at least five feet. The through zone may be reduced pursuant to variance procedures in Section 4.196, a waiver pursuant to Section 4.118, or by authority of the City Engineer.
   B. Within a Planned Development the Development Review Board may approve a sidewalk on only one side. If the sidewalk is permitted on just one side of the street, the owners will be required to sign an agreement to an assessment in the future to construct the other sidewalk if the City Council decides it is necessary.

(.04) Bicycle Facilities. Bicycle facilities shall be provided to implement the Transportation System Plan, and may include on-street and off-street bike lanes, shared lanes, bike boulevards, and cycle tracks. The design of on-street bicycle facilities will vary according to the functional classification and the average daily traffic of the facility.

(.05) Multiuse Pathways. Pathways may be in addition to, or in lieu of, a public street. Paths that are in addition to a public street shall generally run parallel to that street, and shall be designed in accordance with the Public Works Standards or as specified by the Engineering Director. Paths that are in lieu of a public street shall be considered in areas only where no other public street connection options are feasible, and are subject to the following standards.
   A. Paths shall be located to provide a reasonably direct connection between likely pedestrian and bicyclist destinations. Additional standards relating to entry points, maximum length, visibility, and path lighting are provided in the Public Works Standards.
   B. To ensure ongoing access to and maintenance of pedestrian/bicycle paths, the Engineering Director will require dedication of the path to the public and acceptance of the path by the City as public right-of-way; or creation of a public access easement over the path.

(.06) Transit Improvements
A. Development on sites that are adjacent to or incorporate major transit streets shall provide improvements as described in this section any bus stop located along the site’s frontage, unless waived by the Community Development Director. Transit facilities include bus stops, shelters, and related facilities. Required transit facility improvements may include the dedication of land or the provision of a public easement.

B. Development shall at a minimum provide:
   1. Reasonably direct pedestrian connections, as defined by Section 4.154, between building entrances and the transit facility and between buildings on the site and streets adjoining transit stops.
   3. Improvements at major transit stops. Improvements may include intersection or mid-block traffic management improvements to allow for pedestrian crossings at major transit stops.

C. Developments generating an average of 49 or more pm peak hour trips shall provide bus stop improvements per the Public Works Standards. Required improvements may include provision of benches, shelters, pedestrian lighting; or provision of an easement or dedication of land for transit facilities.

D. In addition to the requirements of 4.154.03.B.3, development generating more than 199 pm peak hour trips on major transit streets shall provide a bus pullout, curb extension, and intersection or mid-block traffic management improvements to allow for pedestrian crossings at major transit stops.

E. In addition to the requirements of 4.154.03.B.3, development generating more than 500 pm peak-hour trips on major transit streets shall provide on-site circulation to accommodate transit service.

(.02) Residential Private Access Drives shall meet the following standards:
   A. Residential Private Access Drives shall provide primary vehicular access to no more than four (4) dwelling units, excluding accessory dwelling units.
   B. The design and construction of a Residential Private Access Drive shall ensure a useful lifespan and structural maintenance schedule comparable, as determined by the City Engineer or City’s Authorized Representative, to a local street constructed in conformance to current public works standards.
      1. The design of residential private access drives shall be stamped by a professional engineer registered in the state of Oregon and shall be approved by the City Engineer or City’s Authorized Representative to ensure the above requirement is met.
      2. Prior to issuing a certificate of occupancy for any residential dwelling unit whose primary vehicular access is from a Residential Private Access Drive the City Engineer or City’s Authorized Representative shall certify construction of the Residential Private Access Drive substantially conforms the design approved by the City Engineer or City’s Authorized Representative.
   C. Residential Private Access Drives shall be named for addressing purposes. All Residential Private Access Drives shall use the suffix “Lane”, i.e. SW Oakview Lane.
   D. Residential Private Access Drives shall meet or exceed the standards for access drives and travel lanes established in Subsection (.01) G. of this Section.

(.08) Access Drives and Travel Lanes.
A. An access drive to any proposed development shall be designed to provide a clear travel lane free from any obstructions.
B. Access drive travel lanes shall be constructed with a hard surface capable of carrying a 23-ton load.
C. Secondary or emergency access lanes may be improved to a minimum 12 feet with an all-weather surface as approved by the Fire District. All fire lanes shall be dedicated easements.
D. Minimum access requirements shall be adjusted commensurate with the intended function of the site based on vehicle types and traffic generation.
E. Where access drives connect to the public right-of-way, construction within the right-of-way shall be in conformance to the Public Works Standards.

(09) Approach and Driveway Development Standards. Approaches and driveways shall conform to all of the following development standards:

A. The number of approaches on higher classification streets (e.g., collector and arterial streets) shall be minimized; where practicable, access shall be taken first from a lower classification street;
B. The City may limit the number or location of connections to a street, or impose access restrictions where the roadway authority requires mitigation to alleviate safety or traffic operations concerns;
C. The City may require a driveway to extend to one or more edges of a parcel and be designed to allow for future extension and inter-parcel circulation as adjacent properties develop. The City may also require the owner(s) of the subject site to record an access easement for future joint use of the approach and driveway as the adjacent property(ies) develop(s);
D. Where emergency vehicle access is required, approaches and driveways shall be designed and constructed to accommodate emergency vehicle apparatus and shall conform to applicable fire protection requirements. The City may restrict parking, require signage, or require other public safety improvements pursuant to the recommendations of an emergency service provider;
E. Driveways shall accommodate all projected vehicular traffic on-site without vehicles stacking or backing up onto a street;
F. Driveways shall be designed so that vehicle areas, including but not limited to drive-up and drive-through facilities and vehicle storage and service areas, do not obstruct any public right-of-way;
G. Approaches and driveways shall not be wider than necessary to safely accommodate projected peak hour trips and turning movements, and shall be designed to minimize crossing distances for pedestrians;
H. As it deems necessary for pedestrian safety, the City, in consultation with the roadway authority, may require traffic-calming features, such as speed tables, textured driveway surfaces, curb extensions, signage or traffic control devices, or other features, be installed on or in the vicinity of a site;
I. Approaches and driveways shall be located and designed to allow for safe maneuvering in and around loading areas, while avoiding conflicts with pedestrians, parking, landscaping, and buildings;
J. Where a proposed driveway crosses a culvert or drainage ditch, the City may require the developer to install a culvert extending under and beyond the edges of the driveway on both sides of it, pursuant applicable Public Works standards;

K. Except as otherwise required by the applicable roadway authority or waived by the City Engineer, temporary driveways providing access to a construction site or staging area shall be paved or graveled to prevent tracking of mud onto adjacent paved streets;

L. Unless constrained by topography, natural resources, rail lines, freeways, existing or planned or approved development, or easements or covenants, driveways proposed as part of a residential or mixed-use development shall meet local street spacing standards and shall be constructed to align with existing or planned streets, if the driveway:
   1. Intersects with a public street that is controlled, or is to be controlled in the planning period, by a traffic signal;
   2. Intersects with an existing or planned arterial or collector street; or
   3. Would be an extension of an existing or planned local street, or of another major driveway.

(.10) Minimum street intersection spacing standards.
   A. New streets shall intersect at existing street intersections so that centerlines are not offset. Where existing streets adjacent to a proposed development do not align properly, conditions shall be imposed on the development to provide for proper alignment.
   B. Minimum and maximum intersection spacing standards are provided in Table x.

(.11) Exceptions and Adjustments. The City may approve adjustments to the spacing standards of subsections (.05) and (.06) above through a Class II process, or as a waiver per Section 4.118(0.3)A, where an existing connection to a City street does not meet the standards of the roadway authority, the proposed development moves in the direction of code compliance, and mitigation measures alleviate all traffic operations and safety concerns. Mitigation measures may include consolidated access (removal of one access), joint use driveways (more than one property uses same access), directional limitations (e.g., one-way), turning restrictions (e.g., right in/out only), or other mitigation.

Section 4.178. Sidewalk and Pathway Standards.
   (.01) Sidewalks. All sidewalks shall be concrete and a minimum of five (5) feet in width, except where the walk is adjacent to commercial storefronts. In such cases, they shall be increased to a minimum of ten (10) feet in width. Sidewalk widths shall include a minimum through zone of at least five feet. The clear zone may be reduced pursuant to variance procedures in Section 4.196.
   (.02) Pathways
      A. Bicycle facilities shall be provided using a bicycle lane as the preferred facility design. Other facility designs described in the Public Works Standards shall only be used if the bike lane standard cannot be constructed due to physical or financial constraints. The order of preference for bicycle facilities is:
1. Bike lane.
2. Shoulder bikeway.
3. Shared roadway.

B. Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities located within the public right-of-way or public easement shall be constructed in conformance with the Public Works Standards.

C. To increase safety, all street crossings shall be marked and should be designed with a change of pavement such as brick or exposed aggregate. Arterial crossings may be signalized at the discretion of the City Engineer.

D. All pathways shall be clearly posted with standard bikeway signs.

E. Pedestrian and equestrian trails may have a gravel or sawdust surface if not intended for all-weather use.

(.03) Bicycle and pedestrian paths shall be located to provide a reasonably direct connection between likely destinations. A reasonably direct connection is a route which minimizes out-of-direction travel considering terrain, physical barriers, and safety. The objective of this standard is to achieve the equivalent of a 1/4 mile grid of routes.

(.04) Pathway Clearance.

A. Vertical and horizontal clearance for bicycle and pedestrian paths is specified in the Public Works Standards. The clearance above equestrian trails shall be a minimum of ten feet. [Section 4.178 amended by Ord. 610, 5/1/06]

Section 4.197. Zone Changes and Amendments To This Code – Procedures.

(.01) The following procedure shall be followed in applying for an amendment to the text of this Chapter:

A. The Planning Commission shall conduct a public hearing on the proposed amendment at its earliest practicable meeting after it is proposed and shall, within forty (40) days after concluding the hearing, provide a report and recommendation to the City Council regarding the proposed amendment. The findings and recommendations of the Commission shall be adopted by resolution and shall be signed by the Chair of the Commission.

B. In recommending approval of a proposed text amendment, the Planning Commission shall, at a minimum, adopt findings relative to the following:

1. That the application was submitted in compliance with the procedures set forth in Section 4.008; and
2. The amendment substantially complies with all applicable goals, policies and objectives set forth in the Comprehensive Plan; and
3. The amendment does not materially conflict with, nor endanger, other provisions of the text of the Code; and
4. The amendment is in compliance with applicable Statewide Land Use Planning Goals and related administrative rules; and
4. 5. If applicable, the amendment is necessary to insure that the City's Land Use and Development Ordinance complies with mandated requirements of State or Federal laws and/or statutes.

(.02) In recommending approval or denial of a proposed zone map amendment, the Planning Commission or Development Review Board shall at a minimum, adopt findings addressing the following criteria:
A. That the application before the Commission or Board was submitted in accordance with the procedures set forth in Section 4.008, Section 4.125 (.18)(B)(2) or, in the case of a Planned Development, Section 4.140; and [Amended by Ord 557, adopted 9/5/03]

B. That the proposed amendment is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan map designation and substantially complies with the applicable goals, policies and objectives, set forth in the Comprehensive Plan text; and

C. In the event that the subject property, or any portion thereof, is designated as "Residential" on the City's Comprehensive Plan Map; specific findings shall be made addressing substantial compliance with Implementation Measures 4.1.4.b, d, e, q, and x of Wilsonville's Comprehensive Plan text; and [Amended by Ordinance No. 538, 2/21/02.]

D. That the existing primary public facilities, i.e., roads and sidewalks, water, sewer and storm sewer are available and are of adequate size to serve the proposed development; or, that adequate facilities can be provided in conjunction with project development. The Planning Commission and Development Review Board shall utilize any and all means to insure that all primary facilities are available and are adequately sized; and

E. That the proposed development does not have a significant adverse effect upon Significant Resource Overlay Zone areas, an identified natural hazard, or an identified geologic hazard. When Significant Resource Overlay Zone areas or natural hazard, and/or geologic hazard are located on or abut the proposed development, the Planning Commission or Development Review Board shall use appropriate measures to mitigate and significantly reduce conflicts between the development and identified hazard or Significant Resource Overlay Zone and

F. That the applicant is committed to a development schedule demonstrating that development of the property is reasonably expected to commence within two (2) years of the initial approval of the zone change; and

G. That the proposed development and use(s) can be developed in compliance with the applicable development standards or appropriate conditions are attached that insure that the project development substantially conforms to the applicable development standards.

H. Adequate public facilities, services, and transportation networks are in place, or are planned to be provided concurrently with the development of the property. The applicant shall demonstrate compliance with the Transportation Planning Rule, specifically by addressing whether the proposed amendment has a significant effect on the transportation system pursuant to OAR 660-012-0060. If required, a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) shall be prepared pursuant to the requirements in Section 4.133.05.(01).

Section 4.236. General Requirements - Streets.

(.01) Conformity to the Master Plan or Map: Land divisions shall conform to and be in harmony with the Transportation Master Plan (Transportation Systems Plan), the
Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, the Parks and Recreation Master Plan, the Official Plan or Map and especially to the Master Street Plan.

(.02) Relation to Adjoining Street System.

[...]

(.03) All streets shall conform to the standards set forth in Section 4.177 and the block size requirements of the zone.

(.04) Creation of Easements: [...]

(.05) Topography: [...]

(.06) Reserve Strips: [...]

(.07) Future Expansion of Street: When necessary to give access to, or permit a satisfactory future division of, adjoining land, streets shall be extended to the boundary of the land division and the resulting dead-end street may be approved without a turn-around. Reserve strips and street plugs shall be required to preserve the objective of street extension. Notification that the street is planned for future extension shall be posted on the stub street.
AFFIDAVIT OF MAILING NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING IN THE CITY OF WILSONVILLE

STATE OF OREGON )
COUNTIES OF CLACKAMAS )
AND WASHINGTON )
CITY OF WILSONVILLE )

I, Linda M. Straessle, do hereby certify that I am Administrative Assistant for the City of Wilsonville, Counties of Clackamas and Washington, State of Oregon, that the attached copy of Notice of Public Hearing is a true copy of the original notice of said public hearing; that on April 10, 2013, I did cause to be mailed copies of such notice of said public hearing in the exact form hereto attached to the following property owners:

29100 TOWN CENTER LLC, 29100 SW TOWN CENTER LOOP W STE 140, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-9315
29515 SERENITY LLC, 6 FALSTAFF, LAKE OSWEGO, OR 97035-1902
9126 RIDDER LLC, 4004 KRUUSE WAY PL #290, LAKE OSWEGO, OR 97035-2616
9325 BUILDING LLC, 9325 SW BARBER ST, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-9229
A & F LLC, PO BOX 2359, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-2359
A C INVESTMENTS LLC, 16860 SW PARRETT MT RD, SHERWOOD, OR 97140-8553
AAROE ELIZABETH A, 8181 SW EDGEWATER W, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-9480
AB MAURI BAKING SOLUTIONS, 26994 SW 95TH AVE, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-8240
ABDELSAMAD AHMED, 7530 SW ROANOKE DR, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-6801
ABELE JOY D, 8455 SW METOLIUS LN, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-9780
ABERNATHY APRIL A & MICHAEL J, 28863 SW COSTA CIR W, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-7384
ABOULESEoud AHMED, 7570 SW ROANOKE DR, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-6806
ABRAHAMSEN DARRYL A & MARGIE L, 7575 SW DOWNS POST RD, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-9472
ABRAHAMSON DAVID & KIMBERLEE J, 29850 SW CAMELOT ST, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-7565
ABREU LAUREN D, 11663 SW GRENOBLE ST, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-7334
ABREU STEVE A, 11663 SW GRENOBLE ST, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-7334
ACEVEDO OSCAR BRYANT, 7686 SW CARRIAGE OAKS LN, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-6823
ACKERMAN CAROLYN J TRUSTEE, 10885 SW MERLIN CT, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-8539
ACKERMAN RICHARD, 29350 SW VILLEBOIS DR S, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-7316
AD HOLDINGS LLC, 22225 SW ANTIJIOCH DOWNS CT, TUALATIN, OR 97062-8707
ADAMS CHARLES P TRUSTEE, 15449 SW PARTRIDGE DR, LAKE OSWEGO, OR 97035-3117
ADAMS DEBI & DAVID W, 15599 NW ST ANDREWS DR, PORTLAND, OR 97229-7819
ADAMS DEBRA, 31756 SW COUNTRY VIEW LN, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-7446
ADAMS DONALD T, 11170 SW LAUSANNE ST, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-7333
ADAMS DOUGLAS J & SIDNEY M, 7695 SW THORNTON DR, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-6550
ADAMS HAZEL C TRUSTEE, 32420 SW LAKE DR, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-7409
ADAMS IRIS P TRUSTEE, 31686 SW FAIRWAY VILLAGE LOOP, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-6480
ADAMS MARK C & KIMBERLY A, 29750 SW LANCELOT LN, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-8552
ADAMS MATTHEW & TRACI, 10511 SW BROCKWAY DR, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-6588
ADAMS NORMAN & LYNN OLSZEWSKI-ADAMS, 7662 SW WIMBLEDON CIR S, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-9469
ADAMS ROBERT J & SUSAN M, 7897 SW DAYBREAK ST, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-6846
ADAMS TOMMY, 7556 SW WIMBLEDON CT, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070
ADD LLC, PO BOX 225, LAKE OSWEGO, OR 97034-0027
ADD LLC, 13292 ROGERS RD, LAKE OSWEGO, OR 97035-6752
ADRIAN DAVE L & PATRICIA P, 11218 SW CHAMPOEG CT, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-9597
ADVANCE INVESTMENT PROPERTIES LL, PO BOX 592, WEST LINN, OR 97068-0592
AGA VIMAL M & MINI, 28386 SW WAGNER ST, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-6783
AGC CENTER LLC, 9450 SW COMMERCE CIRCLE #200, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-8859
AGIN GINA, 27186 SW WOOD AVE, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-6538
AGUIAR ARTURO, 30845 SW FIR AVE, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-9769
AHLSKOM KURT R, 28718 SW MEADOWS LOOP, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-8767
AIDA JUSTIN H & LISA M, 28417 SW MORNINGSIDE AVE, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-6840
DEMERS JOHN, 7564 SW ROANOKE DR, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-6801
DEMERS RICHARD E TRUSTEE, 7510 SW ROANOKE DR, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-6801
DEMPSEY ROBERT A & MICHELE S, 30999 SW BOONES FERRY RD, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-9746
DENNIS BRETT T & KRISTIN A, 31398 SW OLYMPIC DR, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-5533
DENNIS GARY R, 28625 SW ASH MEADOWS BLVD APT 13, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-7802
DENT CHARLA TRUSTEE, 31095 SW COUNTRY VIEW LN, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-7416
DEO ANEET & SUKHJINDER, 10702 SW LONDON LN, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-3029
DEPRATER FRANCES M, 30930 SW MAGNOLIA AVE, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-9748
DEPROSPERO JAMES W & JANE W, 32565 SW LAKE POINT CT, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-8740

DEPT OF HOUSING & URBAN DEVELOPMENT, 4400 WILL ROGERS PKWY STE 300, OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73108-1870
DEPT OF THE INTERIOR, PO BOX 3621-MMLC, PORTLAND, OR 97208-3621
DERBY JOHN A & PATRICIA A, 32465 SW LAKE POINT CT, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-6440
DERNONCOURT JANET M, 8440 SW CURRY DR UNIT B, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-8424
DERRY THOMAS F, 11631 SW JAMAICA, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-9563
DESHIIKAN SRINIVASA R, 28989 SW MEADOWS LOOP, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-8769
DESKINS GARRY B & HELEN A, 28617 SW CRESTWOOD DR, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-7728
DESTEFANO DENNIS WAYNE & STACIE, 11218 SW MCKENZIE CT E, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-9589
DEVER SHAW W & LINDSAY A POND, 28300 SW MCGRAW AVE, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-6886
DEVILLE ROGER P & JUDITH E, PO BOX 1862, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-1862
DEVINCENZI CHRISTOPHER E & S J, 28793 SW MEADOWS LOOP, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-8767
DEVINCENZI GILBERT L & LYNNNE K, 3382-6 BRITTON AVE, SAN CARLOS, CA 94070-3422
DEVINE JAMES E TRUSTEE, PO BOX 921, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-0921
DEVRIES SCOTT & MICHELLE, 31521 SW ORCHARD DR, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-5500
DEVWIG ROBERT & ALICE ANNE, 31424 SW OLYMPIC DR, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-5535
DILLENBURGER KARIN, 4405 SW TUNNELWOOD ST, PORTLAND, OR 97221-3750
DILLMAN ERIC MILLER & GAYLE LEE, 10908 SW ROLAND CT, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-8533
DILLON JAMES W, 4620 E RUSSELL RD, COLBERT, WA 99005-9711
DILTZ WILLIAM K, 31533 SW VILLAGE GREEN CT, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-8426
DINARDO JOHN A, 7658 SW VILLAGE GREENS CIR, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-8401
DINELLY VICKIE LYNN, 8405 SW CURRY DR UNIT B, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-8420
DISCHNER SHERYL E, 28962 SW ORLEANS AVE, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-7341
DITTO DAVID J, 32048 SW GUISS WAY, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-8570
DIX PAUL J & DOROTHY E, PO BOX 953, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-0953
DIXON DANIEL W TRUSTEE, 12013 SW GRENOBLE ST, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-7378
DIXON DONALD H & ELIZABETH B, 7215 SW FOUNTAIN LAKE DR, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-7411
DIXON NOELANI, 31233 SW CHIA LOOP, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-7805
DODRILL JEDEDIAH L, 31373 SW CHIA LOOP, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-8707
DOEPKEN LIVING TRUST, 31665 SW ARBOR GLEN LOOP, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-6565
DOILTZ WILLIAM K, 31533 SW COUNTRY VIEW LN, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-8453
DINARD JOHN A, 7658 SW VILLAGE GREENS CIR, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-8401
DINH JESSICA B & DAT T DUONG, 7040 SW FALLEN LEAF ST, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-8871
DINNELL VICKIE LNNY, 8405 SW CURRY DR UNIT B, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-8420
DISCH GREGORY A TRUSTEE, 738 PARADISE VALLEY CT N, DANVILLE, CA 94526
DISCH GERALD & JAMIE, 31035 SW WILLAMETTE WAY E, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-9595
DISCHER SHERRY L, 28962 SW ORLEANS AVE, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-7341
DITTO DAVID J, 32048 SW GUSS WAY, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-8570
DIX PAUL J & DOROTHY E, PO BOX 953, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-0953
DIXON DANIEL W TRUSTEE, 12013 SW GRENROBLE ST, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-7378
DIXON DONALD H & ELIZABETH B, 7215 SW FOUNTAIN LAKE DR, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-7411
DIXON NOELANI, 31233 SW CHIA LOOP, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-7805
DOBIE JEREMY S, 7324 SW BOUCHAINE ST, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-8867
DODGION JAMES E TRUSTEE, 738 PARADISE VALLEY CT N, DANVILLE, CA 94526
DODRILL JEDEDIAH L, 31373 SW CHIA LOOP, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-8707
DOEPKEN LIVING TRUST, 31665 SW ARBOR GLEN LOOP, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-9440
DOHERTY JAMES P & PAMELA E, 29450 SW MONTEBELLO DR, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-7578
DOHERTY JENNIFER E, 28615 SW ASH MEADOWS BLVD UNIT 7, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-7803
DOLLAR CHRISTY M, 29570 SW VOLLEY ST UNIT 36, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-7433
DOLLAR MICHAEL J & MICHELE D, 7083 SW IRON HORSE ST, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-8878
DOLLINGER DANIEL & YINAN QU, 28652 SW COSTA CIR E, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-7301
DON STARR & JAMES P, 30626 SW ROSE LN, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-9703
DONALD MILLER LLC, 7445 CROSBY RD, WOODBURN, OR 97071-9703
DONALDSON MARGARETANN M, 32265 SW LAKE DR, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-6527
DONOVAN JAMES I TRUSTEE, 32525 SW LAKE POINT CT, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-6441
DOORNINK JUSTIN D & CHRISTY A, 31139 SW WILLAMETTE WAY W, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-8546
EASTMAN EDWARD R & BARBARA E, 32086 SW CHARBONNEAU DR UNIT 10B, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-5479
EATON CORPORATION, 1111 SUPERIOR AVE, CLEVELAND, OH 44114-2522
EATON TIMOTHY N & DANAL 28713 SW MEADOWS LOOP, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-8767
EAVE BARBARA M, 30995 SW OTTO LN, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-9775
EAVE SCOTT S & MICHELE L, 31433 SW OLYMPIC DR, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-5535
EBERLE JUDY M TRUSTEE, 31515 SW OLYMPIC DR, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-6531
EBNER DARIUS W, 31526 SW OLD FARM RD, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-6425
EBS COMPANY LLC, 9475 SW WILSONVILLE RD, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-7522
EBY INVESTMENTS LTD, 1660 SW ADVANCE RD, WEST LINN, OR 97068-9678
EBY MARGARET M, 11994 SW SURREY ST, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-7375
EBERLE JUDY M TRUSTEE, 16100 SW CENTURY DR APT 110, SHERWOOD, OR 97140-6220
EBINGER NICOLE M, 29640 SW VOLLEY ST UNIT 40, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-6531
EBNER DARIUS W, 31526 SW OLD FARM RD, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-6425
EBINGER NICOLE M, 29640 SW VOLLEY ST UNIT 40, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-6531
EBNER DARIUS W, 31526 SW OLD FARM RD, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-6425
EBY INVESTMENTS LTD, 1111 SUPERIOR AVE, CLEVELAND, OH 44114-2522
EBY MARGARET M, 11994 SW SURREY ST, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-7375
EBY MARGARET M, 11994 SW SURREY ST, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-7375
EDDY JAMES R & AMY KAUFMAN, 1221 W LIBERTY ST, ANN ARBOR, MI 48103-4331
EDELEN PHILIPPA J & BRETT L, 31533 SW ORCHARD DR, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-5503
EDGEWATER HM OWNER ASSN, CHARBONNEAU32000 SW CHARBONNEAU DR, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-7460
EDMONDS BLAISE, 7692 SW THORNTON DR, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-6551
EDWARDS C SCOTT & AIMEE, 28448 SW MEADOWS LOOP, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-8764
EDWARDS DENO F & CYNTHIA L, 8685 SW MIAMI, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-9758
EDWARDS FORREST A & DEANNA M, 7555 SW KOLBE LN, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-9599
EDWARDS JOHN C & DELLA M, 261 HYLO RD SE, SALEM, OR 97306-9543
EDWARDS RICHARD AUSTIN & DEBRA E, 11687 SW JAMAICA, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-9563
EDWINSON PAUL M & CAROLINE, 31090 SW WALLOWA CT, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-9778
EGGER JANET NADINE, 28643 SW GLENWOOD CIR, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-8758
EGGERT MATTHEW & MEREDITH, 8715 SW CURRY DR UNIT A, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-5423
EGGLESTON CHARLES A, 7875 SW FAIRWAY DR, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-6436
EGGLESTON TODD K & JANICE L, 28105 SW MORGAN ST, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-6792
EGHDAMI CYRUS & MEHRNAZ, 10065 SW COMMERCE CIR, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-8888
EGHDAMI CYRUS O & MEHRANAZ, 0836 SW CURRY ST #1500, PORTLAND, OR 97239-4529
EGLOFF JEFFREY S & STEPHANIE A, 7590 SW VLANOS DR, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-6402
EGLOFF PAMALA, 12002 SW SURREY ST, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-7377
EHRENSHAFT LYNDA, 31203 SW CHIA LOOP, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-7805
EHRSTINE JOHN W TRUSTEE, 8400 SW CURRY DR UNIT B, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-8423
EICHER BRUCE & KATIE M, 8545 SW WILSON LN, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-9737
EILERTSON VIOLET L TRUSTEE, 32531 SW RIVIERA LN, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-7440
EISCHEN LARRY D CO-TRSTE, 31127 SW FRENCH PRAIRIE RD, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-6792
EGIDIMI CYRUS & MEHRNAZ, 10865 SW COMMERCIA CIR, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-8888
EGIDIMI CYRUS O & MEHRANAZ, 0836 SW CURRY ST #1500, PORTLAND, OR 97239-4529
ELDER STEWART M & L MAGDALENE, 31145 SW COUNTRY VIEW LOOP, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-8428
ELDRIDGE ESTHER P, 8615 SW CURRY DR UNIT C, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-8433
ELLIGSEN RALPH H & SHIRLEY L, 7485 SW ELLIGSEN RD, TUALATIN, OR 97062-9623
ELLINGHOUSE JERRY W, 7155 SW EAST LAKE CT, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-9413
ELLIS GENE A, 8170 SW MAXINE LN UNIT 62, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-7785
ELLIS HUSTON IV, 29129 SW MEADOWS LOOP, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-5761
ELLISON JASON P, 7558 SW ROANOKE DR N, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-6801
ELHAIYNY WAEL & ABEER ABOUELELLA, 7664 SW ROANOKE DR S, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-8428
ELMERIN RANDALL D TRUSTEE, 15212 NW EUGENE LN, PORTLAND, OR 97229-7884
EMBURY GLEN R & GLADYS, 31045 SW SALMON LN, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-6748
EMERSON LAWRENCE A, 8376 SW MARINERS DR, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-7457
EMERY RYAN, 29730 SW BROWN RD, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-7556
EMIGH STUART GRANT, 7560 SW FAIRWAY DR, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-6748
EMMETT JAMES R & ALICE S, 28439 SW MORNINGSIDE AVE, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-6840
EMORY JUSTIN O, 29523 SW VILLEBOIS DR S, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-7329
ENGADALL CHRISTOPHER TRUSTEE, 7355 SW MONTGOMERY WAY, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-6740
ENGEL CLIFFORD V & SYLVIA J, 8180 SW FAIRWAY DR, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-6430
EPING GARY TRUSTEE, 11166 SW BELNAP CT, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-8587
EPPSTROM DONALD D TRUSTEE, 8360 SW LAKESIDE LOOP, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-8479
EQUITY TRUST COMPANY CUSTODIAN, 10914 SW PRESTWICK CT, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-5509
ERATH RICHARD C, 19926 NE FAIRVIEW DR, DUNDEE, OR 97115-9115
ERB WILLIAM F & JOANNE S, 10905 SW ROLAND CT, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-8533
ERICHSEN EILEEN TRUSTEE, 32445 SW BOONES BEND RD, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-6420
ERICKSON TIMOTHY R, 32535 SW LAKE POINT CT, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-6441
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masters Capital LLC</td>
<td>27150 SW Kinsman Rd, Wilsonville, OR 97070-8246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathis Michael H &amp; Florence D</td>
<td>31519 SW Wildwood CT, Wilsonville, OR 97070-5501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathison Betty C Trustee</td>
<td>7690 SW Village Greens Cir, Wilsonville, OR 97070-8401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matin Jerrold C Trustee</td>
<td>31655 SW Village Crest CT, Wilsonville, OR 97070-8476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matrix Development Corp.</td>
<td>12755 SW 69Th Ave Ste 100, Tigard, OR 97223-8373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matson Ben T</td>
<td>10385 SW Madrid Loop, Wilsonville, OR 97070-3038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthews Brian A &amp; Christina</td>
<td>31509 SW Orchard Dr, Wilsonville, OR 97070-5509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthews Ronald B &amp; Kristin L</td>
<td>31428 SW Orchard Dr, Wilsonville, OR 97070-6589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurer Bernard &amp; Jennifer L</td>
<td>10913 SW Prestwick CT, Wilsonville, OR 97070-5509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice Bryan P &amp; Jennifer K</td>
<td>11168 SW Barber St, Wilsonville, OR 97070-7305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mautz Robert T Trustee</td>
<td>7550 SW Middle Greens Rd, Wilsonville, OR 97070-9417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxwell Shari L</td>
<td>28464 SW Meadows Loop, Wilsonville, OR 97070-7703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May Christine E &amp; Stanley E</td>
<td>29574 SW Kings Ct, Wilsonville, OR 97070-8536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybee Joe Jr &amp; Janet</td>
<td>28610 SW Sandalwood Dr, Wilsonville, OR 97070-8775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayberry Robert &amp; Ann</td>
<td>7575 SW Kolbe Ln, Wilsonville, OR 97070-9599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayer D J &amp; Ann K</td>
<td>2461 SW Crestdale Dr, Portland, OR 97225-3236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayer Donald J &amp; Ann K</td>
<td>2461 SW Crestdale Dr, Portland, OR 97225-3236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA Rosemary C</td>
<td>11033 SW Parkview Dr, Wilsonville, OR 97070-6595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McBeth Darby Sargent</td>
<td>28659 SW Canyon Creek Rd S, Wilsonville, OR 97070-7743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mcbride Gregory S &amp; Kimberly M</td>
<td>5685 SW Wilson Ln, Wilsonville, OR 97070-7744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mcbride Investments LLC</td>
<td>28831 SW Costa Cir W, Wilsonville, OR 97070-7384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mcbride Investments LLC</td>
<td>5533 Meadows Rd Ste 250, Lake Oswego, OR 97035-3189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mcbride Joyce E</td>
<td>8405 SW Curry Dr Unit C, Wilsonville, OR 97070-8420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mcbride Matthew C</td>
<td>29169 SW Charlotte Ln, Wilsonville, OR 97070-7310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCabe Timothy J</td>
<td>11141 SW Barber St, Wilsonville, OR 97070-7307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCabe Timothy J &amp; Jennifer R</td>
<td>10352 SW Franklin Ln, Wilsonville, OR 97070-5523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCall Judy Earline</td>
<td>8510 SW Curry Dr Unit D, Wilsonville, OR 97070-5409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCann Dennis R &amp; Judy R</td>
<td>32265 SW Armitage Rd, Wilsonville, OR 97070-7452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCann Edward James &amp; MaryAnn</td>
<td>31062 SW Country View Ln, Wilsonville, OR 97070-7415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCann Elizabeth C R</td>
<td>29730 SW Lancelot Ln, Wilsonville, OR 97070-8551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCann Mary M Trustee</td>
<td>8495 SW Metolius Ln, Wilsonville, OR 97070-9780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCarty Brian &amp; Brenda</td>
<td>31517 SW Orchard Dr, Wilsonville, OR 97070-5500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCarty James P &amp; Julie A</td>
<td>7743 SW Arbor Glen Ct, Wilsonville, OR 97070-8469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCarty Lila M A Trustee</td>
<td>7680 SW Fairway Loop, Wilsonville, OR 97070-8739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCarty Michael E &amp; Annette C</td>
<td>31116 SW Willamette Way W, Wilsonville, OR 97070-8526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCaulay John R</td>
<td>8224 SW Mariners Dr, Wilsonville, OR 97070-7455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McClellan Eric L &amp; Lisa B</td>
<td>31150 SW Country View Loop, Wilsonville, OR 97070-8428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCloud Jim W &amp; Cynthia J</td>
<td>72 Milland Dr, Mill Valley, CA 94941-4910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mcclure Earl &amp; Judi Eichman-Mcclure</td>
<td>7509 SW Murray St, Wilsonville, OR 97070-6548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mcconnel Mary A</td>
<td>11848 SW Palermo St, Wilsonville, OR 97070-7382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mcconnell Bruce K Trustee</td>
<td>32523 SW Riviera Ln, Wilsonville, OR 97070-7405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mccord Glen A &amp; Elizab th A</td>
<td>7893 SW Rockbridge St, Wilsonville, OR 97070-6848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mccoskey Teresa Ann</td>
<td>32530 SW Armitage Rd, Wilsonville, OR 97070-7447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mccoy Benjamin D</td>
<td>29650 SW Courtside Dr Unit 21, Wilsonville, OR 97070-7482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mccoy Janice M</td>
<td>32205 SW East Lake Pt, Wilsonville, OR 97070-8455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mccoy Kevin R</td>
<td>7065 SW Highland Ct, Wilsonville, OR 97070-8761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mccracken John W lll &amp; DeWana M</td>
<td>31625 SW Country View Ln, Wilsonville, OR 97070-9445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mccready Connie R</td>
<td>29520 SW Volley St Unit 58, Wilsonville, OR 97070-5437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mccrum Ronald R</td>
<td>7520 SW Wimbledon Cir S, Wilsonville, OR 97070-9469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mccloughall T Michael</td>
<td>8605 SW Metolius Ln, Wilsonville, OR 97070-6742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mccloughall Timothy G &amp; Stephanie</td>
<td>A29072 SW San Remo Ave, Wilsonville, OR 97070-7376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mccloughall John Trustee</td>
<td>32405 SW Armitage Rd, Wilsonville, OR 97070-9403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDaniel Steven M &amp; Phyllis</td>
<td>9150 SW Blake, Tualatin, OR 97062-9009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDiarmid Lindsay A</td>
<td>6920 SW Boeckman Rd, Wilsonville, OR 97070-6728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mcdonald George Duncan Trustee</td>
<td>10816 SW Edgewood Ct, Wilsonville, OR 97070-5532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mcdonald John T &amp; Alice L</td>
<td>28333 SW Wagner St, Wilsonville, OR 97070-6784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mcdonald Richard A &amp; Barbara C</td>
<td>7223 SW Lake Bluff Ct, Wilsonville, OR 97070-9410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mcdonald Scott &amp; H Rudken-Mcdonald</td>
<td>7085 SW Cedar Pointe Dr, Wilsonville, OR 97070-7850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mcdonals Peter W &amp; Wenda K</td>
<td>10962 SW Flores St, Wilsonville, OR 97070-8571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McEwan-Coyer Annette &amp; L A Coyer</td>
<td>7078 SW Cedar Pointe Dr, Wilsonville, OR 97070-7850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mcfall Patrick E Trustee</td>
<td>29558 SW Glacier Way, Wilsonville, OR 97070-7559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCFARLAND ANITA C</td>
<td>32510 SW Juliette Dr, Wilsonville, OR 97070-7445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAHL RONALD B &amp; JOY L</td>
<td>7888 SW ROCKBRIDGE ST, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STALDER KYLE D</td>
<td>30380 SW REBEKAH ST UNIT 26, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANAWAY TATE</td>
<td>26799 SW MCLEOD ST, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANCI L DANNY R &amp; HELEN V</td>
<td>28540 SW MORNINGSIDE AVE, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANGE PATRICIA A, 31122 SW WILLAMETTE WAY W, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
<td>97070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANISLOWSKI BRIAN SCOTT &amp; LUANN</td>
<td>31402 SW OLYMPIC DR, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANTON HELEN M TRUSTEE, PO BOX 704</td>
<td>7004, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANTON JEANICE MARIE, 26920 SW MCLEOD ST</td>
<td>WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAPLES JEFFREY W</td>
<td>29545 SW QUEENS CT, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAR SHERIE J</td>
<td>7650 SW ARBOR LAKE CT, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STARK EUGENE R &amp; CAROL G</td>
<td>7272 SW IRON HORSE ST, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STARR CHRISTINA</td>
<td>28859 SW COSTA CIR W, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STARR SCOTT A &amp; TINA L</td>
<td>28750 SW CASCADE LOOP, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE OF OREGON, RIGHT OF WAY MS# 2</td>
<td>FILE 17515, SALEM, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE OF OREGON, STATE HWY BLDG RM 119</td>
<td>SALEM, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATES WILLIAM G &amp; JULEEN S</td>
<td>7859 SW LOVE CT, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATHEM THOMAS KEVIN &amp; AIDA CATALINA</td>
<td>18460 SW BOONES FERRY RD APT K302, TIGARD, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAUCH DENNIS J</td>
<td>11420 SW PAULINA DR, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAUFFER DONALD S</td>
<td>32036 SW GUISS WAY, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAUFFER NANCI</td>
<td>29675 SW JACKSON WAY, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEAD DAVID B</td>
<td>28492 SW MEADOWS LOOP, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STERNER JAMES</td>
<td>28615 SW ASH MEADOWS BLVD UNIT 8, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEELE DOUGLAS R TRUSTEE, 28568 SW CASCADE LOOP, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
<td>97070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEELE WILLIAM R &amp; SUSAN</td>
<td>32355 SW BOONES BEND RD, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEFANELLI MARJORIE</td>
<td>8200 SW FAIRWAY DR, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEIGER ALAN L &amp; SHARON P</td>
<td>7054 SW CEDAR POINTE DR, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEINMETZ SELENA A</td>
<td>29117 SW VILLEBOIS DR S, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEITZER JOEL</td>
<td>8515 SW CURRY DR UNIT A, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STELL JAMES</td>
<td>10903 SE ONEONTA DR, HAPPY VALLEY, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STENGERS JAMES A</td>
<td>7250 SW MONTGOMERY WAY, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STENGERS JAMES A &amp; JUDY LUCILLE</td>
<td>7250 SW MONTGOMERY WAY, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEENSTRUM DAVID A</td>
<td>7306 SW IRON HORSE ST, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEPHENS CASEY H &amp; KAREN A</td>
<td>8475 SW MIAMI, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEVENS FAMILY FARMS LLC</td>
<td>400 SW MARYLHURST DR, WEST LINN, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEVENS MICHAEL B TRUSTEE, PO BOX 3527</td>
<td>WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEVENS MICHAEL B TRUSTEE</td>
<td>16920 SW WILSONVILLE RD, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEVENS SUSAN L &amp; JOHN E DUNCAN</td>
<td>10907 SW PARKWOOD CT, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEVENS WADE E &amp; LESLIE</td>
<td>28722 SW CASCADE LOOP, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEWART ANDREW D</td>
<td>8410 SW CURRY DR UNIT A, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEWART BRADLEY J &amp; MARGARET L</td>
<td>7023 SW HOLLYBROOK CT, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEWART MARK K &amp; MARY D</td>
<td>28955 SW MEADOWS LOOP, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEWART MARVIN D</td>
<td>7330 SW MONTGOMERY WAY, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEWART MICHAEL R</td>
<td>29268 SW ORLEANS AVE, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEWART MILIAN J</td>
<td>11106 SW MONT BLANC ST, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIBEL ELAINE M, 3 ALEXANDRIA CT, FAIRFILD, CT</td>
<td>06824-7819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIFFLER SYLVIA</td>
<td>6923 NE NORTHBRIDGE LN, LA CENTER, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STILES DON B</td>
<td>9450 54TH AVE NE, SALEM, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STILLWELL DAVID A &amp; JOYCE J</td>
<td>31204 SW CHIA LOOP, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STITES DERRICK J &amp; SHEILA J</td>
<td>29036 SW COURTSIDE DR, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIXRUD NEAL ADLING &amp; ANNETTE D</td>
<td>8440 SW LAFAFETTE WAY, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STODDARD GEORGE CAMERON &amp; BOEL, PO BOX 3273</td>
<td>WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STOFFREGEN JOHN C II &amp; ANGELA L</td>
<td>28800 SW MEADOWS LOOP, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STOHIR THEODORE R JR, 8675 SW CARMEL CIR, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
<td>97070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STOKES KENNETH M TRUSTEE, 1640 5TH ST, COLUMBIA CITY, OR</td>
<td>97018-970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STONE BRUCE L &amp; LEI LANI, 8126 SW WINCHESTER WAY, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
<td>97070-9420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STONEBRAKER HELENE O &amp; DEBRA V, 8235 SW FAIRWAY DR, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
<td>97070-9419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STONER DENNIS C TRUSTEE, 2992 KIHAUNA PLANTATION DR, KOLA, HI 96756-8568</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STOREY DOUGLAS E &amp; CYNTHIA M, 30998 SW ORCHARD DR, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
<td>97070-7535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STOOGARD JUDY A, 28687 SW ROGER BLVD UNIT 74, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
<td>97070-8738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORM TERRY G &amp; KAREN J, 11092 SW PARKVIEW DR, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
<td>97070-6595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STOTT JAMES C TRUSTEE, 32111 SW WILLAMETTE WAY E, WILSONVILLE, OR</td>
<td>97070-7513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALTER BRENT E</td>
<td>28933 SW CASCADE LOOP, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-8751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALTER STEPHEN J</td>
<td>10858 SW PARKWOOD LN, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-8531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALTERS THEODORA S TRUSTEE</td>
<td>2002 OLD CLAIRTON RD, JEFFERSON HILLS, PA 15025-3178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WANG ALBERT</td>
<td>8 CHURCHILL DOWNS, LAKE OSWEGO, OR 97035-1412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WANG PENG &amp; ZHENKUN REN</td>
<td>13566 NW HOGAN ST, PORTLAND, OR 97229-4140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WANG XIAO-FENG</td>
<td>29370 SW VILLEBOIS DR S, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-7316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WANG YI HELEN</td>
<td>32105 SW ARBOR LAKE DR, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-9408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WANLESS LINDA S</td>
<td>8130 SW WOODBRIDGE CT, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-9427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAPPES GARY W</td>
<td>11688 SW PALERMO ST, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-7317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARD JEFF</td>
<td>28627 SW MORNINGSIDE AVE, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-6850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARD KARL MAX</td>
<td>31223 SW KENSINGTON DR, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-7530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARD STEVEN P</td>
<td>29550 SW VILLEBOIS DR S, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-7326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARD SYLVIA</td>
<td>29371 SW VILLEBOIS DR S, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-7316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARDEN MATTHEW C</td>
<td>29327 SW VILLEBOIS DR S, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-7316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARDLE STEVE LAMAR</td>
<td>6851 SW GLENWOOD CT, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-8759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARNER BRIAN J</td>
<td>8625 SW WILSON LN, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-7744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARNER DUANE A</td>
<td>1505 NW HEALY CT, BEND, OR 97701-5521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARNER JUDITH A</td>
<td>7698 SW THORNTON DR, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-6550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARNINCK RYAN S &amp; KERRIE E</td>
<td>7086 SW IRON HORSE ST, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-8878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARNICK RYAN S &amp; KERRIE E</td>
<td>32228 SW BOONES BEND RD, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-6418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARNINS MARGARET H TRUSTEE</td>
<td>7670 SW ARBOR LAKE CT, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-9407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATERS GREG &amp; TRISH</td>
<td>31313 SW CHIA LOOP, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-7806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATKINSON PETER MARSHALL</td>
<td>32575 SW RIVIERA LN, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-6403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATKINSON TARA D &amp; SAMUEL</td>
<td>7894 SW ROCKBRIDGE ST, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-6848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATMAR I LLC, ATTN: W GRANT</td>
<td>31150 SW WALLOWA CT, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-9778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATSON KEITH BYRON</td>
<td>8200 SW MAXINE LN UNIT 58, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-7784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATSON RANDY D</td>
<td>30330 SW REBEKHA ST UNIT 1, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-6667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEAKLEY ESTHER E</td>
<td>7855 SW TENNIS CT, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-9450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEAKLEY FAMILY LLC</td>
<td>PO BOX 368, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-0368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEAKLEY ESTHER E</td>
<td>7855 SW TENNIS CT, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-9450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEBB BARRY W &amp; DONNA M</td>
<td>7700 SW FAIRWAY DR, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-9687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEBB CARMELLA A</td>
<td>32325 SW DEL MONTE DR, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-9431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEBB CLIFFORD S</td>
<td>32501 SW JULIETTE RD, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-7445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEBB EDWARD W</td>
<td>1239 NW MAYFIELD RD, PORTLAND, OR 97229-9102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEBER DIETER</td>
<td>11311 SW CHURCHILL, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-9572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEBER ELENA M</td>
<td>6764 SW MOLALLA BEND RD, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-9572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEBER LAWRENCE A TRUSTEE</td>
<td>8232 SW EDGEEWATER W, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-9481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEBER LOIS</td>
<td>7330 SW EAST LAKE CT, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-8456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEBER PETER</td>
<td>7563 SW ROANOKE DR, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-6805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEKLY NORMAN L &amp; ARLENE M</td>
<td>7700 SW FAIRWAY DR, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-6749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEIDEMANN PARK APARTMENTS</td>
<td>8532 SW ST HELENS DR STE 201, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-9639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEIGEL BETTE J EST</td>
<td>6764 SW MOLALLA BEND RD, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-9404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEIGEL PAULA A C</td>
<td>29700 SW COURTSIDE DR UNIT 23, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-5433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEIGEL SEAN A</td>
<td>7900 SW RACQUET CT, WILSONVILLE, OR 97070-9449</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Zhang Zhong, 5012 Greensboro Ct, Lake Oswego, OR 97035-8748
Zhou Ying, 3-2-12E Guan Cheng, Beijing, 10008
Ziehl Donald & Anita, 29439 SW Yosemite St, Wilsonville, OR 97070-8504
Ziercher Eric L, 31439 SW Orchard Dr, Wilsonville, OR 97070-5536
Zimel Mark S, 11830 SW Palermo St, Wilsonville, OR 97070-7317
Zimmerman Eugene Brian, 28669 SW Meadows Loop, Wilsonville, OR 97070-8766
Zimmerman James E, 28620 SW Crestwood Dr, Wilsonville, OR 97070-7728
Zimmerman Lin A, 11931 SW Lausanne St, Wilsonville, OR 97070-7328
Zinssler Leroi & Carol, 31550 SW Village Green Ct, Wilsonville, OR 97070-8426
Zinssler Leroi Donald Trustee, 7490 SW Downs Post Rd, Wilsonville, OR 97070-8454
Zitek Gladys Jll, 30825 SW Rogue Ct, Wilsonville, OR 97070-9786
Zotos Kamyrin J, 31175 SW Metolius Ct, Wilsonville, OR 97070-9782
Zou Wei & Bei Huang, 11969 SW Lausanne St, Wilsonville, OR 97070-7328
Zucker Leonard Trustee, 22505 SW Arbor Lake Dr, Wilsonville, OR 97070-6443
Zuercher David J & Pamela A, 8680 SW Miami, Wilsonville, OR 97070-9758
Zundel Robert F & Deborah Y, 8575 SW Rogue Ln, Wilsonville, OR 97070-6744
Zurcher Timothy Scott & Lisa Marie, PO Box 2528, Wilsonville, OR 97070-2628
Zweber Kenneth D, 6303 SW Ash Creek Dr, Portland, OR 97219-3182
Zweigart Melody R & Neil, 10450 SW Wilsonville Rd, Wilsonville, OR 97070-7583
Mildred Hill, 23885 SW 65th, Tualatin, OR 97062
Aquilla Hurst-Ravich, City of Tualatin18880 SW Martinazzi Avenue, Tualatin, OR 97062
Attn: Development Review, ODOT123 NW Flanders Street, Portland, OR 97209
Bill Ferber, Region Manager, Oregon Water Resources Department725 Summer Street, NE, Salem, OR 97301
Bill Rhoades, West Linn/Wilsonville School District3722210 SW Stafford Rd, Tualatin, OR 97062
Bobbi Burton, Community Coordinator, Facilities Division2575 Center Street, NE, Salem, OR 97310
Brian Moore, Portland General Electric9540 SW Boeckman Road, Wilsonville, OR 97070
Brian Tietzert, United Disposal ServicesLE295 SW Ridder Road, Wilsonville, OR 97070
Caleb Winter, Metro600 NE Grand Avenue, Portland, OR 97232
City Planner, City of Canby182 N. Holly, Canby, OR 97013
Columbia Cable of Oregon, 14200 SW Brigadoon Ct, Beaverton, OR 97005
Jane Estes, ODOT Region 2A6000 SW Raab Road, Portland, OR 97221
John Lilly, Department of State Lands775 Summer Street, NE, Salem, OR 97301-1279
Lidwien Rahman, ODOT, Region 1123 NW Flanders Street, Portland, OR 97209
Manager, Community Development, Metro Growth Management Services900 NE Grand Avenue, Portland, OR 97232
Marah Danielsen, ODOT, Region 1213 NW Flanders Street, Portland, OR 97209
Oregon Dept of Environ Quality, 811 SW Sixth Avenue, Portland, OR 97204
Planning Director, City of Sherwood22560 SW Pine Street, Sherwood, OR 97140
Ray Valone, Metro600 NE Grand Avenue, Portland, OR 97232
Richard Ross, Department of Corrections2575 Center Street NE, Salem, OR 97310
Saskia Dresler, West Linn/Wilsonville School District3722210 SW Stafford Rd, Tualatin, OR 97062
Shelley Fenton, BPA, Realty DepartmentPO Box 3621, Portland, OR 97208
Sherwood School District Admin Office, 23295 SW Main Street, Sherwood, OR 97140
Tom Simpson, NW Natural Gas220 NW 2nd Avenue, Portland, OR 97209
Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue, South Division7401 SW Washo Court, Tualatin, OR 97062-8350
Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue, 29875 SW Kingsman Road, Wilsonville, OR 97070
Tualatin Valley Water District, 1850 SW 170th Ave, Beaverton, OR 97005-4211
Wendy Buck, Portland General Electric121 SW Salmon 1 WTC3, Portland, OR 97204
William Graffi, Unified Sewerage Agency155 N. First Avenue, Room 270, Hillsboro, OR 97124

Witness my hand this ___day of April 2013

Linda M. Straessle, Administrative Assistant III

Acknowledged before me this ___day of April 2013

[Signature]

NOTARY PUBLIC STATE OF OREGON

LP13-0003 Transportation System Plan Update
LP13-0004 TSP-related Code Amendments
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This is to notify you that the City of Wilsonville has proposed Land Use Regulations that may affect the permissible uses of your property and other properties.

(This notice required by ORS 227.186)

Planning Commission:
On Wednesday, May 8, 2013, beginning at 6:00 p.m., the Wilsonville Planning Commission will hold a public hearing regarding adoption of the Wilsonville Transportation System Plan and related Comprehensive Plan and Development Code amendments (Case File # LP13-0003 and LP13-0004). The Planning Commission will consider whether to recommend adoption of the amendment to the City Council. No additional mailed notice will be sent to you unless you either:
- Submit testimony or sign in at the Planning Commission hearing, or
- Submit a request, in writing or by telephone, to the Planning Division.

City Council:
The Wilsonville City Council is scheduled to hold a public hearing on the proposal on June 3, 2013, at 7:00 p.m. after which it may make the final decision.

The hearings will take place at Wilsonville City Hall, 29799 SW Town Center Loop East, Wilsonville, Oregon. A complete copy of the relevant file information, including the staff report, findings, and recommendations, will be available for viewing seven days prior to each public hearing at Wilsonville City Hall and at the Wilsonville Public Library.

The City of Wilsonville has determined that the adoption of the TSP and related Code amendments may affect the permissible uses of your property and other properties in the affected zone and may change the value of your property.

The language in the above paragraph is required by Oregon state law ORS 227.186. The City has not determined that this particular proposal will reduce or otherwise impact either the value or use of your property. Any changes to permitted land uses may reduce or increase property values, depending on various factors.

Summary of Proposal: Updated Wilsonville Transportation System Plan
The Transportation System Plan (TSP) is a 20-year blueprint for Wilsonville’s transportation system. The TSP update integrates and updates past master planning efforts for vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian, and transit improvements and programs into one new Plan. The TSP accounts for changing economic and social circumstances (including land use growth and revenue forecasts through the year 2035) to ensure consistency with state and regional planning policies.

The Transportation System Plan is a City-wide plan that guides transportation policies, including property access, and projects such as street expansions and new connections

The draft TSP includes:
- City goals, policies and implementation measures related to the transportation system;
- An evaluation of the existing transportation system;
- Identification of capital improvement projects to address vehicles, bicycles, pedestrians, freight, transit and safety;
- Establishment of functional street classifications, connectivity, spacing and cross-section standards.

Amendments to the Development Code are proposed to implement and coordinate with the policies in the TSP, particularly with regard to transportation-related improvements of large new developments.

Date of Planning Commission Meeting: May 8, 2013
Date Notice was mailed: April 10, 2013
Oral or written testimony may be presented at the public hearing. Written comment on the proposal to be submitted into the public hearing record is welcome prior to the public hearings. To have your written comments or testimony distributed to the Planning Commission before the meeting, it must be received by 2 pm on May 8\textsuperscript{th}. Direct such written comments or testimony to:

Chris Neamtzu, Planning Division,
29799 SW Town Center Loop East, Wilsonville, Oregon, 97070;
Neamtzu@ci.wilsonville.or.us, (503) 682-4960

Copies of the full draft plan is available from the Wilsonville Planning Department at the above address and at the project website: www.ci.wilsonville.or.us/tspupdate

Note: Assistive Listening Devices (ALD) are available for persons with impaired hearing and can be scheduled for this meeting. The City will also endeavor to provide qualified sign language interpreters and/or bilingual interpreters, without cost, if requested at least 48 hours prior to the meeting. To obtain such services, please call Linda Straessle, Planning Administrative Assistant at (503) 682-4960.
## Postage Statement - Standard Mail

### Mailer
- **Permit Holder's Name and Address**
  - ADVANCED POST & PRESS INC
  - 14419 SE McLOUGHLIN BLVD
  - PORTLAND, OR 97267

- **Telephone**
  - 503-239-9488

### Name and Address of Mailing Agent (If Other than permit holder)
- **Name and Address**
  - CITY OF WILSONVILLE
  - 29799 SW TOWN CENTER LOOP E
  - WILSONVILLE, OR 97070

### Post Office of Mailing
- **Post Office**
  - 97208

### Processing Category
- **Type of Postage**
  - Permit Imprint
  - Precanceled Postage
  - Stamps

### Mailing Date
- **Mailing Date**
  - Apr 10, 2013

### Federal Agency Cost Code
- **Statement Seq. No.**
  - 113846

### No. and Type of Containers
- **Total # of Pieces in Mailing**
  - 4,632

### Total Weight
- **Total Weight**
  - 63.9216 pounds

### Permit #
- **Permit #**
  - 1547

### For Mail Enclosed within Another Class
- **Permit Enclosed within Another Class**
  - Bound Printed Matter
  - Library Mail

### Statement Seq. No.
- **Statement Seq. No.**
  - 113846

### No. and Type of Containers
- **No. and Type of Containers**
  - 1 ft. Letter Trays
  - 2 ft. Letter Trays
  - EMM Letter Trays
  - Flat Trays
  - Pallets
  - Other

### Move Update Method
- **Move Update Method**
  - Ancillary Service Endorsement
  - via Alternative Address Format

### For Carrier Route Sequencing
- **For Carrier Route Sequencing**
  - OnOne Code ACS

### Parts Completed (Select all that apply)
- **Parts Completed**
  - A
  - B
  - C
  - D
  - E
  - F
  - G
  - H
  - L
  - M
  - S
  - NSA
  - Letter-size or flat mailpiece contains DVD/CD or other disc.

### Subtotal Postage
- **Subtotal Postage**
  - (Add Parts Totals)
  - $978.18

### Price at Which Postage Affixed (Check one)
- Complete if the mail includes pieces bearing metered/PC postage or precanceled stamps.
- **Price at Which Postage Affixed**
  - $78.18

### Incentive/Discount Flat Dollar Amount:
- **Incentive/Discount Flat Dollar Amount**
  - $78.18

### Net Postage Due (Line 1 +/- Lines 2, 3, 4)
- **Net Postage Due**
  - $978.18

### Total Adjusted Postage Affixed
- **Total Adjusted Postage Affixed**

### Total Adjusted Postage Permit Imprint
- **Total Adjusted Postage Simplified Addressing (EDDM)**

### Certification
- **Incentive/Discount Claimed**
  - Type of Fees:
  - Yes

### Signature of Mailer or Agent
- **Signature of Mailer or Agent**
  - ADVANCED POST & PRESS
  - 503-239-9488

### Printed Name of Mailer or Agent Signing Form
- **Printed Name of Mailer or Agent Signing Form**
  - ADVANCED POST & PRESS

### Telephone
- **Telephone**
  - 503-239-9488

### Facsimile by Bulk Mailing Pro 5.7.0, Satori Software Inc. (208) 357-2900

### USP Use Only
- **USP Use Only**
  - To be completed in non-Postal/One Sites

### To be completed in non-Postal/One Sites
- **Print USPS Employee's Name**

### PS Form 3802-R1, January 2013
- **PS Form 3802-R1, January 2013**

- (121102)

- Facsimile by Bulk Mailing Pro 5.7.0, Satori Software Inc. (208) 357-2900
## Standard Mail

### Part A

**Automation Letters**

**Letters** 3.3 oz. (0.2063 lbs.) or less

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Price Category</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>No. of Pieces</th>
<th>Subtotal Postage</th>
<th>Discount Total</th>
<th>Fee Total</th>
<th>Total Postage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>5-Digit</td>
<td>$0.247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3-Digit</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>AADC</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Mixed AADC</td>
<td>0.282</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>80.934</td>
<td></td>
<td>80.9340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>DNDC</td>
<td>5-Digit</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>DNDC</td>
<td>3-Digit</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>DNDC</td>
<td>AADC</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>DNDC</td>
<td>Mixed AADC</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>DSCF</td>
<td>5-Digit</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>3830</td>
<td>781.320</td>
<td></td>
<td>781.3200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>DSCF</td>
<td>3-Digit</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>88.085</td>
<td></td>
<td>88.0850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11</td>
<td>DSCF</td>
<td>AADC</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>16.279</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.2790</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Letters** Over 3.3 oz. up to 3.5 oz.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Price Category</th>
<th>Piece Price</th>
<th>Or Amount Affixed</th>
<th>No. of Pieces</th>
<th>Pieces Subtotal</th>
<th>Pound Price</th>
<th>Pounds Pounds Subtotal</th>
<th>Subtotal Postage</th>
<th>Discount Total</th>
<th>Fee Total</th>
<th>Total Postage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A12</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>5-Digit</td>
<td>$0.092</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.752</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3-Digit</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A14</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>AADC</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A15</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Mixed AADC</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A16</td>
<td>DNDC</td>
<td>5-Digit</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.591</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A17</td>
<td>DNDC</td>
<td>3-Digit</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.591</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A18</td>
<td>DNDC</td>
<td>AADC</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.591</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A19</td>
<td>DNDC</td>
<td>Mixed AADC</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.591</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A20</td>
<td>DSCF</td>
<td>5-Digit</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A21</td>
<td>DSCF</td>
<td>3-Digit</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A22</td>
<td>DSCF</td>
<td>AADC</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For affixed postage mailings as described in DMM 243, compute and enter the price for each piece in the Amount Affixed column, multiply by No. of Pieces and total in the Total column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Price Category</th>
<th>Piece Price</th>
<th>Or Amount Affixed</th>
<th>No. of Pieces</th>
<th>Pieces Subtotal</th>
<th>Pound Price</th>
<th>Pounds Pounds Subtotal</th>
<th>Subtotal Postage</th>
<th>Discount Total</th>
<th>Fee Total</th>
<th>Total Postage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard Mail Automation Letters Subtotal (Add lines A1-A22)** 966.6180

### Full Service Intelligent Mail Option

**A24**

Letters - Number of Pieces that Comply $\times 0.001 = $

**Part A Total (Line A23 minus A24)** 966.6180
### Standard Mail

**Part B**

**Nonautomation Letters**

#### Machinable Letters  3.3 oz. (0.2063 lbs.) or less

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Price Category</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>No. of Pieces</th>
<th>Subtotal Postage</th>
<th>Discount Total</th>
<th>Fee Total</th>
<th>Total Postage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>AADC</td>
<td>$0.274</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Mixed AADC</td>
<td>0.290</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.480</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.4800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>DNDC</td>
<td>AADC</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>DNDC</td>
<td>Mixed AADC</td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>DSCF</td>
<td>AADC</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Nonmachinable Letters  3.3 oz. (0.2063 lbs.) or less

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Price Category</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>No. of Pieces</th>
<th>Subtotal Postage</th>
<th>Discount Total</th>
<th>Fee Total</th>
<th>Total Postage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>5-Digit</td>
<td>$0.408</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3-Digit</td>
<td>0.503</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>ADC</td>
<td>0.537</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Mixed ADC</td>
<td>0.632</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10</td>
<td>DNDC</td>
<td>5-Digit</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11</td>
<td>DNDC</td>
<td>3-Digit</td>
<td>0.470</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B12</td>
<td>DNDC</td>
<td>ADC</td>
<td>0.504</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B13</td>
<td>DNDC</td>
<td>Mixed ADC</td>
<td>0.599</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B14</td>
<td>DSCF</td>
<td>5-Digit</td>
<td>0.365</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B15</td>
<td>DSCF</td>
<td>3-Digit</td>
<td>0.460</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B16</td>
<td>DSCF</td>
<td>ADC</td>
<td>0.494</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Nonmachinable Letters  Over 3.3 oz. but less than 16 oz.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Price Category</th>
<th>Piece Price</th>
<th>Or Amount Affixed</th>
<th>No. of Pieces</th>
<th>Pieces Subtotal</th>
<th>Pound Price</th>
<th>Pounds</th>
<th>Pounds Subtotal</th>
<th>Subtotal Postage</th>
<th>Discount Total</th>
<th>Fee Total</th>
<th>Total Postage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B17</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>5-Digit</td>
<td>$0.257</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.752</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B18</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3-Digit</td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>ADC</td>
<td>0.387</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B20</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Mixed ADC</td>
<td>0.429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B21</td>
<td>DNDC</td>
<td>5-Digit</td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.591</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B22</td>
<td>DNDC</td>
<td>3-Digit</td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.591</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B23</td>
<td>DNDC</td>
<td>ADC</td>
<td>0.387</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.591</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B24</td>
<td>DNDC</td>
<td>Mixed ADC</td>
<td>0.429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.591</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B25</td>
<td>DSCF</td>
<td>5-Digit</td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B26</td>
<td>DSCF</td>
<td>3-Digit</td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B27</td>
<td>DSCF</td>
<td>ADC</td>
<td>0.387</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For affixed postage mailings as described in DMM 243, compute and enter the price for each piece in the Amount Affixed column, multiply by No. of Pieces and total in the Total column.

**Part B Total** (Add lines B1-B27)  **11.5650**

---

**PS Form 3602-R3, January 2013 (121102)**

Facsimile by Bulk Mailer Pro 5.7.0, Satori Software Inc., (206) 357-2000
AFFIDAVIT OF EMAILING AND POSTING NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING IN THE CITY OF WILSONVILLE

STATE OF OREGON )
COUNTIES OF CLACKAMAS )
AND WASHINGTON )
CITY OF WILSONVILLE )

I, Linda M. Straessle, do hereby certify that I am Administrative Assistant for the City of Wilsonville, Counties of Clackamas and Washington, State of Oregon, that the attached copy of Notice of Public Hearing is a true copy of the original notice of said public hearing; that on April 10, 2013, I did cause to be emailed copies of such notice of said public hearing in the exact form hereto attached to the following people:

Ray Cooper, r2cooper@yahoo.com
Abbie Allen, abbie.allen@oit.edu
Andy DeHart, Vision Plastics Inc, Warehouse supervisor, adehart@visionplastics.com
Tony Holt, Ajholt36@aol.com
Alan Kirk, Orepac Building Products, CFO, akirk@orepac.com
Anthony Calcagno, anthony.calcagno@gmail.com
Art Sasaki, ART_SASKI@msn.com
Ben Altman, baltman@sfadg.com
David Bloudek, bloudekd@gmail.com
Boyd Westover, Eaton Corp, Plant Manager, BoydKWestover@eaton.com
Brian McCabe, brian.mccabe@machinesciences.com
Carol White, carolwhite522@comcast.net
Susie Stevens, ccc@teleport.com
Christine Reynolds, cerathome@aol.com
Kristi Halstead, ekhalstead@frontier.com
Chuck Knorr, cknorr45@gmail.com
Rose Cox, cox@pacwestcom.com
Doris Wehler, d1wehler@gmail.com
Danielle Cowan, danielle@mthoodterritory.com
David Bernert, WCP Inc, dave.bernett@hp.com
Dave Lucas, dave.lucas@teck.com
Dan O’Halloran, Rockwell Collins, Facilities Manager, dfohallo@rockwellcollins.com
Dean Downs, didowns503@gmail.com
Doug Gilmer, Wilsonville Concrete, doug@wilsonvilleconcrete.com
Doug Friesen, Mentor Graphics Corp, Manager, doug_friesen@mentor.com
Andrew Karr, drewdown69@gmail.com
Jerri Bohard, ebohard@comcast.net
Ed Doubrava, ed@showplacerlandscape.net
Elisa Walch, elisa.walch@comcast.net
Fred Robinson, Fred_Robinson@FMI.com
George Adams, Wilsonville Concrete, georgeadams@wilsonvilleconcrete.com
Ryan Gillett, Sysco Portland, VP of Operations, gillett.ryan@pdx.sysco.com
Ginnie Schultens, Xerox, Supply Chain Director, ginnie.schultens@xerox.com
Kate Greenfield, gr33kat@yahoo.com
Grace Lucini, grlucii@gmail.com
Carl Hosticka, Metro Councilor, hostickac@metro.dst.or.us
Anne Easterly, iamjann@juno.com
Jamie Morgan-Stasny, Assistant Planner, Metropolitan Lan Group, LLC, JamieM@metlandgroup.com
Jerry Greenfield, jer.greenfield@gmail.com
Joe Keys, Rite Aid Distribution Center, General Manager, jkeys@riteaid.com
John Ludlow, john07@hevanet.com
Jim Kimsey, RockwellCollins, Logistics/ Warehouse Supervisor, jtkimsey@rockwellcollins.com
Justin Doornink, justin.doornink@gmail.com
Justin Wood, Homebuilders Associat, justinw@hbapdx.org
John Lucini, jwluc@gmail.com
Kathryn Whittaker, k6Whittaker@gmail.com
Kamryn Zotos, kamryn.zotos@ocdc.net
Karen Mohling, Deputy Fire Marshal
Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue, Karen.Mohling@tvfr.com
Keith Cochrun, Keith.Cochrun@dcma.mil
Kevin Van Dyke, kevin9711@yahoo.com
Kevin Hoffman, Wilsonville Toyota, Parts Manager, khoffman@wilsonvilletoyota.com
Kallen Kentner, Wilsonville Spokesman, kkentner@wilsonvillespokesman.com
Kris Rector, kkrec823@aol.com
Tim Knapp, knapp@ci.wilsonville.or.us
Lisa Krecklow, KrecklowFamily@gmail.com
Larry Harvey, larry@smartdecision.biz
Lee Oien, PE, Xerox Corporation, lee.oien@xerox.com
Jim Lehman, Sysco, lehman.Jim@pdx.sysco.com
Al and Pat Levit, levirehberg@frontier.com
Mark Sepull, FLIR Systems, Shipping/ Warehouse Manager, mark.sepull@flir.com
Vern Wise, marvern@comcast.net
Mary Closson, maryclosson@msn.com
Maureen Showalter, maureenshowalter@hotmail.com
Michelle Ripple, michelle@alumni.rutgers.edu
Michelle Labrie-Ripple, Northwest Automation & Control, michelle@nwautomation.com
Noel Coulson, Distribution Center Manager, Coca-Cola, ncoulson@coca-cola.com
Pat Knorr, patricia.knorr@gmail.com
Paul Peri, Paul.Peri@mtangel.edu
Pete Schmidt, peter_schmidt@FWS.gov
Phyllis Straight-Milian, phyllmikey@frontier.com
Peter Hurley, phhurley1@gmail.com
Phillip Rosebrook, Rosebrook@comcast.net
Bob McQuown, r.mcquown@comcast.net
Ray Cooper, r2cooper@yahoo.com
Randi Wortman, randal.wortman@gmail.com
Rep. Matt Wingard, repmattwingard@state.or.us
Ron Kief, RonKief@comcast.net
Russell Knoebel, Washington County, russell_knoebel@co.washington.or.us
Ruth Miller, TE Connectivity (Tyco), Warehouse Supervisor, ruth.miller@TE.com
Susan Cochrun, s_cochrun@yahoo.com
Dave Schalk, schalk.dave@yahoo.com
Susan & John Schenk, schenk.susen3@gmail.com
Scott Shamberg, scott@shamburgheating.com
Shawn Nili, NW Rugs, shawnnili@aol.com
Simon Springall, simon@springall.com
Sheri Young, Silver Leaf Farm, sjyoung1@aol.com
Steven Van Wechel, steve.l.vanwechel@multco.us
Steve Gilmore, Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce, steve@wilsonvillechamber.com
Steve Gilmore, Wilsonville Area Chamber of Commerce, CEO, steve@wilsonvillechamber.com
Stu Peterson, stu@macadamforbes.com
Tony Darcy, US Crane And Hoist Inc., tdarcy@uscraneandhoist.com
Thomas Ripple, thomas.ripple@gmail.com
Todd Zuvich, Coca-Cola, SCDC Manager, TZuvich@coca-cola.com
Wendie L. Kellington, Attorney at Law P.C., wk@wkellington.com
Frank Lonegran, Allied Waste, FLonergan@republicservices.com
Also notice was posted at the following locations:

- Wilsonville City Hall, 29799 SW Town Center Loop, East, Wilsonville OR 97070
- Wilsonville Community Center, 7965 SW Wilsonville Road, Wilsonville, OR 97070
- Wilsonville Library, 8200 SW Wilsonville Road, Wilsonville OR 97070
- City of Wilsonville Web Site

Witness my hand this 7th day of April 2013

[Signature]

Linda M. Straessle, Administrative Assistant III

Acknowledged before me this 12th day of April 2013

[Signature]

OFFICIAL SEAL
BARBARA S BAKER
NOTARY PUBLIC-OREGON
COMMISSION NO. 473074
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES NOVEMBER 30, 2016

Hearing Date: May 8, 2013
Date Notice was emailed & Posted: April 10, 2013
NOTICE OF LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARING
BEFORE THE PLANNING COMMISSION:
UPDATE OF WILSONVILLE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN (TSP)
and related amendments to the Development Code

Planning Commission:
On Wednesday, May 8, 2013, beginning at 6:00 p.m., the Wilsonville Planning Commission will hold a public hearing regarding adoption of the Wilsonville Transportation System Plan and related Comprehensive Plan and Development Code amendments (Case File # LP13-0003 and LP13-0004).

The Planning Commission will consider whether to recommend adoption of the amendment to the City Council. No additional mailed notice will be sent to you unless you either:
- Submit testimony or sign in at the Planning Commission hearing, or
- Submit a request, in writing or by telephone, to the Planning Division.

City Council:
The Wilsonville City Council is scheduled to hold a public hearing on the proposal on June 3, 2013, at 7:00 p.m. after which it may make the final decision.

The hearings will take place at Wilsonville City Hall, 29799 SW Town Center Loop East, Wilsonville, Oregon. A complete copy of the relevant file information, including the staff report, findings, and recommendations, will be available for viewing seven days prior to each public hearing at Wilsonville City Hall and at the Wilsonville Public Library.

Oregon State Law ORS 227.186. The City has not determined how or if this particular proposal will reduce or otherwise impact either the value or use of properties within Wilsonville. Any changes to permitted land uses may reduce or increase property values, depending on various factors. A written notice has been mailed to potentially impacted properties owners, as required by Oregon law.

Summary of Proposal: Updated Wilsonville Transportation System Plan
The Transportation System Plan (TSP) is a 20-year blueprint for Wilsonville’s transportation system. The TSP update integrates and updates past master planning efforts for vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian, and transit improvements and programs into one new Plan. The TSP accounts for changing economic and social circumstances (including land use growth and revenue forecasts though the year 2035) to ensure consistency with state and regional planning policies.

The Transportation System Plan is a City-wide plan that guides transportation policies, including property access, and projects such as street expansions and new connections.

The draft TSP includes:
- City goals, policies and implementation measures related to the transportation system;
- An evaluation of the existing transportation system;
- Identification of capital improvement projects to address vehicles, bicycles, pedestrians, freight, transit and safety;
- Establishment of functional street classifications, connectivity, spacing and cross-section standards.

Amendments to the Development Code are proposed to implement and coordinate with the policies in the TSP, particularly with regard to transportation-related improvements of large new developments.

How to Comment: Oral or written testimony may be presented at the public hearing. Written comment on the proposal to be submitted into the public hearing record is welcome prior to the public hearings. To have your written comments or testimony distributed to the Planning Commission before the meeting, it must be received by 2 pm on May 8. Direct such written comments or testimony to:

Chris Neamtzu, Planning Division
29799 SW Town Center Loop East, Wilsonville, Oregon, 97070;
Neamtzu@ci.wilsonville.or.us, (503) 682-4960

Copies of the full draft plan is available from the Wilsonville Planning Department at the above address and at the project website: www.ci.wilsonville.or.us/tspupdate

Note: Assistive Listening Devices (ALD) are available for persons with impaired hearing and can be scheduled for this meeting. The City will also endeavor to provide qualified sign language interpreters and/or bilingual interpreters, without cost, if requested at least 48 hours prior to the meeting. To obtain such services, please call Linda Straessle, Planning Administrative Assistant at (503) 682-4960.

Date of Planning Commission Meeting: May 8, 2013

Date Notice was posted: April 10, 2013
NOTICE OF LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARING
BEFORE THE PLANNING COMMISSION:
UPDATE OF WILSONVILLE TRANSPORTATION
SYSTEM PLAN (TSP)
and related amendments to the Development Code

Planning Commission:
On Wednesday, May 8, 2013, beginning at 6:00 p.m., the Wilsonville Planning Commission will hold a public hearing regarding adoption of the Wilsonville Transportation System Plan and related Comprehensive Plan and Development Code amendments (Case File # LP13-0003 and LP13-0004). The Planning Commission will consider whether to recommend adoption of the amendment to the City Council. No additional mailed notice will be sent to you unless you either:
• Submit testimony or sign in at the Planning Commission hearing, or
• Submit a request, in writing or by telephone, to the Planning Division.

City Council:
The Wilsonville City Council is scheduled to hold a public hearing on the proposal on June 3, 2013, at 7:00 p.m. after which it may make the final decision.

The hearings will take place at Wilsonville City Hall, 29799 SW Town Center Loop East, Wilsonville, Oregon. A complete copy of the relevant file information, including the staff report, findings, and recommendations, will be available for viewing seven days prior to each public hearing at Wilsonville City Hall and at the Wilsonville Public Library.

Oregon state law ORS 227.186. The City has not determined how or if this particular proposal will reduce or otherwise impact either the value or use of properties within Wilsonville. Any changes to permitted land uses may reduce or increase property values, depending on various factors. A written notice has been mailed to potentially impacted properties owners, as required by Oregon law.

Summary of Proposal:
Updated Wilsonville Transportation System Plan
The Transportation System Plan (TSP) is a 20-year blueprint for Wilsonville’s transportation system. The TSP update integrates and updates past master planning efforts for vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian, and transit improvements and programs into one new Plan. The TSP accounts for changing economic and social circumstances (including land use growth and revenue forecasts through the year 2035) to ensure consistency with state and regional planning policies.
The Transportation System Plan is a City-wide plan that guides transportation policies, including property access, and projects...
CITY COUNCIL MEETING
STAFF REPORT

Meeting Date:
June 3, 2013

Subject: Ordinance No. 719
Transportation System Plan Development Code Amendments

Staff Member: Katie Mangle
Department: Community Development

Action Required
☐ Motion
☒ Public Hearing Date: 6/3/13
☒ Ordinance 1st Reading Date: 6/3/13
☐ Ordinance 2nd Reading Date:
☐ Resolution
☐ Information or Direction
☐ Information Only
☐ Council Direction
☐ Consent Agenda

Advisory Board/Commission Recommendation
☒ Approval
☐ Denial
☐ None Forwarded
☐ Not Applicable

Comments:

Staff Recommendation:

Recommended Language for Motion: I move the adoption of Ordinance 719, amendments to the Wilsonville Planning and Development Code.

PROJECT / ISSUE RELATES TO:
☒ Council Goals/Priorities
Ensure efficient, cost effective and sustainable development and infrastructure.
☒ Adopted Master Plan(s)
Update to the 2003 Transportation System Plan
☐ Not Applicable

ISSUE BEFORE COUNCIL:
Amendments to the Development Code are needed to implement the revised policies of the proposed 2013 Transportation System Plan (TSP) and to comply with state and regional requirements.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
The TSP is the City’s long-term policy and planning document for transportation improvements. It identifies the City’s transportation system goals and objectives, projects needed to provide efficient transportation choices for all users, and design standards for a system that operates reliably and safely, and is complementary to surrounding land uses. The Planning Commission held a public hearing on the proposed TSP on May 8th, and unanimously recommended it to Council for adoption.

The purpose of the proposed amendments to the Planning and Land Development Ordinance (“Development Code”) is to update the requirements the City applies to new development so they are consistent with the new policies in Chapter 2 of the draft TSP, and consistent with the Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP) and State Transportation Planning Rule (TPR). The Ordinance for adopting the revised TSP is scheduled for first reading on June 3, 2013 contemporaneously with the implementing amendments to the Development Code. Chapter 2 of the draft TSP lists updated goals, policies, and implementation measures, which need to be coordinated with the transportation policies and implementation measures in the Comprehensive Plan. The transportation policies will be implemented through development review, capital projects, and SMART and public works operations. Amendments to the Development Code are necessary to affect City decisions on private development applications.

The proposed amendments reflect direction provided by the Planning Commission at the public hearing, and during Planning Commission and City Council work session discussions of the proposal. This report presents the proposed amendments in three formats:

- Attachment A, Exhibit 2: proposed underline / strikethrough edits to existing Code;
- Attachment A, Exhibit 3: “clean” version showing the proposed policies as they would appear in the final Code;
- Attachment B: a “commentary” version of the underline / strikethrough version explains the intent, affect, or reason for the key edits proposed to the Code.

The proposal was created by first identifying areas of the Code that are not in substantial compliance with state and regional policy. Wilsonville already has a strong policy of “transportation concurrency”, i.e., requiring that new or expanded development projects provide the transportation infrastructure to support the new trips generated by the development. Additionally, Wilsonville’s policies are already multimodal, meaning that development plans are reviewed to ensure they provide safe access to and from the site whether people are traveling by truck, automobile, bus, bicycle, or on foot. Many of the proposed amendments codify existing practices, or provide more detail as to how a plan will be evaluated against these same objectives of multimodal connectivity. Providing specific standards, with built-in flexibility as to how an applicant can meet those standards, will help applicants and staff ensure each development application meets the goals of transportation concurrency.

Much of the new Code text that is needed is borrowed from the state’s Model Development Code for Small Cities, and in some cases from Wilsonville’s code regulations for the Villebois Village zone. Planning, Engineering and Legal staff collaborated with the project consultant to explore alternative approaches and refine the draft to ensure the proposed Code will work for Wilsonville.
The proposal includes the following key policy changes:

- On-site pedestrian access and circulation standards (Section 4.154) are expanded to ensure safe and convenient walkability of new development sites. Some of these standards exist currently in the Code, but were moved to this section so all on-site pedestrian standards are in one place. These types of requirements are especially important for large sites, on which the existence of functional pathways could make it easier for people to walk from one site to another rather than drive.

- Additional design standards for large parking lots (Section 4.155). Lots over three acres in size will need to provide street-like features (curbs, sidewalks, street trees or planting strips, and bicycle facilities) along entrance drive aisles, to make large parking lots safer for cyclists and pedestrians also entering the site.

- New standards for the quantity, location, and design of short term and long term bicycle parking (Section 4.155(.04). These standards are based on the City’s existing bicycle parking requirements for the Village zone, but relaxed somewhat to apply to the rest of the community.

- New section (4.155(.06)) outlining the situations in which development may be required to construct SMART bus stop improvements. The City is able to require such improvements now, but adding the triggers and possible requirements into the Code will make the process more predictable for applicants and staff.

- New section to address property access and driveway development standards, and intersection spacing standards.

**Planning Commission Recommendation**

On May 8, 2013, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on the proposed amendments. The proposed amendments to the Code were advertised as part of the citywide public notice for the TSP proposal; no testimony or comments on this application have been received. During the hearing, the Planning Commission refined the draft by making changes to the bicycle parking and on-site pedestrian access standards. The Commissioners present voted 4-1 to recommend the proposal to Council for adoption. Though Chair Altman voiced support for the overall package, he voted against it because he regretted the proposal did not include a statement that development applications would only be required to make findings of compliance with the Development Code.

**EXPECTED RESULTS:**

Amendments to the Development Code are needed to coordinate with the TSP and comply with state and regional policy. Tables 1 and 2 in Attachment A, Exhibit 1 summarizes how the proposed amendments will fulfill the City’s responsibility to implement a Development Code that complies with state and regional requirements.

**TIMELINE:**
The grant that is funding the consultant work on this project will expire June 30, 2013. The City’s deadline for adopting a TSP and code amendments that comply with the Regional Transportation Plan is December 31, 2013.

CURRENT YEAR BUDGET IMPACTS:
The TSP update, including the draft Code amendments to support TSP implementation, has been funded by a grant from ODOT’s Transportation Growth Management program. Community Development staff has collaborated with Angelo Planning Group to perform the work. Staff time on the project is supported by the grant, which is factored into adopted budgets for each department. Any work on the proposal after the grant expires on June 30, 2013 will be conducted by staff. The project is on budget and schedule.

FINANCIAL REVIEW / COMMENTS:
Reviewed by: ______________ Date: ______________

LEGAL REVIEW / COMMENT:
Reviewed by: _MEK____________ Date: 5/22/2013_____________
The Ordinance is approved as to form.

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT PROCESS:
The Planning Commission held two televised work sessions on the Code amendments; the City Council held one on May 6, 2013. The draft amendments were posted on the project website on April 3, 2013. On April 10, 2013, the City mailed a notification of the upcoming hearings, with a link to the project website, to every property owner in the city. The Planning Commission record for this application is included in Attachment C.

POTENTIAL IMPACTS or BENEFIT TO THE COMMUNITY:
The TSP update is an important project that sets the framework for the next 20 years of major transportation improvements. The proposed Code amendments are intended to support community livability and economic development by ensuring that new development pays for related infrastructure needed to create a connected, safe, and active community. Any changes to the Development Code will influence future applications for new development and redevelopment. None of the proposed amendments are anticipated to significantly affect the type and intensity of development that is allowed in Wilsonville.

ALTERNATIVES:
Council may direct staff to modify the proposal, or continue the hearing. Taking no action is not an option because the City needs to amend its Code to comply with several state and regional requirements by December 2013. However, there is flexibility as to how these requirements are met. Many alternative approaches were available from the different documents, and many were explored by staff and the Commission before arriving at the proposed amendments.

CITY MANAGER COMMENT:
ATTACHMENTS
A. Ordinance No. 719 to adopt TSP-related Development Code amendments
   Exhibit 1. Findings in Support of Approval of Application #LP13.04
   Exhibit 2. Recommended Development Code amendments (underline/ strikeout version)
   Exhibit 3. Recommended Development Code amendments (clean version)
B. Commentary explanation of proposed amendments
C. Casefile #LP13.04 Planning Commission Record
CITY COUNCIL MEETING
STAFF REPORT

Meeting Date:  
June 17, 2013

Subject: Ordinance No. 719  
Transportation System Plan Development Code Amendments – Revised Bike Parking Requirements

Staff Member: Katie Mangle  
Department: Community Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Required</th>
<th>Advisory Board/Commission Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒ Motion</td>
<td>☒ Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Public Hearing Date: 6/3/13</td>
<td>☐ Denial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Ordinance 1st Reading Date: 6/3/13</td>
<td>☐ None Forwarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ Ordinance 2nd Reading Date: 6/17/13</td>
<td>☐ Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Resolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Information or Direction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Information Only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Council Direction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Consent Agenda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Staff Recommendation:** Amend Ordinance 719 to replace subsection 4.155(.04) Bicycle Parking with the revised version found in Attachment A.

**Recommended Language for Motion:**
1. I move to amend proposed Ordinance 719, as reflected in Attachment A to the June 17, 2013 staff report.
2. I move for a second reading of Ordinance 719, as amended.

**PROJECT / ISSUE RELATES TO:**

- ☒ Council Goals/Priorities
- 4 – Clear Vision and Community Design
- 9 - Multimodal Transportation Network
- ☒ Adopted Master Plan(s)
- Update to the 2003 Transportation System Plan
- ☐ Not Applicable
ISSUE BEFORE COUNCIL:
Amendments to the Development Code are needed to implement the revised policies of the proposed 2013 Transportation System Plan (TSP) and to comply with state and regional requirements.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
At its meeting on June 3, 2013, Council approved by first reading a package of amendments to the Planning and Land Development Ordinance (“Development Code”) that are needed to be consistent with the new policies in Chapter 2 of the 2013 Transportation System Plan, the Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP), and State Transportation Planning Rule (TPR).

Council directed staff to modify the proposed section 4.155(.04) related to Bicycle Parking, and ensure that the proposal could be effectively implemented in a range of real-world development scenarios. See Attachment A for staff’s proposed revisions to this section. The remainder of the proposal remains unchanged (see attachments to the June 3, 2013 staff report).

Encouraging use of bicycles for trips around town is part of the City’s strategy for reducing the vehicle miles traveled related to new development, and thereby extending the life of roadway capacity for motor vehicles. Additionally, encouraging people to choose active transportation modes, especially for short trips, is one way to improve health and reduce carbon emissions. Providing convenient and secure bicycle parking at destinations addresses two common deterrents to cycling for transportation: fear of theft and inconvenient storage. Good, convenient bicycle parking encourages people to bike, encourages cyclists to stop and shop, and prevents damage to trees, street furniture, and building interiors.

The Metro Regional Transportation Functional Plan includes the following requirements for short and long-term parking:

**TITLE 4: REGIONAL PARKING MANAGEMENT**

3.08.410 Parking Management

[...]

H. To encourage the use of bicycles and ensure adequate bicycle parking for different land uses, cities and counties shall establish short-term (stays of less than four hours) and long-term (stays of more than four hours and all-day/monthly) bicycle parking minimums for:

1. New multi-family residential developments of four units or more;
2. New retail, office and institutional developments;
3. Transit centers, high capacity transit stations, inter-city bus and rail passenger terminals; and
In response to Council concerns and direction, staff has modified the short-term and long-term bicycle proposal presented at the June 3, 2013 meeting in the following key ways:

- Simplified and streamlined the structure of the section so it will be easier to follow and apply;
- Limited applicability to those uses the City is required to address;
- Focused long-term parking on being secure and weather-protected;
- Provided less direction on the location of the bike parking, allowing decisions to be made on a site-by-site basis.

The following table outlines the key policy choices in this section, and how they compare between the current adopted policy, the June 3 draft, and the draft prepared for the second reading on June 17.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Short-term bicycle parking</strong></th>
<th><strong>Current policy:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Proposed policy in June 3 draft:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Revised policy in June 17 draft:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Required for all uses except residential development with fewer than 10 units.</strong></td>
<td>Require a minimum of 2 bike parking spaces for apartments with fewer than 10 units.</td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weather protection not required.</strong></td>
<td>50% of spaces must be covered (indoors, under awnings, in lockers, or under structures).</td>
<td>Weather protection not required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No minimum spacing or siting standards.</strong></td>
<td>Use best practices siting standards for spacing, security, access.</td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Must be located within 30 feet of the main entrance.</td>
<td>No change; added siting flexibility for multi-tenant sites.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Long term bicycle parking</strong></th>
<th><strong>Current policy:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Proposed policy in June 3 draft:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Revised policy in June 17 draft:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not required.</strong></td>
<td>Applies to all uses.</td>
<td>Applies only to multi-family, retail, office, institutional, and transit center uses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long term parking defined as being secure/monitored, and located to serve users who stay for several hours.</td>
<td>Long-term parking defined only as weather protected and secure/monitored.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If more than 6 bike parking spaces are required, 50% of those must be long-term parking.</td>
<td>If 6 or more bike parking spaces are required, 50% of those must be long-term parking. (See note below.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50% of long-term spaces must be covered (indoors, under awnings, in lockers, or under structures).</td>
<td>100% of long-term spaces must be covered.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All long-term spaces must be located within 100 feet of entrance.</td>
<td>No siting or location requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note that Council has a choice as to the numerical threshold for requiring provision of some long-term bike parking. Staff recommends that this threshold be when Table 5, which lists the formula for calculating bicycle parking for each type of land use, requires 6 bicycle parking spaces. See Attachment B for an analysis of the size of uses that would trigger a requirement to provide 4, 6, and 10 bicycle parking spaces.

EXPECTED RESULTS:
Unless waived by the Development Review Board, most new schools, office buildings, apartment buildings, and retail centers will be required to include bicycle parking that is designed for long-term use. Long-term bicycle parking could take the form of:

- Bicycle lockers placed anywhere on site
- A bike room within an office building or apartment building
- Covered bike racks visible from the reception area of an office building
- Covered bike racks with “eyes on the street” visibility from actively used walkways in a retail center
- A bike cage within a parking garage
- A bike rack near the staffed entrance of a parking garage
- A bicycle parking space within a private garage of a townhouse-style multifamily development

TIMELINE:
The grant that is funding the consultant work on this project will expire June 30, 2013. The City’s deadline for adopting a TSP and code amendments that comply with the Regional Transportation Plan is December 31, 2013.

CURRENT YEAR BUDGET IMPACTS:
The TSP update, including the draft Code amendments to support TSP implementation, has been funded by a grant from ODOT’s Transportation Growth Management program. Community Development staff has collaborated with Angelo Planning Group to perform the work. Staff time on the project is supported by the grant, which is factored into adopted budgets for each department. Any work on the proposal after the grant expires on June 30, 2013 will be conducted by staff. The project is on budget and schedule.

FINANCIAL REVIEW / COMMENTS:
Reviewed by: ______________ Date: ______________

LEGAL REVIEW / COMMENT:
Reviewed by: MEK Date: June 6, 2013
The recommended procedure for passing the amendment and the passage on second reading is correct. However, a substantial amendment to be passed as part of second reading must be read in full. While the amendment is basically a simplification of the first draft of Bicycle Parking Standards provision, it falls into a gray area of whether it constitutes a substantial amendment. Therefore, it is recommend to be read in full as the most defensible position.
COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT PROCESS:
The Planning Commission held two televised work sessions on the Code amendments; the City Council held one on May 6, 2013. The draft amendments were posted on the project website on April 3, 2013. On April 10, 2013, the City mailed a notification of the upcoming hearings, with a link to the project website, to every property owner in the city.

POTENTIAL IMPACTS or BENEFIT TO THE COMMUNITY:
The proposed Code amendments are intended to support community livability and economic development by ensuring that new development pays for related infrastructure needed to create a connected, safe, and active community. Any changes to the Development Code will influence future applications for new development and redevelopment. None of the proposed amendments are anticipated to significantly affect the type and intensity of development that is allowed in Wilsonville.

ALTERNATIVES:
Council may direct staff to modify the proposal, or continue the hearing. Taking no action is not an option because the City needs to amend its Code to comply with several state and regional requirements by December 2013. However, there is flexibility as to how these requirements are met. Many alternative approaches were available from the different documents, and many were explored by staff and the Commission before arriving at the proposed amendments.

CITY MANAGER COMMENT:

ATTACHMENTS
A. Revised recommended Development Code amendments (underline/ strikeout version) to replace subsection 4.155(.04) in Ordinance 719
B. Bike parking trigger analysis table
Attachment A. Revised Recommended Development Code amendments (underline/ strikeout version) to replace subsection 4.155(.04) in Ordinance 719

(.04) Bicycle Parking:

A. Required Bicycle Parking - General Provisions
   1. The required minimum number of bicycle parking spaces for each use category is shown in Table 5, Parking Standards.
   2. Bicycle parking spaces are not required for accessory buildings. If a primary use is listed in Table 5, bicycle parking is not required for the accessory use.
   3. When there are two or more primary uses on a site, the required bicycle parking for the site is the sum of the required bicycle parking for the individual primary uses.
   4. Bicycle parking space requirements may be waived by the Development Review Board per Section 4.118(.03)A.9 and 10.

B. Standards for Required Bicycle Parking
   1. Each space must be at least 2 feet by 6 feet in area and be accessible without moving another bicycle.
   2. An aisle at least 5 feet wide shall be maintained behind all required bicycle parking to allow room for bicycle maneuvering. Where the bicycle parking is adjacent to a sidewalk, the maneuvering area may extend into the right-of-way.
   3. When bicycle parking is provided in racks, there must be enough space between the rack and any obstructions to use the space properly.
   4. Bicycle lockers or racks, when provided, shall be securely anchored.
   5. Bicycle parking shall be located within 30 feet of the main entrance to the building or inside a building, in a location that is easily accessible for bicycles. For multi-tenant developments, with multiple business entrances, bicycle parking may be distributed on-site among more than one main entrance.

C. Long-term Bicycle Parking
   1. Long-term bicycle parking provides employees, students, residents, commuters, and others who generally stay at a site for several hours a weather-protected place to park bicycles.
   2. For a proposed multi-family residential, retail, office, or institutional development, or for a park and ride or transit center, where six (6) or more bicycle parking spaces are required pursuant to Table 5, 50% of the required bicycle required parking shall be developed as long-term, secure spaces. Required long-term bicycle parking shall meet the following standards:
      a. All spaces shall meet the standards in subsection B above, and must be covered in one of the following ways: inside buildings, under roof overhangs or permanent awnings, in bicycle lockers, or within or under other structures.
b. All spaces must be located in areas that are secure or monitored (e.g., visible to employees, monitored by security guards, or in public view).

c. Spaces are not subject to the locational criterion of B.5.
Attachment B. Bike Parking Trigger Analysis Table

What should the threshold be for requiring the use to provide some of the required bike parking as LONG TERM bike parking?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POTENTIAL THRESHOLDS - Min. bike parking spaces required (x)</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>single family residential</td>
<td>never triggered</td>
<td>never triggered</td>
<td>never triggered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multifamily with 9 or fewer units</td>
<td>never triggered</td>
<td>never triggered</td>
<td>never triggered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multifamily with 10 or more units</td>
<td>always triggered</td>
<td>always triggered</td>
<td>always triggered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hotel</td>
<td>20+ rooms</td>
<td>30+ rooms</td>
<td>50+ rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nursing home</td>
<td>24000 sf</td>
<td>36000 sf</td>
<td>60000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hospital</td>
<td>20 beds</td>
<td>40 beds</td>
<td>400 beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>church</td>
<td>200 seats</td>
<td>300 seats</td>
<td>500 seats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>museum</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>10000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preschool</td>
<td>14000 sf</td>
<td>21000</td>
<td>35000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elementary</td>
<td>always triggered</td>
<td>always triggered</td>
<td>always triggered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high school</td>
<td>always triggered</td>
<td>always triggered</td>
<td>always triggered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theater</td>
<td>always triggered</td>
<td>240 seats</td>
<td>400 seats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bowling alley</td>
<td>never triggered</td>
<td>never triggered</td>
<td>never triggered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gym</td>
<td>16000 sf</td>
<td>24000 sf</td>
<td>40000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retail</td>
<td>16000 sf</td>
<td>24000 sf</td>
<td>40000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>large product retail</td>
<td>32000 sf</td>
<td>48000 sf</td>
<td>80000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>office</td>
<td>20000 sf</td>
<td>30000 sf</td>
<td>50000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dental office</td>
<td>20000 sf</td>
<td>30000 sf</td>
<td>50000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restaurant or bar</td>
<td>16000 sf</td>
<td>24000 sf</td>
<td>40000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fast food</td>
<td>always triggered</td>
<td>never triggered</td>
<td>never triggered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>