



PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

January 10, 2024 at 6:00 PM

City Hall Council Chambers & Remote Video Conferencing

Draft PC Minutes were reviewed and approved at the February 14, 2024 PC Meeting.

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, January 10, 2024. Chair Heberlein called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m., followed by roll call. Those present:

Planning Commission: Ron Heberlein, Jennifer Willard, Andrew Karr, Nicole Hendrix, Matt Constantine, Samuell Scull, Yana Semenova

City Staff: Miranda Bateschell, Amanda Guile-Hinman, Daniel Pauly, Amy Pepper, Kimberly Rybold, Georgia McAlister, and Mandi Simmons.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

CITIZEN INPUT

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

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, welcomed new Planning Commissioners Matt Constantine, Yana Semenova, and Sam Scull.

The Planning Commissioners introduced themselves, highlighting their professional work experience, volunteer history with the City, time living in Wilsonville, and outside areas of interest.

Ms. Bateschell clarified the Planning Commission had historically been a seven-member body and when Commissioner Olive Gallagher had to step down, there was a vacancy on the Commission for the last quarter of 2023.

1. Planning Commission Chair & Vice Chair Nomination

Amanda Guile-Hinman, City Attorney, reviewed the rules for nominating and electing the Chair and Vice-Chair.

Ron Heberlein nominated Andrew Karr as 2024 Planning Commission Chair.

Jennifer Willard nominated Ron Heberlein as 2024 Planning Commission Chair

A roll call vote was taken, and Andrew Karr was elected 2024 Planning Commission Chair by a 6 to 1 vote.

Nicole Hendrix nominated Jennifer Willard for 2024 Planning Commission Vice Chair.

Jennifer Willard nominated Ron Heberlein for 2024 Planning Commission Vice Chair.

A roll call vote was taken, and Ron Heberlein was elected 2024 Planning Commission Vice Chair by a 6 to 1 vote.

2. Consideration of the December 13, 2023 Planning Commission Minutes

The December 13, 2023 Planning Commission Minutes were accepted as presented.

WORK SESSION

3. Frog Pond East and South Implementation-Development Code (Pauly)

Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager, gave a brief overview of the work done to date on the proposed Code amendments to implement the Frog Pond East and South Master Plan. He presented the Frog Pond East and South Development Code Amendments via PowerPoint, focusing on the proposed Housing Variety Standards, a strong tenet of the Master Plan. His presentation highlighted the basis for the recommended standards, which included a comparison of Villebois to Frog Pond East and South, as well as a review of the key concepts of the Housing Variety Standards: urban form, sub-districts, and minimums and maximums for specific housing types.

- Mr. Pauly also presented the current draft of Housing Variety Standards, noting the numbers were still subject to refinement; however, the same concepts would be carried forward. The presentation addressed the standards consolidated in Table 6B, which broke down the minimum number of housing types in sub-districts and tax lots, and described the calculations used as well as an alternative calculation for Table 6B. (Slides 11-14) Also reviewed were the Housing Unit Types in Table 6C and the related variety standards (Slides 15-17), as well as examples of the number and types of units resulting from the proposed draft Code amendments. (Slides 18-23)

Staff addressed questions from the Planning Commission as follows:

- Different construction types would be blended into each site so that a single-family home, a condominium, and an apartment building would be in one area. While a range of housing types would be allowed, regulations would ensure that building envelopes were not too divergent within the same urban form. The urban form mapping was done to prevent having extremely different product types adjacent to one another.
 - Additionally, from a practical site planning perspective, developers would not put a single-family home in the middle of an apartment parking lot. In laying out a block, lot depths, for example, would lend to certain product types and limit how fine a mix would result.
 - Specific building heights were also a factor in differentiating urban forms to avoid having an abrupt or awkward juxtaposition. Each urban form type would have different height limits, which were still being refined. In Urban Form Type 1, up to four stories would be allowed, but

development would be predominantly three stories. Type 2 would primarily be two stories, but up to three stories would be allowed because townhouses were typically three-stories. Type 2 would look similar to the outer areas of Villebois with four or five flex townhouses mixed in with detached homes. Type 3 would be one- and two-story developments.

- Another component was the setbacks along the urban form boundaries, which tend to be streets. The recommended setbacks were the same to help blend as one moved between urban forms. Structures set back farther from the street, for example, look smaller from the street' perspective.
- The proposed minimum units required was a middle of the road approach so not to under or over develop East and South. Some sites would tend toward having the minimum number of units for various reasons, and Staff did not want to have an unusable or unfeasible amount required for such sites or have it not too low if more units were doable.
- When a unit can be counted as both a small unit and middle housing, the builder could claim credits for both housing types.
- The Code used the phrases “mobility friendly” and “mobility-ready” interchangeably. Staff would be changing all instances of “mobility friendly” to “mobility-ready” for consistency.
- Staff confirmed the 20% target for Middle Housing aligned with the State’s housing goals. While the State did not require specific minimum or maximum thresholds, Staff’s focus was more on performance targets based on comments from the Planning Commission and City Council to ensure a substantive amount of Middle Housing was achieved in Frog Pond East and South. The targets were not unreasonable or beyond what the market would rationally do.
 - Whether that threshold would be used in future developments or be development dependent had not been discussed yet.
 - The Housing Our Future Work Plan, which combines the City’s housing needs and capacity analysis with the City’s housing production strategy, would help inform the City’s policy choices for how to provide housing to meet those needs. Those discussions would be part of future endeavors regarding the housing production strategy, which could change over time based on future housing needs.
- Staff confirmed the assumptions for the net development area of Frog Pond West were valid. The industry standard was that 20% of the area would be developed as right-of-way and data indicated that 5% of Frog Pond West would be developed with stormwater infrastructure, resulting in a reasonable assumption that 75% of the area would be available for development.
 - There adjustments are available if the net dropped below 75%; the formula was still based on Table 6B, which had clear and objective criteria. With only two variables, the math was simple: multiply the percent of developable land times the standard and round the minimum up to the full number.
 - The calculation was done at which ever level the requirement was, the lessor of the sub-district or the Stage I area as defined by the table.
 - The standards were a minimum, which would be easy to meet if the net developable area was greater than 75%. The standard would not grow. The concept was if the net area was less, it would be less feasible to meet those standards so an adjustment might be necessary.
- Staff clarified Accessory dwelling units (ADUs) were not technically considered Middle Housing, however, every Middle Housing rule references ADUs as a separate sub-category. The proposed policies were not inconsistent with the State, because the City allowed ADUs on every single parcel.

However, the State did not require ADUs to count towards the percentage of Middle Housing units in this particular type of master planning area.

- The incentive/encouragement to build an ADU was to meet the small unit requirement or have it count as another unit type in primarily detached areas. ADUs were not defined in Middle Housing, and ADUs were defined separately in the City's Code; however, a Middle Housing land division could be used to divide an ADU off from the primary unit.
- Incentives existed to avoid dividing a large acreage into multiple small units. Multiple smaller acreages, such as three, .4 acre lots would be aggregated to do a Stage I Master Plan area.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows with responses from Staff as noted:

- A comparison of the City's existing housing unit types to the Housing Variety standard targets (Slide 23) was requested to get a sense of scale for how much would be added to the overall inventory. Targeting 296 middle housing units would be huge if the City had only 30 Middle Housing units, but not a bit deal if the City had 12,000 middle housing units.
- Ms. Bateschell noted that as of the last Middle Housing report, approximately 10% of the City's housing stock was Middle Housing, so requiring a minimum of 20% would be a substantial difference. Statistics would also be provided on ADUs. Given the small unit requirements and ability to have an ADU with a single-family home, there was a high probability of ADUs being built in Frog Pond East and South, which would be interesting to see considering the city had a relatively small supply of ADUs
- Mr. Pauly added a vast majority currently would be townhouses and attached single-family homes like those seen around the golf course in Charbonneau, which technically qualified as Middle Housing.
- ADUs were defined as an accessory unit not exceeding 600 sq ft in Old Town or 800 sq ft of habitable area in most areas of the city. An ADU could be a converted garage, the ground floor of a townhouse, or a separate structure, but the ADU must be associated with another larger unit and must have full housekeeping facilities and a separate entrance.
- Some urban forms consume more land than others so, rather than specifying a 60% standard, wouldn't the maximum percent of land used for one unit type vary by the urban form? (Slide 22)
 - Staff clarified that certain unit types consume more land than others, noting the urban form could be any unit type. In each urban form, the setbacks were the same for all housing types, so the ratio of land to structure would be the same regardless of unit type. With 10 acres in Urban Form 1, no more than 60% of the land could be used for apartments or detached homes.
 - The point of the standard was to provide enough variety that no one housing type would dominate that subdistrict. The standard was based on land area and not the number of units, because unit types consume land at different rates. If the standard was based on units, 60% of the units could be in an apartment building and 80% of the land could have detached homes. The idea was to take up no more than 60% of the land regardless of the number of units.
 - Mr. Pauly clarified that the standard was the maximum percent of the net land area.
- Mr. Pauly explained that of the 10% requirement for mobility-ready units, one-third must be full mobility units with the remaining two-thirds being either/or. The one-third standard was determined by checking what was reasonable for the market, because such units took land for a single-level unit or adding an ADU. A lot of discussion noted a partial mobility-ready unit could

meet the same purposes as a full mobility-ready unit, but the City wanted to ensure full mobility-ready units were built, which was why a fairly small portion had to be full mobility-ready.

- By definition, partial mobility-ready units had stairs to some part of the building while full mobility-ready units have no stairs.
- Staff wrestled with determining the right requirement for mobility-ready units, which was new for the City, so no precedents existed to have a more scientific basis for the requirement.
- Ms. Bateschell added the differences existed due to Statewide housing policy changes. When master planning Villebois, the City had the ability to prescribe certain percentages of the different housing types and to determine the locations of different housing types, enabling the exact number of each unit type to be determined as well as who they might serve.
 - The proposed mobility-ready targets came from the City current focus on serving certain people within the community, including those with accessibility/mobility constraints, regardless of the specific unit type, which was a clear goal of both the Planning Commission and Council.
- The mobility-ready targets were relatively low because such targets were relatively new and novel, even across the state. There were no State mandates for mobility-ready units and other cities were having similar discussions. Other language regarded visitability, which was similar to partial mobility-ready rather than full mobility-ready. Staff's definitions were slightly different because of the direction to have full mobility-ready units where the entire facility was accessible for someone with mobility constraints. While other built units throughout the city would meet these definitions, they had not been prescribed in this way in a master plan area or in the Zoning Code.

Chair Karr called for public comment on the Development Code being discussed.

Mimi Doukas, AKS Engineering, representing West Hills Land Development, distributed two West Hills' site plans for the Azar property, which was the largest piece of property in Frog Pond located at the northeast corner of Stafford and Advance Roads. West Hills had been working with Staff on the development for a couple years on what the Azar property could become within Frog Pond East and South, including on the variety standards, how the subdistricts would work, and ground truthing the proposed provisions, but West Hills was doing that with a real estate lens.

- West Hills struggled most with Sub-district E4, which was along Stafford Rd because the site constraints, including a roundabout, the extension of Brisband St, required improvements along Stafford and Advance as well as the wetlands on the property, limited the kind of development footprint could fit on the sub-district. West Hills, Planning Staff, and the Planning Commission agreed that apartments would be best along the corridor.
 - Sub-district E4 also had the mixed-use district along Brisband Street and West Hills questioned the viability of the ground floor retail of the elevator-served structures. The ground floor retail along Stafford Rd was expected to be walk up, garden-style apartments.
 - West Hills' primary concerns with the Variety Standards were focused on Sub-district E4 and had also not been able to meet two of the standards shared tonight. Otherwise, the site planning for the Azar property was pretty close to being compliant.
 - West Hills currently had only two housing types proposed in Sub-District E4 and had explored site planning concepts to find a way to add another housing type, but from an

urban design standpoint, it was difficult to put for sale homes adjacent to the parking lot. A small wetland also needed to be protected.

- Ironically, there was no Middle Housing in Sub-district E4, although it was the most affordable housing district with the proposed multifamily, so she believed West Hills was achieving what Middle Housing intended, but West Hills was not meeting the strict definition of Middle Housing. She suggested special provisions be created for Sub-district E4 to provide extra allowances.
- She agreed the City was pushing the envelope regarding the mobility concept. Several jurisdictions had visitability standards. She encouraged the Commission to discuss from a policy standpoint whether full mobility friendly with a sleeping space on the ground floor was required or if it was important that the units were accessible for people to visit; an inviting, accessible home where no one feels left out, which was where the visitability standard came from. Visitability units had a bathroom on the main floor, minimal if any steps into the entry and the kitchen on the ground floor. Including a bedroom on the ground floor changes the programming. What was the public policy desire for the extra bedroom on the ground floor? If a fully accessible unit was desired, a single story was the answer. She was not sure there was a lot of public value with mobility-friendly and the sleeping space on the ground floor versus the visitability standard most other jurisdictions were using.
- She clarified the excluded white and gray zoned area on the distributed site plans indicated property not owned by West Hills, adding West Hills did not know where the wetland boundary was on the other property, which also had a radio tower.
 - The area was shaded in, assuming it would follow the pattern of Sub-district E5. For the Variety Standards, across the entire Sub-district of E4, likely get some version of variety with the addition of that property, but Table 6B was not set up that way. The table stated what needed to be achieved in Sub-district E4, West Hills' parcel and that the other parcel had to achieve its own metrics.

Mr. Pauly stated Staff and West Hills had discussed and continued to work through the things Ms. Doukas mentioned. New concepts for Sub-district E4 would come to the Commission once they had been refined a bit more. Staff acknowledged the challenges West Hills was facing.

Chair Karr asked if Sub-districts E4, E5, and E6 could be combined to apply the standards across all the sub-districts.

- Mr. Pauly explained the intent of having different sub-districts was to ensure a finer variety. Options were available, but those were not ready for discussion yet and Staff was committed to work with West Hills to find a solution.

Ms. Doukas noted the minimum density Staff expected across the entire district was 1,325 units (Slide 23), and West Hills planned to develop 743 dwelling units, which was more than half the units, so the Azar property was pretty significant in terms of the overall planning for Frog Pond East and South. West Hills was exceeding the minimums, being fairly aggressive on the proposed multifamily, which was a public good, had a good , and provided a good urban design along Stafford Rd. West Hills would also be providing 143 Middle Housing units, again, almost half of the City's planned 296 units.

Commissioner Heberlein:

- Asked how much parking in Sub-district E4 was based on the premise of a mixed-used building, specifically around the commercial use.
 - Ms. Doukas did not believe West Hills had seen the parking standards. The site plan showed a less than 2:1 parking ratio, so West Hills was concerned the sub-district was under parked, but it was too early to start counting parking stalls. The amount of parking, particularly south of Brisband, was a concern, particularly for the mixed-use buildings, so that parking would likely be on the north side of Brisband, requiring people to cross the street.
- Noted the Sub-district E4 plan was based on a minimum number of units. Given that West Hills did not have all of E4 and the City was mandating the mixed-use building, forcing a particular unit type and removing options for other unit types, perhaps Staff could consider how to mitigate that.
 - Mr. Pauly noted in working through things, Staff was aware of the Brisband main street was unique, serving a lot of different unit type needs, including small, single-level units, elevator served units and some of the most mobility-ready units in the development

Ms. Doukas noted the feedback loop West Hills had with Staff did not always match the feedback loop with the Planning Commission, so sometimes things stumbled over each other.

- She clarified the range of difficulty for accessible units was visitable, mobility-friendly, and then full mobility, which Mr. Grimberg would discuss in more detail.

Dan Grimberg, West Hills Land Development, noted West Hills was locally owned and relayed details regarding the developer's 25 years of building in Wilsonville. He stated this had been the most difficult planning development West Hills had ever encountered, and the site plan distributed by Ms. Doukas was version #36, so they were trying to make it work and believed it was close. West Hills could make the distributed plan work, but several details still needed work.

- One challenge was being limited to 60% maximum of one unit type. West Hills' single-family lots in the distributed plans were 32-ft and 38 ft wide with many different and unique unit types on them. According to this Table 6B, all single-family units are the same, but it was not the same in the market. A 32-ft-wide house would have a different floor plan, price point, and buyer than a 38-ft-wide house.
- The mobility friendly requirements with a bedroom, kitchen, and bathroom on the main floor were difficult to meet on lots with limited footprints and in small units. West Hills could make mobility friendly design an option as part of a pre-sale as long as the buyers were willing to accept the shortcomings in floor plan that would be necessary to meet the requirements.
- People moving to Wilsonville think of having detached single-family homes. This area of Wilsonville was primarily a single-family neighborhood, but West Hills' plan was limited to a certain number of single-family homes, which were all treated the same. West Hills was planning a lot of townhomes, apartments, and different things to make it work, but the original intent of Frog Pond East and South was affordable housing. Smaller units and different types were not necessarily more affordable.
- Additionally, if the City's current draft of the Stormwater Master Plan update is adopted as written, there would be a 15% loss of density in West Hills plan distributed to the Commission. That loss would impact the cost of housing, number of units, and minimum number of units by unit type. This matter was still unresolved, and he was very concerned because if the existing stormwater

code is revised, the cost of homes would increase significantly and may not make the projects feasible.

- West Hills has a great relationship with City Staff and has had many good conversations about these tough issues. West Hills wanted the development to be successful but the minimums being presented were not proven. West Hills could the plan before the Commission, but beyond that he did not know; it was likely doubtful.

Commissioner Willard:

- Asked how Mr. Grimberg felt about seeking exceptions or waivers as a developer, since not everything could be written into the Code.
 - Mr. Grimberg responded that having exceptions were better than not having that option. Generally, waivers were nice to have but developers would rather have a Code that was workable so they know what they can build. West Hills had put a lot of time, energy and money into this project over the last two years, and still did not know what could be done with the property, which was beautiful, level, and had good access. Normally, a developer could look at the Code and know what type of community could be developed, and it would be the very best. None of the subject discussion was about the market. He understood the City's desire to create variety, but that was just one element. West Hills was building to a market, so whatever was built had to sell, or the development could not be done. Simply checking boxes in the Code did not provide good housing. West Hills was successful because it produces great neighborhoods and great housing by not being so restricted by all this code.
- Noted that building to the market had helped lead to the housing crisis, which the Commission had to consider to be good stewards of the community.
 - Mr. Grimberg stated that the SDC and permit fees for one single-family home permitted in December 2023 totaled \$93,000. With the new increase in fees for the park and the supplemental fee for Frog Pond West, the fees would be \$108,000 for a single-family home, which was not affordable housing. Having to pay \$108,000 on a restricted size unit would not be marketable; it was virtually impossible. There were certain factors that impacted West Hills' ability to hit the City's goals.
- Appreciated Mr. Grimberg bringing some reality to the conversation.

Mr. Grimberg confirmed the ADUs in Sub-districts E5 and E6 were expected to meet the fully accessible mobility ready requirements because the units would be on one floor. However, with the partial mobility-ready units, it would be difficult to get a bedroom on the main floor of a two-story unit.

Mr. Pauly confirmed that as currently drafted, a bedroom on the main floor was required for the partial mobility-ready units because the idea was to be able to live solely on one floor.

- The full mobility-ready requirement was 1/3 minimum mobility-ready units required. The full 10% of the mobility-ready units could be full mobility-ready units if the developer so chose.

Mr. Grimberg noted the number of ADUs in West Hills' plan was limited because the ADUs would be the end unit of town homes with accessibility from the side. Such units had been successful in inner Portland, but the ADUs were limited because only so many end units were available.

Mr. Pauly added West Hills' 125 elevator served apartments in Sub-district E5 met the full mobility-ready requirement. It was more difficult in multifamily areas where ADUs and cottages were used to meet the requirement.

Commissioner Heberlein asked if any master bedrooms on the main floors were expected in the single-family detached rear-load product types located in Sub-district E5.

- Mr. Grimberg stated West Hills preferred not to have a certain number for the requirement and be allowed to offer it as an option to buyers. One district required 27 units to have bedrooms on the main floor, restricting them to a substandard design for a housing type that should be the meat-and-potatoes of the development. The requirement also decreases the value of the lot and house and impacts the feasibility of the entire development. If offered as an option, the floor plan would meet the need of the customer requesting it, and not be built for an obscure hope that someone would end up in that type of home.

Ms. Doukas confirmed West Hill's design would meet the requirements if the three sub-districts were combined and treated as one. As stated, all the multi-family units were full mobility, so the numbers would be met across the entire master plan. However, mobility and visitability requirements still create market issues. Was it good public policy to require a bedroom on the main floor of that percentage of homes?

Commissioner Heberlein:

- Noted in West Hills' plan, Sub-district E5 had 212 units, so 14 partial mobility-ready units were required, which was 6.6% and ADUs cover some of the requirement, so to meet the 10% total, in the 104 detached homes—
 - Ms. Bateschell clarified the City no longer did 10% of what was proposed because if the site plan changed, then the calculations would need redone. The 10% was based on the initial calculation (Table 6B). The numbers for E5 were 27 partial mobility-ready units and 9 full mobility-ready units.
 - Mr. Pauly noted the ADUs were subtracted from the 27-unit requirement.
- Stated with the 12 ADUs, only 15 of the 104 detached homes would need to be partial mobility-ready units. Was that a reasonable number from a developer's perspective to have a bedroom on the first floor?
 - Ms. Doukas replied West Hills' was struggling with which floor plans would be substandard because of that requirement.

Commissioner Willard noted the design was only substandard at the lot size West Hills laid out. In Sub-district E6, West Hills had doubled the number of units required by the minimum stated in Table 6B.

- Ms. Doukas replied if bigger homes were built in order to fit a bedroom on the main floor, the cost of the home increases and affordability decreases. She believed visitability was a better policy objective than the partial mobility because many people do not want bedrooms on the main floor. When dealing with tight homes, the floor plan implications were real. She understood full mobility requirements, noting single level living options were available in the plan.

Staff explained the original intent was that these would be essentially single-story requirements, but it morphed to provide flexibility and allow spare bedrooms on the second floor of single level units.

Overall, the intent was to achieve the City Council and Planning Commission goals to meet the needs of people in the community with limited mobility.

Chair Karr:

- Asked if the City knew the need of the community for this requirement.
 - Ms. Bateschell stated the new Housing Needs and Capacity Analysis would provide information about the varying needs within the community and how it would impact which housing types and sizes were needed. However, there was a known shortage of accessible unit types at the State and regional level, but there was no guarantee that the people who need accessible housing would buy the units in the plan. However, the more housing units provided across various price points for a community, and in this case the more units with an accessible component, the more that would become available on the market to meet the demand.
- Stated that policy was now being shrunk to a plot of land, whereas if a single development spread across three subdistricts accomplished what was desired, why not apply the requirements across the three sub-districts.
 - Ms. Bateschell responded it was not proposed that way because Staff heard that the Commission wanted variety throughout the full neighborhood. Originally, block level variety was considered, but was not workable. That notion was baked into the sub-district level to keep from isolating the accessible units, multifamily, and various other housing types into the same areas. The desire was to mix the units together and the requirements had evolved to Table 6B. At this point, the proposal was to apply every minimum percentage at the sub-district level.
 - The Commission could have a policy level discussion about changing the requirements to apply some at the sub-district level, others at a more aggregated level, or to allow for flexibility to blend certain requirements. She assured the Commission would see the draft again, so even further adjustments could be made.

Amanda Guile-Hinman, City Attorney, noted West Hills' plan was not reflective of Frog Pond East and South and reminded that the Development Code would apply to all of Frog Pond East and South, not just the West Hills development area.

Mr. Pauly noted at the next worksession, Staff would present a layout produced by a consultant that followed the proposed standards. Staff appreciated the guidance from West Hills and AKS.

Commissioner Willard expressed concern about the timing of receiving the housing analysis data with the Code scheduled for public hearing in April. Last year's housing data focused on price and that people were really overspending on housing in Wilsonville.

- Ms. Bateschell added last year was the first year Wilsonville became a severely cost burdened city. Staff could present the new housing statistics, outside of the polished Annual Housing Report, to the Commission in February or March prior to the hearing on the proposed Code. She anticipated seeing data similar to last year.

Chair Karr agreed having the information would help the Commission analyze the mobility units especially.

Commissioner Heberlein confirmed West Hills could have offices in the downstairs products in E5. He noted that a room needed a closet to be considered a bedroom and if someone needed to live downstairs, they would convert an office to a bedroom by adding a dresser.

- He suggested that the Code recognize the creative options residents would use to support someone needing mobility assistance without backing away and going toward visitability. Keeping the mobility side was important since the goal was to have housing products in Wilsonville that could be lived in, not just visited.
- West Hills' proposal looked good and pretty close to meeting the standards, and being able to be more flexible with some creativity might make it easier to comply.
- He confirmed the idea was to have a designated spot, such as a built office or downstairs area, that could be converted to an extra bedroom to meet the partial mobility requirement.

Mr. Pauly clarified the requirement was for the space to be ready as an option, not fully built out.

Commissioner Willard stated having that option as a clear and objective standard was not likely, but it would be discussed during the existing waiver process. Introducing a new, 'conversion friendly' housing type would create complications. Price and affordability were her North Star.

Chair Karr agreed with the comments made and liked having the minimums and addressing mobility and middle housing. However, he was concerned about whether West Hills' development could be built based on the requirements as proposed and whether developers in other sub-districts would also struggle with these requirements. Were the requirements too stringent to build anything?

Commissioner Willard noted West Hills was building almost double the number of units required by Code in Sub-district E6. Anything could be built; it would just change the price point and the Commission needed to decide if it was okay with the resulting price point, which impacted affordability.

Commissioner Scull asked if the Code could include an option to build a certain configuration with a minimum number of purchasers. For example, the 15 ADUs would be purchased first come, first served and may not be used as an ADU unit. Could there be an option that if 3 of 15 were purchased, the developer had the option to build it in a specific configuration. This might better fit into the Code and help with costs as well.

Chair Karr replied he liked allowing the builder to offer that; however, the housing development would be built over many years, so having that as an option required by Code would be difficult. Houses that are sold with options typically have a limited resale capability. He agreed a low percentage would actually pre-purchase such homes. As a developer, having to pre-sell a bunch of houses to meet the minimums of the entire development did not seem reasonable or practical.

Commissioner Heberlein suggested Staff rethink the mobility-ready units and how to achieve that goal.

Commissioner Hendrix requested a layout of the terminology definitions for each mobility level.

Chair Karr believed having data on how many mobility units were needed in the current market would be helpful.

Staff explained that a full market study would not be available until late this year or early next year, but Staff could try to collect county and regional based housing need and supply data from partner organizations to share with the Commission to see potential regional or state gaps. The State would be creating a dashboard in the future that would highlight housing supply at a state and city level, noting affordability price points and accessibility needs.

Commissioner Heberlein said he believed the Code was on the right track and really close to being completed. The diagrams from AKS and West Hills were fantastic, and he looked forward to seeing the other options and scenarios to test the Code for other areas.

INFORMATIONAL

4. City Council Action Minutes (December 4 & 18, 2023) (No staff presentation)
5. 2024 PC Work Program (No staff presentation)

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, stated the work program agenda was always subject change.

ADJOURN

Commissioner Heberlein moved to adjourn the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 8:31 p.m. Commissioner Hendrix seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

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