

Vision43 Project Working Group

Meeting #7 Summary

Wednesday, November 19, 2025

Meeting Recording [Link](#)

Committee Members:

- Carol Bryck – City Council
- Spencer Crandall – Small business consultant
- Mary Carlson – Robinwood Neighborhood
- Dawn Meaney – Local realtor
- Victoria Meinig - Executive Director of Chamber of Commerce
- Beau Genot – Resident
- Rob Henderson – Robinwood Neighborhood

Project Team:

- Matt Hastie – MIG, consultant team project manager
- Brandon Crawford – MIG, consultant planner
- Steve Koper – City of West Linn, Community Development Director
- Lynn Schroder – City of West Linn, project coordinator and communications

Project Status

Matt Hastie briefly discussed the agenda and project status. He noted the major work completed since the previous PWG meeting, including revisions to the Mixed-Use Corridor Zone chapter, the project timeline extension and phased approach, and the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) analysis. Matt noted that the TPR analysis found that there is no projected significant impact from the types of development/land uses that are being proposed.

Committee Discussion:

- The timeline extension does not actually delay any action since the mixed-use zone is being adopted simultaneously with the master plan.
- Adoption of the new zone will not change any current land use applications in the focus areas. Current applications will be subject to the existing standards at the time of submittal.
- Does the TPR analysis consider bike lanes?

- The long-term OR43 Concept Plan includes bike lanes. The Vision43 plan also includes bike/ped improvements that'll need to be incorporated into TSP and likely approved by ODOT.
- How can the City assume “no impact” from the TPR analysis if we don’t know what new businesses or development will be on the corridor in the future?
 - The analysis assumes some impacts, but not enough to meet the state’s definition of a “significant impact” and not to a degree that will trigger the need for “mitigation measures” such as traffic signal improvements or roadway widening. The trip projections are based on vehicle trip assumptions associated with types of land uses and scale of development that are planned for the corridor and which are expected to occur during the next 15 years.
 - The analysis also accounts for existing traffic patterns, which includes pass-through vehicle traffic from Oregon City and other surrounding communities.
 - Individual development proposals will also have to conduct their own traffic studies in the future, which may include mitigation measures to address anticipated traffic impacts.

Key Revisions to Draft Code

Matt summarized the key revisions to the draft code since the last time the PWG met. The biggest change was scaling back the rezoning boundary mainly to properties that are currently zoned or used for commercial purposes for “Phase 1” rezoning, and the remaining properties in the focus areas would be considered for rezoning after the completion of this project. Other key changes included adding new uses to the list of those that are allowed, prohibiting firearm ranges and waste storage, modifications to various development standards (parking, setbacks, floor-area-ratio), adding minimum housing density, limiting height near residential uses, and adding several design standards.

- Does the 5,000 square foot maximum for accessory manufacturing apply to entire building?
 - The maximum would only apply to the manufacturing portion of the building (i.e., the use), not the entire building.
- What is floor-area-ratio (FAR) and what is the purpose of requiring a minimum?
 - FAR is the ratio of total building area to the total area of the property.
 - There were previous discussions around requiring minimum height to ensure properties weren’t underutilized along the corridor. FAR provides more site design flexibility by allowing a variation of heights on the property.

- Can the code include standards that prevent big blank walls next to existing residential?
 - Architectural and window requirements will help prevent that. The minimum window area requirement allow for fake windows as well.
- Would it make more sense to have the zone boundary go to street rather than property line? That may help prevent the contrast between larger mixed-use development bordering smaller residential properties.
 - The Phase II boundaries (i.e., entire focus area) mostly extend to the streets but the Phase I boundaries typically just go to the adjoining property.

Policy Options and Discussion

Matt summarized the main policy options and discussion topics for the PWG to consider. The policy questions and considerations are included below.

QUESTION FOR PWG: Should ground-floor commercial uses be required for a minimum percentage of building frontage along Hwy 43? Considerations and options:

- *Little demand for commercial/office space in West Linn, strong competition with neighboring markets.*
- *Commercial requirement reduces development flexibility.*
- *City needs to maintain commercial land supply.*
- *Mix of uses supported by community, PWG and decision-makers.*
- *Not requiring at least some commercial could result in residential-only development of entire sites.*
- *Current recommendation: Min. 50% along Hwy 43 frontage. Consider reducing (25% or 30%) and/or only require on the street corner.*

PWG comments:

- Why would avoiding standalone residential be a “pro”?
 - Because standalone residential would not be “mixed-use” development, and the community has largely indicated that they’d like to see mix-use development along the corridor. In addition, if those areas were developed purely as housing, the City would lose a portion of its employment land capacity.
- Development should have specific design standards for ground floor rather than regulate by use.
- There are good examples of horizontal mixed use with townhouses next to commercial development.
- Do we know how much demand there is for commercial use across the whole corridor?
 - The MU code is focused on specific areas, not the entire corridor. A market analysis would tell us what would be feasible today versus the future. Market

feasibility analyses are also typically focused on particular properties and it's challenging to determine feasibility across multiple properties.

- At the same time, market analyses typically looks at what's been built in similar communities across the region. The mixed-use code includes standards that are common across the metro area, therefore a market analysis would likely conclude that the type of development being proposed for the corridor is feasible. It might not tell us how much demand there is for that type of development in this particular location.
- With some local businesses going under, does it make sense to require any ground-floor commercial?
 - There might not be enough residential to support new commercial, and it may be risky for the first projects to break ground given market conditions and lack of local customer base.
- It's tough to attract young people to West Linn. Younger people are attracted to walkable, mixed-use areas.
- Spencer supports some ground-floor requirement.
- Does the community want to become more dense or provide more walkable neighborhoods?
- These changes could support expanding tax base by encouraging more commercial and multi-family.
- Ultimately, there was a mix of opinions about this topic but a majority of PWG members support some type of requirement for ground floor commercial use along Highway 43, possibly reducing the requirement to less than 50%.

QUESTION FOR PWG: Should the corridor prioritize attractive design or development flexibility?
Considerations and options:

- *Detailed design requirements can reduce development feasibility and increase costs.*
- *Detailed design requirements give the city more control to help ensure new development is attractive and meets community preferences.*
- *Aesthetics of design have been a priority for community members and decision makers.*

PWG Comments:

- Having good design standards may attract developers to the community.
- The community wants building/site design that people will want to live in and that will age well. Durability of materials is also important.
- The group is generally leaning toward prioritizing good design over prioritizing development flexibility.

QUESTION FOR PWG: Should there be any minimum density requirement for housing along Highway 43? Should mixed use developments be required to include a housing component?
Considerations and options:

- *Current recommendation: Require a minimum density of 40 units per acre on lots greater than ½ acre.*
- *City has a need for multi-family and mixed-use housing. A minimum density requirement will help ensure mixed-use housing is developed along the corridor and will help the city meet housing production goals.*
- *Requiring housing reduces development flexibility.*
- *Developers are likely to provide some housing regardless of whether it is required.*

PWG Comments:

- Does this require people to build housing or only meet minimum density if they build any housing?
 - Only if they build housing
- The group is supportive as long as it's designed well, recognizing this part of the long term plan.

Next steps

Matt discussed the next steps for the project, including revising/finalizing the draft code, community open houses in early 2026, and the adoption process in spring/summer 2026.

PWG Comments:

- Will the open houses talk about phase II?
 - The open houses will be focused on Phase I. There will be more community engagement in the future when Phase II is underway. Phase II is primarily intended to alleviate the concerns in the more residential areas of the Focus Area. That said, we will acknowledge that there will be a Phase II process during the open houses and present maps of the entire focus areas.
- This is the last meeting of the PWG, but the project team can still share deliverables and welcome feedback. Everyone is always welcome and encouraged to go to planning commission or city council meetings and share comments, questions, concerns, or general support for the project.
- Is there an opportunity to fast track the pedestrian improvements along the corridor?
 - Transportation improvements will likely take a while longer since it's an ODOT facility and improvement timelines are largely contingent on funding availability. However, we will emphasize the high level of support for these improvements.
- The project team won't be meeting with the Technical Advisory Committee again, but we have been communicating with them and asking for feedback on our most recent work products and will continue to do that moving forward.

