

Vision43 Project Working Group

Meeting #4 Summary

Thursday, March 6, 2025

1:30 PM – 3:30 PM

Meeting Recording [Link](#)

Committee Members:

- Shatrine Krake – Community member (Bolton Neighborhood) & Executive Director, Chamber of Commerce
- Christine Lewis – Metro Councilor
- Mary Carlson – Community member (Robinwood Neighborhood)
- Spencer Crandall – Community member & small business consultant
- David D. Jones – Planning Commissioner
- Carol Bryck – City Council
- Beau Genot – Resident

Project Team:

- Matt Hastie – MIG, consultant team project manager
- Brandon Crawford – MIG, project associate
- Chris Myers – City of West Linn, planner and project manager
- Lynn Schroder – City of West Linn, project coordinator and communications

Agenda overview and project status update

Matt Hastie briefly discussed the agenda and project status. He noted the major work completed since the previous PWG meeting, including Survey #3, draft zoning concepts, draft mixed use zone boundaries, and multi-modal transportation connections.

Survey #3 Summary

Matt discussed the purpose of the third survey and summarized the results. The survey was intended to gather community input on the three corridor concepts and visualizations (existing conditions and Scenario 1 & 2). He noted that the survey respondents were most supportive of Scenario 1 and least supportive of existing conditions. Some of the key themes included strong support for pedestrian and bicycle safety, green infrastructure/landscaping, and economic development growth opportunities. There was opposition to many of the elements associated with existing conditions, including large parking lots, and there were some concerns over traffic congestion and how new development would fit in with existing neighborhood character.

Respondents had mixed opinions on potential height increases. Working Group members shared the following questions and comments.

- There seems to be some concerns over increased traffic associated with the scenarios.
 - Improved neighborhood connectivity may help reduce car dependency and traffic in the surrounding areas.
- Can the city add any traffic calming treatments?
 - There are 12 proposed crosswalks and some of them could potentially include pedestrian islands.
 - The City cannot make improvements in the right-of-way without ODOT's approval since Hwy 43 is owned by ODOT. The City will be working with ODOT to implement the Highway 43 Concept Plan (2016).
- How was the survey advertised and distributed?
 - The Survey was hosted on the city website and advertised via the City's social media channels, weekly newsletter, city website, and the project email list.
 - The project has been reaching a lot of people between the surveys and community events.
- There were several survey comments indicating residents want the corridor to feel like downtown Willamette.

Mixed Use Zoning Proposed Boundaries

Matt described the location for each of the mixed-use zoning boundaries, noting that they are based on the focus areas and they follow commercial zoning and/or properties with commercial uses on them. Chris added that including residentially zoned lots that have a commercial use will help ensure the current use is consistent with the zoning designation. Matt also noted the church property focus area is not being proposed for mixed-use zoning at this time because this area is better suited for multi-family and/or affordable housing and has more limited potential for commercial or mixed use development, given its size, configuration, and proximity to other potential mixed use focus areas.

QUESTION FOR PWG: *Do you agree with the proposed mixed-use zone boundaries? Are there areas that should be included or removed?*

- Will these changes affect property value?
 - Rezoning for mixed-use typically improves property value by improving redevelopment opportunities and easier access to more goods and services.
 - Mixed-use zoning and the proposed transportation/multi-modal improvements will improve walkability/walk score for neighbors and neighborhood access to services, all of which will benefit property values.
- Focus Area 4 includes a dentist office on the corner of Amy Street. Should it be included?
 - It would make sense to include it so that it is consistent with the zoning. We'll also include the neighboring properties.
 - There is a lot of high school student foot traffic in the area.

- Should the properties along 1st Court that neighbor the ones that front 43 be included?
 - Yes, including those properties will improve development and access opportunities.
 - If extending the whole length of 1st Court, the new mixed-use area could expand opportunities to create a small downtown-like area.
 - It's usually easier to start big with these boundaries are remove areas rather than vice versa.
- Will the property owners get any notification from the city?
 - There will be notice requirements and letters directly to property owners within a certain distance of the zone change boundaries, which is a legal requirement for zone changes.
 - There will also be other opportunities for neighbors and community members to review and comment on the draft boundaries at the open house and other community events.
- Focus area 1 – Should Robinwood Station and the neighboring properties be included in the boundary?
 - It could be a nice to have a live-work space that is compatible with the existing Robinwood Station.
 - There is a weird property next to Burgerville. The R10 property is a large lot that has been vacant for years, large property. Should it be included?
 - These areas will be included for Focus Area 1.
- Focus area 3
 - There are awkward development constraints across 43 from existing commercial.
 - The old firehouse has had some offers in the past, but is currently storage for parks and rec. The building would need substantial structural upgrades and will likely need to be torn down as part of any potential future redevelopment.
 - There have been conversations around closing ingress on Failing and turning it over to neighboring properties. Might be more opportunities now that there aren't parking requirements.
 - The MU boundary could include the neighboring R4.5 properties to make the mixed-use area more contiguous.

QUESTION FOR PWG: *The church property (Focus Area 2) is a priority site for affordable, multifamily housing, and therefore does not need mixed-use zoning. Do you agree that this area does not need mixed-use zoning?*

- What is the reasoning for not including this as a mixed-use?
 - Because this property does not have any existing commercial uses/designation nor is it near any commercial uses. This focus area is also already near the other Focus Areas.
 - The City could still upzone this property to allow multifamily.

- If the church property changed to mixed-use zoning, are there any allowances that are unique to churches that'd be enabled by rezoning?
 - Not likely. Church properties are already allowed to provide affordable housing on their property. The property would not gain much by rezoning to mixed use and might even inadvertently reduce feasibility for affordable housing.
 - Both churches in the area do not want to redevelop based on recent conversations.

Mixed Use Zoning Proposed Uses

Brandon Crawford discussed the proposed uses that would be allowed in the new mixed use zone, noting that they were informed by community input, the Vision and Goals, and the uses depicted in the Concept Visualizations. He added that each of the use categories listed are existing use categories that the City allows in other zones. He also discussed options for requiring ground floor commercial for mixed use development (i.e., require for entire ground floor, do not require at all, require for a percentage, or require in specific areas/frontages).

QUESTION FOR PWG: *Do you generally support the types of uses that would be allowed in the mixed-use areas? Note the city will not list every allowed use, but rather broader categories of uses (e.g., commercial, retail, etc. – see memo).*

- Add child-care
- Ensure storage facilities are explicitly not allowed.
- Should doctor's offices, dentist, research/medical uses be allowed?
 - Hospitals? Urgent Care? Medical services?
 - Hospitals can get pretty big.
 - West Linn has an aging population and there may be increased demand for medical services.
 - Medical services could be allowed at a small/neighborhood scale.
- Would food carts be included in any of the proposed use categories?
 - They would fall under "eating/drinking establishments," but they technically need licenses from the DMV since they are on wheels.
 - There is a strong community desire for food carts.
 - Food carts can also be a good interim use before a site develops into a more permanent/brick and mortar use.
- Should marijuana dispensaries be allowed? There is a lot of revenue associated with these businesses that could benefit West Linn.
 - That'll be up to the City Council to decide and may or may not be a topic that is addressed in this planning process.
- Maker spaces may include artist studios, workshops, tool libraries, etc.
 - These uses may help provide unique opportunities for these areas to distinguish West Linn from neighboring communities. The PWG strongly supports including these as allowed uses.

- Why would the commercial uses be limited to 30k square feet?
 - It is about the size for more neighborhood scale retail or markets – e.g., Trader Joe’s or New Seasons.
 - A downside of requiring too much ground-floor commercial is that it can limit development opportunities if there isn’t a market for retail/commercial in the area. It may also lead to vacant storefronts.
 - Recommend requiring minimum of approximately 25% ground-floor retail/commercial in certain areas. Limit the retail/commercial requirements to areas fronting Hwy 43.

Mixed-Use Zone Development Standards

Brandon Crawford discussed the key development standards for the PWG to consider, including options for lot coverage, maximum height, and setbacks. He shared examples from other communities and the concept visualizations.

QUESTION FOR PWG: *Do you generally support the development standards proposed for the mixed-use areas?*

Lot Coverage Options:

1. None (same as Willamette Falls Drive)
2. 80% for all uses
3. Vary by use (e.g., 80% for mixed-use/multi-family, lower for other uses)
 - Could higher lot coverage compromise gathering/open spaces?
 - The City can program some areas for open space/public gathering.
 - Need to be careful to not be overly restrictive.
 - A development can still be below the maximum coverage. Other development standards would likely prevent the building from covering 100% of the lot area (e.g., setbacks).
 - How would high lot coverage look on smaller lots?
 - The PWG favor Option 1 – no maximum coverage. Allow other standards to drive the lot coverage.

Maximum Height Options:

1. 45 feet – Scenario 1 (existing for GC)
2. 55 feet – Scenario 2
3. Vary by distance from Hwy 43
 - 45 or 55 ft if < x feet from Hwy 43
 - 35 or 45 ft if > x feet from Hwy 43
 - The PWG favors Option 3 – vary by distance from Hwy 43.

Setback Options:

1. Apply equally to all uses and locations

2. Vary by use
 3. Vary by location or by “frontage/ pedestrian zone”
- Would no setback prevent sidewalks and public spaces?
 - Sidewalks are included in the Hwy 43 Concept right-of-way cross section.
 - Does the 2016 plan include purchase for ROW?
 - No.
 - The PWG favors varying setback by location (Option 3)
 - There should be a relatively high maximum setback in areas that do not front on Hwy 43 that would allow setbacks to match those of adjacent properties.

Next steps

The PWG will schedule a follow-up meeting to make sure we have time to talk through the final agenda items – design options and transportation/neighborhood connectivity.

- We can provide a recap along with next steps in addition to the remaining agenda items we need to cover.
- This meeting should be scheduled before or just after spring break.
- There will be one more PWG meeting after the follow-up to this meeting to go over the draft Mixed-Use code standards.