



*Draft PC Minutes were reviewed and approved at the November 16, 2022 PC Meeting.*

## **PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES**

**October 19, 2022 at 6:00 PM**

**City Hall & Remote Video Conferencing**

---

### **CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL**

A regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission was held at City Hall beginning at 6:00 p.m. on Wednesday, October 19, 2022. Chair Heberlein called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m., followed by roll call. Those present:

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

City Staff: Miranda Bateschell, Amanda Guile-Hinman, Kerry Rappold, and Mandi Simmons.

### **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

### **CITIZEN'S INPUT**

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

**Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director**, confirmed the Commission would entertain public comment following the work session presentation so those in attendance could hear the presentation first.

### **WORK SESSION**

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

**Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director**, started by congratulating Mr. Pauly on the addition of a baby girl in his household. She thanked the Planning Commissioners for their extra work and time commitment in developing the Master Plan, which would guide one of Wilsonville's next great neighborhoods. Tonight's main purpose was for the Commission to review and provide comment on some Master Plan items related to the transportation network and some of the cross sections, as well as stormwater and a few public realm items. The project team would return to the Planning Commission on the Housing Variety discussion from a previous work session to confirm the strategies settled on and make sure they were captured correctly. The strategies could be found in the Implementation Section of the Master Plan. She noted the following two items submitted for public comment:

- Letter dated October 14, 2022 from AKS Engineering & Forestry, LLC requesting changes to the draft Frog Pond East and South Master Plan with attached map.

- Letter dated October 19, 2022 from AKS Engineering & Forestry, LLC requesting additional changes to the draft Frog Pond East and South Master Plan with five attached maps.
- West Hills and AKS were requesting a potential update to the Master Plan to change a couple lots along Stafford Rd from Type 2 to Type 1, a higher density urban form, and a couple parcels by the park potentially. The Commission received that extra packet at tonight's meeting because she had requested some precedent images of what West Hills was thinking about, so the Commission and Staff could understand whether the requests fit within the Type 1, Type 2, Type 3 as outlined and discussed by Planning Commission and community. If not, that conversation could occur. The images were to help the Planning Commission better understand how the City had been visualizing it over the last six months and how that lined up with some of the housing products West Hills envisioned.

**Joe Dills, MIG**, introduced the project team members and presented the Frog Pond East and South Land Use and Housing Policy via PowerPoint, highlighting the focus of tonight's discussion, and providing an overview of the Master Plan and its key roles. After tonight's review of the Master Plan, a public hearing was scheduled on November 16, 2022. The Development Code and other implementation, including funding, would occur in 2023.

The Planning Commission had no feedback from on Chapters 1 through 4.

- **Mr. Dills** explained the best way to submit edits and comments related to the draft document was by a photograph or scan of the Commissioner's notes.
  - He clarified this Master Plan was not as prescriptive as the Villebois Village Master Plan for a development practicality reason. Villebois had a single master developer who had control over all 500 acres of the property and approached that Master Plan with a very fine grain of master plan layout. The streets and alleys shown were largely what was going to be proposed, though they evolved a bit through development review. The housing variety was likely the best example of how under a single developer, they went all the way down to the lot level on every block, which also played out over time with the market. Contrasting that with East and South, which had at least 20 different ownerships that would roll out incrementally over time; even the larger ownerships would undergo a phased type of development. So, because development would happen in more steps by more entities over time, the Frog Pond Master Plans had more flexibility in them.

**Mr. Dills** continued the PowerPoint presentation, briefly reviewing the highlights of the Master Plan addressed so far. (Slide 7)

**Mike Carr, Murray Smith**, presented the components of the Stormwater Plan specific to the Master Plan area, noting the citywide Stormwater Management Plan was being updated and describing the three major principles that would govern stormwater development as developers implement the urban design: utilize low impact development approaches (LIDA), limit the number of outfalls to enhance stream health, and the use a topographical, basin-by-basin approach to manage stormwater rather than according to each development. He highlighted applicable LIDA approaches, noting benefits and challenges of LIDA specific to Frog Pond East and South. (Slides 8-9)

Comments and feedback from the Planning Commission were as follows with responses to Commissioner questions as noted:

- Was having multiple basins in the area helpful or did that make it more difficult ~~and more~~ or challenging to do the LIDA approach?
  - **Mr. Carr** replied multiple basins could be helpful in the sense of not having to collect a lot of stormwater to push it into a larger pipe, which then pushes it down to some larger facility. It forced developers to manage stormwater on a local level, and no large tract of land was needed to treat runoff downstream. Individual developers might need to have two different stormwater basins to deal with which could double the effort needed to manage the stormwater for their piece of property, making things a bit more challenging because the topography on a particular piece of land could dictate how the development was phased.
- How would the Stormwater Plan be designed so as not to be onerous to any one lot, subdivision, or ownership plot? [29:00]
  - **Mr. Carr** acknowledged was challenging for the City to manage, adding each basin could be a little different. As the framework streets go in, stormwater facilities would be developed, particularly to manage the streets themselves. The idea was to encourage development to utilize those streets to also provide stormwater treatment that can collect from the surrounding areas. Individual lots would likely need to manage their stormwater, but the idea was to come up with the basin-wide plan; a basin-by-basin approach to get an outfall and a conveyance to the outfall that would facilitate the individual owners to be able to develop and connect to that conveyance.
- Would the stormwater facilities be dedicated to public and managed publicly for maintenance? The NPDES permit issued to the City, correct?
  - **Mr. Carr** replied the City historically had HOAs manage their own facilities for developments or particular groups of properties. Where the facilities needed to be utilized by the public or treating stormwater in public spaces, like streets, those would be owned and managed by the City. A regional facility both taking stormwater from the public right-of-way as well as some private properties could also be managed by the City.
  - **Kerry Rappold, Natural Resources Manager**, clarified even if stormwater facilities were in the public right-of-way, they were still owned and maintained by that private development, and so the City allowed the right-of-way to be used for that purpose, but it was still the responsibility of the HOA or the individual property owner to ultimately maintain those facilities. City Staff provided reports on the stormwater facilities with regard to the City's NPDES permit. Wilsonville was unique in that 90% to 95% or more of the stormwater management facilities in the city were privately owned and maintained. The City takes responsibility for the conveyance system, the pipes and streets, or the outfalls where the stormwater runoff went. It was a lot of work to coordinate that, but the other alternative was to have a lot more Staff involved with managing the facilities.
  - Regarding the NPDES permit, the City was one of 13 co-permittees within Clackamas County, perhaps within the country, with a unique Phase 1 NPDES permit.
  - Collectively, Wilsonville's population rose above the 100,000-person threshold when looking at the permitted cities, such as Lake Oswego, Oregon City, Milwaukie, Gladstone, which were all part of the individual permit, but each city had its own responsibilities with regard to the permit.
- How did the City make sure the maintenance was done and the quality of the discharge was up to par?

- **Mr. Rappold** replied by really working with HOAs and individual property owners and having them submit reports every year about what they were doing as far as maintenance and then going out to inspect that. City Staff also did water quality monitoring, which was required ~~to be done~~ under the City's permit. While a bit difficult to relate those results back to any particular stormwater facility, it did provide trends allowing the City to analyze what was seen in terms of that water quality.
  - He believed the current system worked really well. There were deficiencies like any place one could go to in terms of looking at stormwater facilities, but the alternative would be for the City to have a much more substantial budget, as well as more staff and more resources to devote to if it was taking responsibility for all of that.
- Sometimes HOAs had a hard time figuring out what flowers to plant much less whether it was worthwhile maintaining the rain garden that was treating its stormwater. Was the City looking down the road, especially as it grew, to cumulatively start pushing against its standards and not be able to track it to any one HOA and not be able to really control it, as opposed to publicly owned facilities that have one responsible entity.
  - **Mr. Rappold** noted the City's current process was ahead of the curve as far as operation and maintenance, even when compared with publicly maintained facilities and had been using it since the mid-1990s. Currently, there were more than 100 agreements and it was challenging. Moving to publicly owned facility had to be a policy level decision that would have ramifications. He believed it still worked at the level the City was at now, but he was uncertain how it would be 5 or 10 years. He confirmed the City had an eye on it and would continue to track.
  - **Chair Heberlein** highlighted his HOA experience, noting the City regularly reviewed and gave notice when the HOA needed to update and maintain its stormwater facilities. One challenge on the HOA side was how to do that because they were not experts in stormwater maintenance. While it was working on the City side, it was a little more problematic on the homeowner side once there was a problem with the stormwater maintenance facility.
  - **Mr. Rappold** agreed, adding his employee, Sarah Sand, Stormwater Management Coordinator, tried to educate homeowners and HOAs as much as possible. His Staff worked a lot with the landscaping companies doing the maintenance work because a lot of it came back to the plants themselves, which tend to be one of the bigger issues in terms of maintaining what was there; that level of education was important on an ongoing basis.
- Did the City have access to resources, such as at the Metro, with stormwater design experts who could troubleshoot and problem solve with HOAs? Issues could snowball pretty quickly, and it was more than plants, soils and other things could go wrong with any of the facilities and it required expertise to solve them.
  - **Mr. Rappold** replied a number of training programs were available to landscapers to learn the appropriate ways of maintaining stormwater facilities, especially low-impact development. The City tried to push towards that as much as possible, so people get that level of expertise and training. It was an ongoing process because sometimes landscapers and employees change. The City faced the same thing with its own employees for the facilities it maintains.
  - This was very similar to the Urban Forest Management Plan discussion where arborists tell people how to cut trees. The HOAs were lost and needed similar support, not just coordinating but technical assistance from someone who could show up, inspect and identify the problem,

and advise them to work with the landscape contractors on certain things, for example, if the City was serious about water quality; otherwise, it would be forgotten. People were not sophisticated enough to know what these facilities are supposed to do. As long as the plants are growing and flowering, they think they are fine.

- **Mr. Rappold** clarified two projects were starting with the Urban Forest Management Plan. One was an action item in the Management Plan, a tree manual that would be available to the public and help Staff in terms of issues with trees.
- Many stormwater manuals have been developed by other municipalities, though they could not just be imported as they needed to be tied into local weather patterns, including rainfall, etc. A stormwater manual could be considered in the future as a first step for HOAs to use.
- **Mr. Rappold** added the City had developed a Low-Impact Development guide that included fact sheets. The guide was geared to the public in terms of information to share with them. Ms. Sand could use it when going out to speak with HOAs and developers, enabling the City to convey as much educational material as possible.
- Why were Basins K1 and K2 separated and what was the reason for the distinct size difference between the two? Why not combine K1 as part of K2?
  - **Mr. Carr** agreed it did all fall into the same designation of Kahle Creek. He was uncertain whether it was a phasing issue and offered to get back to the Commission with that information.
- More context was requested about the purpose of the proposed regional facilities versus others and how they differed from the local control.
  - **Mr. Carr** replied the idea was to have LIDA handle as much as possible, but with the amount of impervious areas going in, in some cases, it was not likely to be covered. To manage stormwater, developers need a place to put it to convey it downstream, but maybe they had not fully managed the flow control and hopefully the treatment, but at least the flow control, the runoff might have been too much relative to the pre-developed conditions. The stars on the map indicated a potential downstream location of some regional facility that may be needed to manage flow control particularly, and possibly incorporate any treatment prior to the outfall. It was a second priority, but it needed to be considered and so, for the upstream areas, it really had to be looked at on a basin-by-basin approach. Some of the basins would have the ability to manage stormwater better upstream and some would not, depending on the distance and the amount of area included. More studies were needed to be reviewed to identify how much space needed to be incorporated. Each of the 8 to 10 basins that needed to be managed may have to be approached differently.
- At what point in the process would the City know if regional facilities were needed and where they would be located?
  - **Mr. Carr** replied stormwater typically got addressed at a development standpoint and also in regard to the roadways. Roadways were typically the first things going in and they required the most intense management of stormwater. Developers try to understand how to manage stormwater for roadways as they come in, and the entire basin must be incorporated with an approach. They may be able to handle the stormwater runoff from the roadway and understand that each development that hooked into the stormwater line would have the ability to manage it on their site. The project team was trying to lay out approaches that the developers would come in and utilize. A number of different stormwater approaches exist, such as incorporating the facilities into a park area, which might require a certain method or level of intensity, and developers wanted that flexibility. The discussion with City Staff regarded being careful not to be

too prescriptive about identifying a particular location where a particular facility needed to be. As development came along, the plan needed to be flexible from that standpoint. The project team did not want to dictate that a particular facility be on a particular parcel.

- Given the number of parcels and the segment of development expected, how would the City know whether a regional facility would be needed?
  - **Ms. Bateschell** explained a lot of that was determined at the development proposal stage because much of the calculation depended upon the added impervious surface and the resulting stormwater runoff that would occur, where it needed to go, and how it needed to be treated along the way, and the City primarily wanted to do that on site. During the development review process, Staff pushed applicant teams to not to provide regional facilities. Even on large industrial sites, the City would have multiple stormwater LIDA facilities to help deal with the flow control and treatment as close to the source as possible. The regional discussion occurred when Staff identified stormwater treatment might not all occur in those separate areas and remain localized. Staff believed regional facilities were possible here because of the small parcels and the densities called for in some areas with smaller properties. The roads would not necessarily be able to have LIDA facilities because a lot of things competed for that space along the road, like parking and street trees, not just stormwater facilities. The project team was starting to look at where those areas might be and call them out on the map to be thinking about it and planning for it where possible. That was why the team was making sure some facilities would be in the BPA easement, if possible, because that was an area the City could take advantage of to provide a larger space and not consume land elsewhere. Similar on 60<sup>th</sup> Ave to the south, likely all of that would not be in the roadway or along the street frontage based on the street cross sections, so the project team was looking at the opportunity to provide it at the corner of the school property or in the park if that regional facility was needed.
  - LIDA was a great strategy and having sites for regional facilities for the long run was also an excellent strategy because the climate and water quality standards change, so there was uncertainty about the future.
  - Once a developer finished working on a parcel, not much could be done by increasing the treatment capability of that facility on the margin, but not if the water quality improvement being required for healthy fisheries downstream, for example, were orders of magnitude of increased water quality. Having room for regional stormwater facilities downstream in the future was an excellent and necessary strategy in this day and age because the City was dealing with very unpredictable climate responses, which were becoming more extreme. A facility that could deal with six months of drizzle might have to suddenly deal with a downpour over two weeks, and it would not be able to handle it. The standards would follow whatever nature is doing and not necessarily where the City had painted itself in a corner. Regional facilities need to be Plan B for future stormwater planning.

**Mr. Dills** continued with the PowerPoint, reviewing the Active Transportation Plan, which included multiple bike route options as well as a new trail from the creek along the south edge of the Meridian Creek school property and extending across 60<sup>th</sup> Ave. The Plan anticipated providing every tool and safe strategy related to Safe Routes to School at the land use planning level. (Slides 11-12)

The Commission had no comments on the Active Transportation Plan.

**Mr. Dills** continued, describing the Street Plan, which regarded the street classifications, specific street designs, and street cross sections, noting the adjustments made in response to the Commission's comments, which included a more boulevard approach on 60<sup>th</sup> Ave North and a consistent streetscape along Brisband Main Street clear to the park. (Slides 14-21)

- **Ken Pirie, Walker Macy** added the Main Street site study (Slide 21) showed surface parking lots behind the buildings on the main street, and while it was subject to a developer's more detailed study, it could potentially be future development sites as well, so there could have been more capacity than what was shown. The plan was primarily trying to show how the Main Street was framed by buildings that could be up to four stories high and creating a lot of public space and a real sense of enclosure there.
- **Mr. Dills** added what was not shown was how the two-block area would connect to the properties to the south. Adjacent to Stafford was a long and skinny component of the Azar property that was a bit of a challenge to get streets to it. It did not include the cell tower property right next to it, though some day it would all be connected. There would have to be circulation down to the Stafford stem of the ownership.

Comments and feedback from the Planning Commission was as follows with responses to Commissioner questions as noted:

- The south section of SW 60th Ave was so straight and flat that it looked like it would invite speed demons and there were no traffic calming features along that section which was a residential street along a school. Even arterial and collector streets had traffic calming measures.
  - **Jenna Bogert, DKS**, explained the buffer bike lanes would help slow traffic on SW 60<sup>th</sup> by visually providing that space that drivers should not be within.
  - **Mr. Dills** noted the team would take a second look and bring back some options to the Commission.
- **Mr. Dills** confirmed that at this time, the team had not planned for SMART to go into Frog Pond East and South but not West. There was a check in with SMART some months back, but the team would follow up on that. (Slide 14)
- **Mr. Dills** confirmed the powerlines would remain above ground on both Stafford and Advance Rds because they had high-voltage wires. The coordination for the Boeckman Rd version revealed they could be moved but could not be put underground for that reason.
  - **Ms. Bateschell** added all other utilities would be undergrounded, only the high voltage lines would not.
  - She understood that these lines were preexisting, unlike the lines in Villebois and other developments where everything was undergrounded but said she would find out and get back to the Commission.
- Looking at the cross section, Stafford Rd provided an opportunity to expand the road to two- or four-lanes in each direction if needed. Since Stafford would be the road that would need to expand, was being able to expand it to a wider road part of the plan? (Slide 16)
  - **Mr. Dills** replied theoretically, it was possible. The intent of the Master Plan was that Stafford would not be widened but was the three-lane gateway into the city. The volume of traffic was managed through the two roundabouts at Kahle and Brisband, the four-way signalized intersection, and the collection of other facilities. The project team did run the traffic analysis for a what-if scenario if Frog Pond East and South were to develop substantially more than what was expected. The team had planned for 1,600 units and analyzed that at 1,800 and 2,400

units, which was where the scales tipped to needing the larger, five-lane facility, which was not part of the vision.

- What was the driver of having the separated bike lane in lieu of a buffered bike lane adjacent to the travel lane? Wilsonville Rd did not have a buffered bike lane, but a bike lane, so why would the City not maintain a consistency or a closer consistency to what was on Wilsonville Rd rather than having a separated bike lane. (Slide 11)
  - **Mr. Dills** replied he could not remember the original rationale; however, the sidewalk on the east side would be where the Advanced Rd wider sidewalk came around and connected. It did not handle the bikes, but it was also separated.
  - **Ms. Bogert** added the team discussed that in their meeting on Friday. Public Works was fine with it being adjacent to the travel lane but separating it from the travel lane and on the opposite side of the planter as shown was more desirable. Bicyclists would have more comfort with more separation from the cars while still providing the same connectivity and access.
  - **Ms. Bateschell** added part of the bike lane conversation had to do with connections to schools. A primary school would be in Frog Pond West in addition to the middle school in South. The team was trying to create more separation and safety between the travel lane and kids who might be using the sidewalks or bike lanes to travel to and from school. Roundabouts and crosswalks were being added to increase safety, but buffered bike lanes further increased the safety by not having the lanes right adjacent to the roadway.
- Kids would not travel down Stafford Rd but would tend to use neighborhood streets until they got to Advance Rd if going to the middle school. Where one lived in the three neighborhoods would determine which collector or arterial would be used to cross Advance Rd to get to school.
  - **Mr. Dills** added in Frog Pond West, the blocks on the west side of the church were intentionally made to be porous north to south, so kids living in those areas could go directly to Boeckman Rd and then to Advance Rd. Pedestrian breaks in the wall and some elements anticipated getting kids to Boeckman rather than out to Stafford Rd.

**Mr. Pirie** continued the PowerPoint, describing the proposed Street Tree, Lighting, and Gateways Plans with additional comments from Mr. Dills, and noting the importance of complementing the trees and lighting in Frog Pond West. (Slides 23-25)

Planning Commissioner questions were as follows with responses as noted:

- Considering the ice storm a few years ago, how did durability and hardiness go into the City's updated Street Tree List, and how much consideration was given to that in these plans?
  - **Mr. Pirie** replied he would probably have to ask the arborist or in-house tree experts, but he believed durability and hardiness was a consideration when Street Tree Lists were provided. The ice storm was a special case, so he was uncertain such damage could be prevented completely.
  - **Ms. Bateschell** noted the City had done a Street Tree Inventory a couple years prior to the ice storm, just as an asset inventory. After the ice storm, Community Development partnered with Public Works, which hired two interns to go out and update the Street Tree Inventory and those results were provided to the Commission and City Council. From that, Staff learned a bit about which tree species were impacted most, and Public Works, Planning, and the Natural Resources Manager had been meeting regularly since the ice storm in partnership with the Urban Forestry



Management Plan and integrated that information to refine the Street Tree List that was provided, adding some species, and excluding that might be more susceptible moving forward in climate change. While those issues were constantly changing, City Staff was responding to them.

- She clarified she had not done a comparison to Frog Pond West to see if the trees in that plan had been removed when the trees list was put together; however, the provided Street Tree List was reviewed by Staff in terms of what it would want to call for on the City's street trees.
- If the City wanted to incorporate a drip system for flowering planters along Main Street, where would that be incorporated? Was that even incorporated in the Master Plan or was it too detailed?
  - **Ms. Bateschell** responded she would want to say it was detailed, but a drip system would typically be done at a streetscape planning level, but if it was a priority, it could be mentioned in the Master Plan.
  - **Mr. Dills** added there was no preclusion; the Master Plan was an ideas book as much as it was a directive outcome book or regulatory function. Thinking of other cities where those programs were done, it was very much programmatic at the city level as opposed to finding it in the Comprehensive Plan.
- Hanging banners to distinguish the area seemed comparable and a good option in the Main Street area.
- Did the Code ensure that lighting at the neighborhood street level was functional as far as the spacing and height of street trees not interfering or blocking the lighting? In years past, the Commission had talked about the challenges of developing a Street Tree Plan so that the lighting remained functional. Did the Code address that issue or was it all part of plan review?
  - **Ms. Bateschell** confirmed it was primarily part of plan review, and it was constantly evolving, especially as the City had a lot of facilities on the street. There was a constant balance between curb cuts, lights, trees, LIDA facilities, etc. as a lot of things had to be provided in that space. On the Main Street, for example, the City was trying to balance the type of trees being calling for in relationship to the type of lighting and spacing, so there were some spacing standards for both to balance at site plan review.

**Mr. Dills** continued the presentation via PowerPoint, reviewing the strategies to implement the Master Plan into the Comprehensive Plan, which would also require amendments to the Transportation System Plan, as well as applying the appropriate zoning to each property during annexation and development review. He reminded the process for adopting the infrastructure funding plan would begin in January. (Slide 27-30)

Comments and questions from the Planning Commission regarding Master Plan Chapters 5 through 8 were as follows with responses by the project team as noted:

- The BPA easement had recommendations of how it could be used with a network of trail systems or open space, but was there any teeth to make sure a developer did not use the BPA easement as RV storage for an HOA, for example? Did the City have anything that could prohibit certain functions so that the easement was prioritized for public space?
  - **Ms. Bateschell** clarified any uses within the BPA easement had to be arranged with them, so it had to be something the BPA agreed upon and RV storage was not a use they would agree to. The City had conversations with the BPA about what was being outlined in the Master Plan so far which were generally uses the BPA supported, and they supported some of the initial

conceptual, high-level drawings in the Master Plan. There would be some restrictions, particularly around height and the radius around each of the footings of each of the towers to ensure security and access for their facilities, such as any underground equipment for example. The City would have to do a much more detailed coordination with them with regard to path, trail, or LIDA facility locations to avoid conflicts with any underground equipment and to ensure the appropriate spacing from the towers' footings. All uses had to be organized with the BPA and part of an easement agreement since it was their easement.

- Would a community garden be something BPA would generally be open to and if not, should the City add community garden to the list of potential uses just to bring it more top of mind of the developer?
  - **Ms. Bateschell** replied the City could put it in that list and worst-case scenario, BPA would not allow it, but adding community garden to the Master Plan as a priority discussion item would be fine. City Staff would follow up with the BPA about the question.
- Was there anything Staff wanted to say about the public comments that were received?
  - **Ms. Bateschell** noted the comments were received on Friday, October 14<sup>th</sup>, and given the City Council meeting on Monday, there was not a lot of time to research and provide comment, but she did respond because she had gotten the information request, read it, and forwarded it to the Planning Commission.
    - One question she had was whether there needs to be a designated change from Type 2 to Type 1 along Stafford Rd, because from the description in the October 14<sup>th</sup> letter, it seemed like it meant the type and form of housing being discussed was housing that would be allowed in Type 2. She followed up asking for potentially, photographs or images of products the development team envisioned potentially putting along Stafford that was behind their request, so everyone could visually see and understand, if those fit what the Planning Commission and community had been discussing. The community had determined to put Type 2 along Stafford Rd, which was discussed when the project team went through the different options for the land use and the urban form and how the transect should play out. Various options were considered by the community and the Commission which included a lot of discussion about where to center the most dense buildings or housing, and how that should fan out within the community. There was also a lot of discussion about the central location of the park closer along Brisband because the Main Street would have the tallest buildings, but they would be distinct from housing along Stafford Rd. She remembered that being a part of the conversation at Planning Commission and knew the Commission would want to understand how that compared to what was being provided in the testimony and the request, so she essentially just responded by asking for images or pictures so that could be better understood to determine if they were talking about the same thing, and so the Planning Commission could have more information to consider the request when hearing the public comments. The requested information was received at 5:45 pm today, which was very responsive of AKS and West Hills considering she was not able to respond until Tuesday.

The Commission took a brief recess at 7:45 pm. The meeting was reconvened at 7:50 pm.

**Chair Heberlein** called for public comment.

**Mimi Doukas, AKS Engineering**, representing West Hills Development, said the developer appreciated the back and forth with City Staff and the Planning Commission, noting they were talking about the

same topics as a few weeks ago. Following Staff's advice, West Hills wanted to provide more documentation that gave an image of what was being requested and why, as well as some context. They were all very preliminary, and not necessarily the architectural styles, but they provided a sense of the urban form and scale of what West Hills was talking about and how it might transition.

- West Hills was still not 100% sure how it would all be implemented and what the rules were going to be, so they were still feeling it out on Type 1, Type 2, Type 3. Its main feedback was along Stafford Rd, West Hills desired to put garden style apartments, so three-story apartments, which was a good transition from the Main Street, which would be a four-story structure with retail mixed use on the main floor and three stories of residential above. Physically that still matched the transect that had been discussed. West Hills' concern with the Type 2 designation was that it said it was a two-story urban form with the option of a third story for certain state-mandated housing types, and it was not clear if garden style apartments fell under that category.
  - So, there was a level of uncertainty, which developers did not like. If West Hills had the Level 1, it would have more assurance that the three-story structure was anticipated by everybody involved. That was why West Hills wanted to change that urban form designation along Stafford Rd to the Type 1. In looking through the descriptions in the Master Plan document about Type 1, Type 2, Type 3, it sounded like West Hills could live with the Type 1 designation around the park, so that was pulled that out of its request. West Hills was still guessing, but as far as it could tell, that was something it could live with.
- As Mr. Dills pointed out, particularly along Stafford Rd, as seen in the exhibits, the team had added the wetland in that next-to-the-cell tower property, there was a narrow strip of land that was not conducive to traditional block patterns. Access was going to be extremely challenging through there which was part of why West Hills thought garden apartments was a good urban form, a good design option, for that piece. If that was garden apartments, it was going to be a little strange to have garden apartments south of the main street on Stafford Rd and not have them north of Main Street along Stafford Rd, and that consistent streetscape was a good thing.
  - The Frog Pond West side of Stafford Rd was not a consistent streetscape with the church and some out parcels. It. Moving farther north was new development, Frog Pond Ridge and Frog Pond Crossing that had the Frog Pond elements such as the brick wall and homes designed with a proper orientation to Stafford Rd; that was a little bit different. To the south, it was a little more piecemeal, so it gave the community more flexibility for how West Hills [we] treated that area.
- West Hills was also concerned about language in the Master Plan about variety of housing types within each block which was still a really hard design component to implement due to the single dimension of lot depth. Many were on 100 ft lot depths, so it was hard to change from a town home at an 85-ft lot depth to a single-family home with a 100-ft lot depth. The depth does not move across a rectangular block. There were a lot of opinions about whether variety should be at a block, community level, or lot by lot; it was really subjective. West Hills had real concerns on how to implement that, particularly as it got into the Type 1 urban form, just based on the logistics of how a block works. They had a good design to do a garden apartment, a single family detached house, then a town house and then garden style apartment; it would be disjointed. So, West Hills would like to do consistent garden-style apartments along Stafford Rd.
- Regarding the Master Plan document, she noted Figure 15 was titled "Frog Pond East and South Master Plan" and should be changed to avoid confusion between the land use map and the title of the entire document.

- The legend also needed to be a bit more descriptive, noting a stranger would not have a clue what Type 1, Type 2, Type 3 were. A subheading within the legend could state that they were urban forms".
- The sub-districts were probably going to be a bit of a challenge the way they were currently designed. The Azar property had blocks that ran north-south, as seen in the provided sketch, but West Hills had a development type on the west side of the Azar property, a bit different housing type in the middle of the Azar property, and a little bit different type moving farther east. West Hills had variety from east to west if the City drew the sub-districts that way, but not as much variety north to south, so those sub-districts did not quite work the way the developer envisioned things.
- In viewing the Stafford Rd cross section, there were two, one-way drive aisles that were 11 ft of pavement with a median in the middle and 11 ft of pavement was narrower than an alley, so the Fire Department would probably not like that cross section. There was a logical reason they needed 20 ft of hard surface in most of their corridors. She encouraged the project team to check in with the Fire Department on that cross section.

**Chair Heberlein** noted it was a challenge getting it late, but it was good information. He asked if Staff saw a conflict in the Type 1 versus Type 2 designation and the need for changing it to a Type 1 to accommodate the submitted testimony.

- **Ms. Bateschell** stated first part of the answer was to look at some of the architectural examples, in particular the large one provided as the garden style walkup apartments that would be provided along Stafford Rd, and whether that somewhat aligned with the Planning Commission envisioned when talking about the Type 2 urban form. Some of the discussion had the Type 1 more central and the Type 2 closer to Stafford Rd adjacent to Frog Pond West. Some images of a three-story garden style apartments discussed and presented in the letter fit the description of Type 2, so would there actually need to be a map change to reflect that because, in her opinion, that was something the process envisioned as potentially being built in Type 2. There were a variety of things that could be built in Type 2, and in part that was because the process envisioned a four-story mixed-use building along the Main Street, so the proposal would be a step down. And, it would not be a four-story building facade all the way along Stafford Rd, but it would have that variety, that step down, and a better transition across the way to Frog Pond West. The Commission envisioned some three-story buildings within the Type 2 throughout the neighborhood, and four-story buildings could be in the Type 1, which created that transition down. A lot of the houses in Type 3, the lowest density, were probably going to be two-story homes, and so it kind of created that transect. She believed what was described in the letter seemed like it fit in Type 2, but she could not say that with certainty before seeing images and hearing from the Commission who had been balancing all the input received from the community. She wanted to make sure the images actually aligned with what the Commission had been picturing when having discussions about the Type 2 versus the Type 1, and it might not. So, the first piece was to have some discussion to see if it lined up.
- She understood the distinction and concern about what was written in the text for the Type 2 urban form, and that the Type 2 did say that buildings were intended to be two stories with three stories allowed under applicable State law for certain housing categories. The certain housing categories referenced there meant three stories had to be allowed for middle housing. If these were units beyond the unit types for middle housing, which they appeared to be based on the pictures, they would not meet the definition by State law of middle housing and the City would not have to allow three stories. That being said, she did not know if the Commission

definitively believed that strongly that three stories would only be allowed for middle housing; maybe it should also be allowed for multi-family housing, which could be discussed. There were options in terms of how to potentially address the question and issue on table which was, if West Hills' proposal aligned with what the Commission had been thinking for Type 2, then maybe it was relevant to keep it as Type 2, but make a wording or verbiage change, a decision around what to allow to three stories or not in Type 2, or if Type 2 should really be as presented in the document, and then there could be discussion about whether the Commission wanted to modify the map and whether a modification of the map was consistent with the conversation over the last six months.

**Commissioner Karr** recalled the Commission had originally said Type 2, because it was blending into Frog Pond West. However, the commercial section was going to be four-story, so it made sense that the surrounding area could have three-story. He liked the idea as it builds up on the multi-family functionality and affordability. He did not want to necessarily change the description of the type, but was more in favor of changing the map. Changing the type opened that type up almost across the board, and he was uncertain if that was the Commission's intent. If the intent was to focus more on that subject plot of land and say the presentation made sense, he would rather change the map.

**Ms. Bateschell** added the Commission did discuss how many stories to have around the neighborhood park as well, which could help inform the decision about whether to change the verbiage or the map. In those prior conversations, the Commission seemed to prefer three-story buildings around the neighborhood park, which might be a verbiage change versus a map change.

Whether the Commission wanted more height on the Main Street and ensure some step down along the rest of Stafford, because making it Type 1 could result in four stories all along Stafford because Type 1 said buildings two to four stories and close to the street. She believed that was how it was described. There were a few moving pieces in terms of whether the Commission wanted that distinction on the Main Street versus the rest of Stafford Rd, and what did the Commission want to see around the park, in addition to what was desired t along Stafford Rd as all those pieces weighed into it.

**Ms. Doukas** noted another question was did the Commission want four-stories in Type 1. Four story on Main Street had been consistently discussed; however, four-story outside of Main Street was probably a valid question.

**Commissioner Mesbah** noted when discussing the experience going north or south on Stafford Rd, the Commission wanted to make sure that as one went from rural to urban, it slowly went up, a three-story to then four-story and back down made sense, especially when tied to the boulevard design for Stafford Rd. However, the big example of the garden style apartment, or whatever was proposed there, should be oriented toward Stafford Rd, so it was not turning its back on Stafford, but looking upon the boulevard and across the Boulevard to the church and everything else in Frog Pond West. That made Stafford more of an urban street, which addressed the question of expanding the road because it would ruin the whole sense of that stretch, because apartments would be looking at a very busy street, which was not currently what was being proposed. The proposal was fine if it respected and faced the boulevard. Some of the smaller examples on the third page would make a lot more sense.

- What happened around the park was an interesting question. Did the Commission want to maximize that kind of view upon the park and open space and allow for a three-story there? He

was fine with that as well as a more dense, two-story looking on the park. Putting a big wall next to an open space was not always a good idea.

**Ms. Doukas** clarified that was what West Hills sketched. Looking at the site plan on the southern portion of the garden style apartments, the buildings were to the Stafford side with parking on the backside, and that could certainly be done north of Main Street as well.

**Commissioner Mesbah** added north of Main Street had more room and could have both, as long as it did not have the back of the building on Stafford Rd.

**Ms. Bateschell** confirmed the garden style apartments did not meet the State's middle housing definition. Duplexes, triplex, fourplex, cottage housing were the State-mandated and definitions provided for middle housing. Units that appeared to have more than a fourplex, which seemed to be shown in the images, would not meet the definition of middle housing at the State level. She confirmed they could meet the definition of the 80% to 120% of the median income. When talking about the Housing Variety Policy garden style apartments would absolutely be in the bucket of housing types that would help the City achieve more market affordable housing opportunities or choices, which was probably why that and the form related to Type 2 felt like it fit.

**Commissioner Willard** stated for her, affordability took priority.

**Chair Heberlein** added that did not mean the City would get affordable, only that it was technically feasible. Compared to some of the costs for apartments or condos in the Lake Oswego developments, which were by no stretch of the imagination affordable, but could have been. That would be the challenge the Commission would face; everything would still depend on the developer.

**Commissioner Willard** agreed the Commission faced that challenge with every housing type.

**Ms. Doukas** added that was partly why West Hills provided that distinction between the Main Street multi-family and the garden style, which was designed to lower that price point. It did not have the elevators, the common shared space, the lobbies, etc., so it was functionally designed to keep the price point lower. Whereas the Main Street was an investment in retail space, it had to have fit and finish, elevators, etc. and at that point it had to go to the higher market place.

**Chair Heberlein** believed the three-story garden style form seemed appropriate. Changing it to Type 1 and then opening it up to four-stories threw him off a bit. He leaned toward a text change to allow the three-story, multi-family in Type 2, just so it maintained a bit more of that transition from Frog Pond West and then also going north and south down to the more reasonable form.

**Commissioner Karr** added that meant the Commission would open all types to that and there was considerable acreage in Type 2.

**Ms. Bateschell** noted three-stories between 25 ft and 35 ft was typically allowed throughout all Wilsonville residential neighborhoods and the City was required to allow three stories for all middle housing. Even in Type 1, while the City predominantly called for one- to two-story homes, some would likely end up single-family detached, and if one ended up being a townhouse or a duplex, it could absolutely be three stories. She agreed changing the language, whether for a certain housing type or any housing type, would open the possibility of up to three stories.

**Chair Heberlein** asked if that came down to identifying minimum and maximum types of products that had been discussed. Was that how the housing type was controlled?

**Ms. Bateschell** replied the variety standards would likely impact that as well as the height of the buildings, though no decisions had been made about the number of housing variety buckets. Though uncertain, if the developer was providing two-story town homes, two-story single-family detached, and two-story cottages, they likely all be the same height. However, three-story town homes, a two-story single-family detached and maybe single-story ADUs would present more fluctuation in building height within the same area.

**Mr. Dills** added if the Commission was headed toward the three-story, what he called the friendly face to Stafford approach that made sense for all the reasons stated, a couple of other things got implied about that. One was how the friendly face was actually executed with buildings. The brick wall treatment was on the west side of Stafford Rd and this approach would imply there was no brick wall approach on the east side. Another consideration was how the portals into the building were arranged. It was common for a garden style apartment to have a single, central breezeway portal up into the building. If that was the only way into the building, then what else would present the friendly face? Were there some porches, balconies, or something else that was semi-public space? The third consideration was the continuousness along Stafford Rd. It was about 600 ft from Advance Rd to the Brisband blocks. Three buildings had some space between them, with maybe some variation would go a long way towards breaking down the continuous wall impression. West Hills' pictures showed articulation, materials, peaked roofs—all nicely done architecture. How all three monopoly pieces fit together had to be considered to create a really nice total effect, and the landscaping did part of that, too. While beyond master planning, the considerations were part of a design package.

**Ms. Bateschell** confirmed the Commission did not have to make a decision tonight, but she asked that the Commissioners about any further input as the project team considered West Hills' requests.

**Chair Heberlein** noted the next time the Commission would see the Draft would be at the public hearing, so the Commission needed to figure out what it wanted to see in a final version, a motion was made to change it at the public hearing.

**Ms. Bateschell** said she preferred the Commissioners' strongest opinions on the matter, noting Staff had a few items to follow up with; some were responses to questions which could be done by email. If there were a few changes also made relative to that, the Staff could communicate that to you as a group, but any discussion about it really needed to occur in the meeting. Staff would put forth a recommendation based on the discussion and any recommendation made to Staff tonight.

**Commissioner Gallagher** stated she liked the illustration with the garden apartments which provided a wonderful, gracious front to the neighborhood, so she supported that if there was a way of making it work. She was not sure how to fix that within the Master Plan document, but believed the team was capable of doing that without impacting everything else because it was a complicated task.

**Ms. Bateschell** understood if Commissioner Gallagher had no strong opinion on the fix, adding it might be more helpful to understand whether the placement of the garden style apartments in other areas of Type 2 was appropriate.

**Commissioner Gallagher** agreed it was appropriate.

**Commissioner Tusinski** stated she would be most in favor of a verbiage change for Type 2 to allow three-story, multi-family but she did not want to open that area up to a four-story situation. She could see the garden style apartments in other areas, especially around the neighborhood park.

**Commissioner Karr** said he was still somewhat reluctant to open it as he was not sure about the ramifications throughout the Type 2, but he was okay with a verbiage change.

**Commissioner Willard** stated she was in favor of the garden style apartments along the corridor, noting she leaned towards allowing garden style apartments in Type 2.

**Chair Heberlein** stated he was still in favor of the verbiage change and shared Commissioner Karr's concern about the potential ramifications. He understood the concern was about a proliferation of multi-family throughout East and South and noted the public shared the same concern. Perhaps, that would be something for the team to think about moving forward, and if there was anything the Commission needed to think about or put in place to help ensure that did not happen.

**Commissioner Karr** noted that could be handled through the minimums and maximums.

**Ms. Bateschell** confirmed Staff could definitely have that conversation and think it through. The housing types for the Code had not been officially categorized. This was just the strategy that would be part of getting at the housing variety policies in the Code. Staff would weigh all of those things over and play out the scenarios with the project team to see what that could look and if it was handled through the variety standards to determine the best recommendations. The previous roundtable gave the team some clear direction on what to consider in order to return with a recommendation.

**Mr. Dills** added the team would couple that with the concept of the buildings providing a friendly face to Stafford Rd and would flesh out what that meant in the Master Plan language.

**Commissioner Karr** stated his concern was that early on the Commission discussed not wanting all single-family in West and all multi-family over in East and South. The idea was to have variety and spread it out. That was the only concern with opening Type 2. He liked what was presented and commended the project team on a good job.

**Ms. Bateschell** confirmed that was all the project team had and that the Commission had responded to the public input and provided Staff with some direction on that.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:29 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

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