



# **PLANNING COMMISSION**

## **WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 2021**

### **I. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

A. Consideration of the August 11, 2021 PC Meeting Minutes

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 11, 2021  
6:00 P.M.**

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

*Draft PC Minutes to be reviewed  
and approved at the September 8,  
2021 PC Meeting*

**Minutes**

---

**I. CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL**

Chair Kamran Mesbah called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m. Those present:

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

City Staff: Miranda Bateschell, Ryan Adams, Daniel Pauly, Kim Rybold, Zach Weigel, and Phillip Bradford

**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.

**ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

A. Consideration of the July 14, 2021 Planning Commission minutes

Chair Mesbah noted on Page 11, in the sixth bullet, the sentence discussing a garage included a double negative that needed corrected.

Commissioner Willard moved to accept the July 14, 2021 Planning Commission minutes with the correction. Commissioner Gallagher seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**II. WORK SESSIONS**

A. Town Center Streetscape Plan (Bradford)

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, noted the direction for the Town Center Streetscape Plan project stemmed from the Town Center Plan adopted in 2019. One of the main elements in the Plan was a harmonious design and ensuring the design of the public realm really supported the type of mixed-use, walkable Town Center that the community envisioned. The Streetscape Plan was critical in achieving that vision and especially for implementation of the Town Center Plan and ensuring clear guidance for construction on both City capital projects and private development projects as the Town Center built out; how the private realm was expected to look, and how the buildings interfaced with the sidewalk and the sidewalk with the street itself. The different themes and design elements of the Streetscape Plan were presented to the community and public input was received as to what was preferred. With that input, several work sessions were held with the Commission and City Council to get more input on the details of those design elements. Tonight, a draft of the Streetscape Plan would be presented, and the project team was seeking confirmation from the Commission that the direction the project was headed was both understood and supported, as well as any final feedback the Commission might have, especially related to the investment levels that the Commission had a lot of questions about at the last work session. The project team had some specific questions for the Commission, as well as updates on what had changed since the last time the Plan was before the Commission.

Philip Bradford, Associate Planner, presented the draft updates to the Town Center Streetscape Plan via PowerPoint, highlighting requests made by the Planning Commission and reviewing the changes made to clarify the Standard, Enhanced, and Signature investment levels. He also reviewed proposed potential changes for lighting selections and street tree recommendations.

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

- Mr. Bradford clarified that both the lighting pole and its fixture would be black. (Slide 8)
- When Standard investment streets intersect Signature level streets, like the Promenade, it was unclear whether the intersection would be a Signature level as well.
  - Mr. Bradford noted the left side of Slide 3 showed a good depiction of how a Standard level street would interface with a Signature street. However, the intersection where the Promenade connects to the east landing of the I-5 Bridge would likely be determined by future development because the area was by the Fry's site. He was uncertain if the Signature level would be at the intersection or start mid-property with a Standard intersection and the Promenade beginning as shown on the Town Center Master Plan. Once a street cross-section was available, the project team would work with the developer to come up with exactly how the interface would look based on the development scenario of the property.
- The Signature east landing at the I-5 Pedestrian Bridge and Signature Promenade should not be separated by a Standard level street in the middle.
  - Mr. Bradford explained the streets around the I-5 Bridge Plaza would be Standard, and the logic was to let the features of the Plaza shine more. He understood from I-5 Plaza project there would be a public street to the north of the Plaza, but no street was outlined in the Streetscape Plan. He was unsure if the street was flexible based on future development and how the Plaza . . . [inaudible]
- Ms. Bateschell confirmed the long-term plan, as called out in the Town Center Plan, was that ownership of the Promenade would transfer to the City and would be City maintained over time.
  - Currently, the Promenade was not a full street; however, each street would be dedicated right-of-way to the City, including the local streets penciled in on the Town Center Street Framework Plan. The Promenade was put in the Plan as a bubble diagram because the street had no specific alignment. The Promenade was intended to connect in both directions to Main Street and to the cycle track that would come off the bridge landing.
- Seamless design functionality between the components should be ensured rather than a disconnect in investment levels.
  - Ms. Bateschell noted the actual location and design of the Promenade intersection was still unclear. If the Promenade came directly out from the street and landed right at the intersection, like four corners, it would look different than one slightly south with an alignment connecting with the north/south street and coming up.
  -
- The Commission could provide feedback on whether the intersection should be Enhanced or Signature, but the Plaza would have a specific design, and the Streetscape design should not encroach into the Plaza, but there should be a seamless transition. The intersection could be acknowledged as important in some way when getting to the specific design or the intersection could be provided with a designation in the Plan. Commissioner comments were as follows:
  - Transitions from one grade to another should be gradual or at least sensitive to the spirit of the higher grade.
  - The continuous green ribbon shown on the map on Page 12 of the attachment was not likely due to the existing streets; there would be basically a sidewalk rather than a promenade. Was the continuity shown in the map realistic?
    - The picture did not lend itself to a seamless connection. The idea of a seamless connection should be kept in mind while progressing through the design.

- The higher-grade street, design wise, should take precedence over the lower one. A thoroughfare should lead through the intersection with the Standard on the side but not go through. A person who landed in Wilsonville and did not know anything and wanted to follow the street should be able to follow the street because it would look like one contiguous street.
- Would the continuous, seamless green ribbon from the bridge landing all the way through Town Center be pursued as redevelopment occurred and as opportunities came up, or were there other options to achieve that?
  - Ben Weber, SERA Architects, confirmed the green ribbon shown on page 12 of the attachment was the approximate route of the Emerald Chain identified in the Town Center Plan several years ago that the project team sought to refine a bit through the Streetscape project. The prototypes being designed did not cover the entire Emerald Chain or the specific facilities in each segment, but rather, segments of it, such as Location IN.12, the Promenade (Slide 6), or Location D, which was part of the central main street on Park Place. Those locations would include Signature elements. The map legend would be updated to represent exactly what the green line meant in the next draft.
- Was the green ribbon a functional ribbon of pedestrian/bike path access that could be a bike lane on the side of the street, a promenade, or other different things as long as it conveyed bicyclists and pedestrians?
  - Kim Rybold, Senior Planner, explained the green ribbon represented the Emerald Chain concept from the Town Center Plan that would be implemented through a series of infrastructure investments, components of which included a cycle track. Different pieces would connect people from the pedestrian bridge clear down to Memorial Park, much of which would be achieved through the bridge landing plaza and the connection over to the Promenade. The links in between were mostly achieved through different cycle tracks called out as part of the improvements or enhancements to some of the existing roads. Parts like the Promenade probably could be achieved as part of redevelopment, but other pieces, such as those on Town Center Loop E or on Courtside, would be part of City-led infrastructure investments that would be tackled as redevelopment came into play. A lot of the green and that mobility would be achieved through the cycle tracks that were part of the roadway cross-section.
  - The ribbon was not continuous, but nodes and links of razzle-dazzle facilities, such as a landing from the bridge or a park, and the trail was a link to the next node or facility.
- With Park Place as a Signature road going all the way through Town Center, and the Promenade connecting directly to Park Place and theoretically to the bridge landing, only one intersection would not be at the Signature level. Staff was asked to determine if making that a Signature intersection would be feasible to ensure the connection was consistent as far as the Signature elements.
- Ms. Bateschell understood the suggestion was that the Promenade be extended to intersect both streets and that the intersection with the Plaza be a Signature level. She sought further input on whether the intersection with the Plaza should be a Signature or Enhanced investment level. Comments and further discussion were as follows:
  - The street should be kept as continuous as possible, which would not be easy because it was a developed area, and even in redevelopment, 120-ft of right-of-way could not be carved out for a promenade next to a street.
  - Signage could be used to carry much of the load to create continuity.
  - A sense of continuity could be created in many ways, but there needed to be a sense that it was planned; that there was a reason for a road's design and that it helped people move and explore the area, and bring them into an experience.
    - Ms. Bateschell noted there were Signature streets that were not the Promenade. The Promenade was picked for the presentation, but other streets, and primarily the Main Street, had enhanced elements and design features. Some of those features could be integrated into the intersection without having the entire cross-section be Promenade or having the Promenade necessarily continue. The elements could be merged into the intersection that faced with the Plaza.
  - Once urban design has been completed, the opportunity for programming would arise, like an art walk, for example, which directs people to the next step.

- The continuity would work itself out over time. Patience would be needed as the project was built out progressively.
- Confusing and jarring transitions should be avoided.
- Development could also create the next destination, such as a coffee shop or restaurant, which could help continuity.
- Changing the trees to better reflect what was going on with current weather patterns was appreciated. Were only specific trees being changed or were all the tree species being changed?
  - Mr. Bradford responded the primary street tree would likely be changed due to concerns about the large amount of sap dropped by the trees in the spring, which might not be appropriate in an area where people walked and parked their cars and bikes. A portion of Villebois had the same type of trees, which created stickiness on the sidewalks. The trees were beautiful, but the project team did not want them to become a maintenance issue long-term. A different tree off the list might be more suitable. Different City divisions had reported issues with ginkgo trees, including odors at certain times of the year. Black tupelo tree branches could be too low and present a hazard for the higher pedestrian traffic desired in Town Center. Zelkova trees had been included, but many tree removal permits from the ice storm were for Zelkova trees. However, whether the trees were older or just particularly vulnerable to ice and breakage in the winter or in heat was not yet known. The project team would need to revisit the list of trees from the Urban Forest Management Plan to make sure the most appropriate species were selected. The renderings would not necessarily change because most people would not pick out specific tree species from the rendering, but there could be changes to the text between now and adoption.
- Mr. Bradford noted the rationale for having an Enhanced intersection on Wilsonville Rd with a Standard connecting street was because on the Town Center Master Plan, the street included bike facilities. The project team believed the Ruth St intersection would be one that could incorporate some Enhanced features to set it apart a bit.
  - He confirmed the other three intersections aligned with the street identifiers. Main St/Park Place would be Signature, and the Town Center East and West would be Standard. Signature would have to be transitioned at the Wilsonville Rd/Park Place intersection because the rest of it was outside the project scope, but the part within the project scope would be Signature.
- More clearly identifying the remaining intersections was suggested.

#### B. I-5 Pedestrian Bridge (Weigel)

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, noted the I-5 Pedestrian and Bicycle Bridge was a key project from the City's Transportation System Plan (TSP) and was also elevated as a framework project through the Town Center Plan for a few reasons. The project would connect the Town Center with the transit center and all of the neighborhoods to the west that currently had to bike or walk through and across interchanges to get to the west side of town. The project would also provide a key connection in the trail system. Trails connected on the west side to the Ice Age Tonquin Trail and down to the south to the river, across I-5 to Memorial Park. Essentially, only the Emerald Chain linking Murase Plaza to this bridge and across I-5 was missing. This project would create an amazing loop for the city, making the whole city accessible to both bicyclist and pedestrians. Through the Town Center Plan, the Gateway Plaza was added to create a welcoming plaza to Town Center to mark this special place and create a community gathering place. Tonight, the project team would be sharing the 60 percent design with some exciting images and updates, as well as key questions for the Commission to help get to the 90 percent design, which would happen by the end of this year. Some of the Streetscape themes were very similar to some of the themes the community liked when doing the Bridge and Plaza design, including the Drops and Ripples and the River Oxbow, features that connected to the Willamette River and nature in Wilsonville, as well as a modern and clean, but warm design. While there were similarities, the Plaza still stood on its own with extra features in design and amenities that created a special and dynamic plaza that would be a gem along the chain connected by the streetscape.

Zach Weigel, Capital Projects Engineering Manager, introduced the project team and presented the updates regarding the Wilsonville Town Center I-5 Pedestrian and Bicycle Bridge via PowerPoint. He reviewed the bridge aesthetic enhancement options for pathway and projection lighting; bridge wing and abutment wall treatment options, noting public input favored the basalt and wildlife etching options. He also described the updated designs of the ramp and plaza, as well as some considerations and options based on the preliminary cost estimates.

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

- Mr. Weigel confirmed the ballpark difference in cost for the sourced basalt versus concrete for the wall treatment was about eight to ten times more per square foot. (Slide 20)

The Planning Commission took a brief recess to address technical difficulties. The meeting reconvened at 7:09 pm.

Discussion and feedback regarding the I-5 Pedestrian and Bicycle Bridge continued as follows:

- Mr. Weigel confirmed Public Works had some concerns about the robustness of the seatwalls and side tables shown in Slide 20. The design team would address those concerns as the design moved forward. The final product might not be exactly the same as pictured, but would be something similar.
- No tables would be preferred over tables that were easily damaged. Having tables invited different behavior in that people would come in with food and drink, which necessitated a place to throw trash away.
  - Mr. Weigel noted waste receptacles were provided throughout the City's parks.
- The Specialty paving options shown on Slide 16 with the glass river ribbons would not integrate well with the Streetscape Plan, which had stamped or tinted concrete as part of the Signature level. Stamped or tinted concrete would be better in the Plaza for a more seamless rather than a disjointed look.
  - Mr. Weigel noted the Streetscape Plan and the Plaza each had their own designs, and there was a transition between them. The design team was trying to incorporate the color into the Drops and Ripples that were part of the Plaza. The image on the right was a good example of what the design team was trying to create in the Plaza. The entrance plaza pictured on the bottom right corner showed different bands that incorporated color into the bands. (Slide 15) The brownish color in the rendering at the top would be the standard concrete and the grayish color would be glass banding concrete. A street crossing would be right at the entrance, and the Promenade Signature design would start across the street.
    - The greenish glass shown on the right was the current proposed specialty paving design of the three types. (Slide 16)
- Kim Rybold, Senior Planner, noted that the goal of the added color was aesthetic. The circular nature of the pattern created by the Drops and Ripples made the stamped and colored concrete more complicated to execute than the concrete with mixed glass. The circular pattern was different than the Streetscape sidewalk where the concrete was a larger, more contiguous band, which was why this material was considered as something that could create a distinction with the Drops and Ripples and not replicate the pattern of the Streetscape sidewalk. The project team also liked the look of the pavers. The example shown on the left felt more fuzzy and less distinct of a pattern. (Slide 16)
  - In trying to create the effect of the Drops and Ripples, the glass should be applied in a way that was clean and crisp. The pictures shown were representative samples to offer ideas about how to use the materials to emphasize the ripples, the defining, central feature of the Plaza.
  - Moving forward, if the Commissioners were still skeptical or concerned about the glass ribbons at 90 percent, the project team could further refine things at that point.
  - The turquoise/teal color, which was reflected in a couple other Plaza elements to provide a pop of color, was the recommended color that was most consistent from a design standpoint. The blue example in the middle was intended to illustrate a cleaner line, which was envisioned.

- The Commission agreed the picture on the left did not pop the way the concept was envisioned.
- The Plaza with the circles had color everywhere (right photo, Slide 15), which was a different tableau than the sidewalk (left photo, Slide 16), which looked like a chalk drawing that was washed out by rain. The rest of the sidewalk needed to have quartz or something to create contrast, or colors to make the main meander pop. The whole sidewalk should be a canvas, not just a line in the middle with regular sidewalk for the rest.
  - Mr. Weigel clarified the intent was not to have a meandering glass pathway through the middle of the path, which was one of the earlier proposals that the project team had the consultant remove. The design team was trying to create an image like the one on the right with the circular features, using the different colors of glass and standard concrete. (Slide 15)
  - He also clarified that the picture on the right was not affordable, but provided an example of the geometries and free flowing design the project team was trying to create with different colors of circular glass and standard concrete. (Slide 15)
  - He confirmed Public Works had noted the pavers in the other two pictures would be hard to maintain.
- The Commission agreed the sample picture worked visually for the look the project team was trying to create.
  - The sample picture had a cohesive look that was attractive, and whether it was achieved with pavers or glass or whatever was easy to maintain, it worked. From an artistic point of view, the picture had a rhythm and flowed in circles rather than angular straight lines, which made a difference.
- Mr. Weigel confirmed the picture on the right of Slide 16 with the green glass was the one the Commission preferred. He noted the middle picture depicted how clean lines could be done with the glass by concentrating more glass in the concrete.
- Jared Trowbridge, DOWL, stated the sourced basalt was about \$250 more per square foot than the concrete formliner, so doing the rock wall area shown in pink with the sourced basalt would be about \$400,000 more expensive. (Slides 13 & 14) The cost difference was probably similar on the west side along Boones Ferry. The preliminary cost estimate did not include the sourced basalt and would go up if the sourced basalt was used on one or both walls. (Slide 26)
  - Ms. Rybold clarified tonight's discussion regarded only the wall in the plaza. While the basalt was a design inspiration that scored well, the project team recommended that any future design of that particular retaining wall happen closer to the time of construction. She confirmed the \$400,000 was purely an addition to the Plaza's cost.
  - Mr. Weigel confirmed there would be a comparable cost increase if basalt was used for the west side ramp area as well. He reiterated Staff's recommendation was to engage local artists before construction. He clarified that maintenance was not that different between the two options. The cost increase was more about installation.
- A suggestion was made to switch the fern wall with the fake basalt wall because the wall on the interior of the curve would get the most activity being near the Plaza. The fern wall was more interesting than a concrete poured basalt wall.
- Commissioners agreed if concrete was used, the artistic concrete work shown in the presentation was more attractive than trying to fake something that was natural. (Slide 10)
  - The artistic expressions for the wall should be compatible and authentic; perhaps an art competition could be done. A local artist or group of artists could potentially design the wall.
  - The Commissioners agreed on switching the fern wall to the interior. However, the fern wall was living and needed to survive, and switching would place it on a south facing wall.
  - Mr. Weigel clarified that the concrete basalt example had not been shown to those who had voted for the basalt wall during the public outreach.
- The basalt did not go with the theme as well, so it was not worth the premium.

### C. Middle Housing (Pauly)

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, noted work on Middle Housing had felt like both a marathon and a sprint. She expressed her gratitude for all the work done that had to be on a timeline to meet the State requirements, as well as the City's goals and projects moving forward on its own timelines. The project team and Planning Commission had spent a lot of time discussing the ins and outs, the big policy questions, as well as the fine-grain details. Tonight was the final work session on Middle Housing before the public hearing coming up in September. The project team would present the final package tonight to make sure the project lined up with the Commission's expectations. The team would do a final review with the City Attorney's assistance to ensure the I's were dotted and T's crossed, but any additional feedback was welcome from the Commission within the next couple weeks as the final hearing package was being prepared. Tonight, updates would be provided on a few last-minute items that had been revised based on recent input from the Commission and City Council. The project team was also seeking feedback on a couple questions before preparing for the hearing.

Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager, thanked the Commissioners for their participation at the July 20th forum, which resulted in good feedback, and for their work on Middle Housing. He presented the Middle Housing in Wilsonville via PowerPoint, reiterating the Desired Project Outcomes and reviewing the Draft Code and Plan Updates for Middle Housing Land Divisions and other recent updates to ensure middle housing in Frog Pond West, as well as updates to parking and a few design standards. He also discussed recent comments regarding ADA access and visitability and proposed options for addressing those concerns.

The Commission responded to the following questions posed by Staff, who also responded to questions as follows:

- Does the Planning Commission support the recommended language regarding middle housing land divisions? (Slide 6)
  - Mr. Pauly explained that a parcel qualified to be expedited for review if a new middle housing project was proposed on the site.
    - He clarified the expedited review was purely a process with a shorter timeframe that if appealed went to a hearings officer rather than to the Development Review Board (DRB) and City Council. No new qualifications or new zoning regulations were applicable to expedited reviews for undivided land.
    - Administrative reviews had different levels. Class I or a ministerial review involved no discretion. Staff essentially checked the boxes to make sure the plans matched what was approved with no judgment calls. A Class II or Type II administrative review had some limited discretion, so that was subject to appeal and to notice to surrounding property owners. An expedited review was not a ministerial action with no notice to neighbors and no discretion exercised.
    - While a Type II Administrative Review could be referred to the DRB, the key difference with the expedited review required by State law was that if appealed, the expedited review went directly to a hearings officer appointed by the City, which was not a process the City used for anything currently. These expedited allowances would go through the same process, where if an administrative decision was appealed, it would first go to the DRB and then it could be appealed to City Council.
    - The expedited review would go to a hearing officer and then directly to the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) rather than the DRB or City Council. This was a specific requirement of State law and the City was only allowing that to the extent required under State law.
  - Concern was expressed that a lot of authority was being given to the Planning Director, which was unprecedented. In going for an expedited review, the City gave up any possible overview by a citizen committee.
    - Mr. Pauly reiterated the process followed an existing procedure under State law. He confirmed that State law did indeed require expedited review for land divisions associated with new middle housing. The City had to go through expedited review.
    - Ms. Bateschell clarified the expedited review applied to land division.



- Mr. Pauly added the middle housing development itself was a ministerial action with no notice to neighbors. If someone had an existing duplex that they wanted to divide, then it would go through the traditional process where it could be appealed to the DRB and City Council.
- Was the State requiring the expedited review because it wanted to prevent "NIMBYism" with middle housing by taking away the chance for citizens to gripe?
  - Mr. Pauly noted with HB 2001, middle housing, like a triplex could be developed without any notice to a neighbor. The law was straightforward in that lines were being drawn on a property for sale rather than changing how far the property was set back or the look or the feel. All that was changing was whether or not the property could be sold to more than one person. The standards that could be applied to the land division were specifically defined by Senate Bill 458 and outside of notice; it was pretty clear and objective. There was not a lot of leeway for local jurisdictions of what could be put on the land division. In some circumstances, street improvements could be required.
  - He noted none of the vertical development was being approved with the land divisions, just the lines being drawn for sale that would create lots with the same zoning.
- On Page 5 of Attachment 1, Land Division, Section 4.232.03.C, was a list of nine easements, but five were unique items and four were duplications.
  - Mr. Pauly noted the list was taken directly from State law, but it appeared to have some formatting issues that would be corrected.
- Mr. Pauly confirmed the requirement would make middle housing easier. In the context of Frog Pond, the market for many builders was the individual home buyer, not investors who wanted to buy a triplex to rent out. Enabling the requirement responded to market realities.
  - That explanation was reassuring, as the requirement introduced the possibility of marketing to a smaller group who would want to rent out a unit, which would be a benefit of the Code changes.
  - Mr. Pauly clarified developers were used to marketing to the home buyer, which was what the middle housing land division further enabled.

Additional comments from the Commission regarding the parking updates were as follows with Staff responses to questions as noted (Slide 8):

- The Commission's concerns about parking were well addressed, and the suggested wording was good.
- While the effort was appreciated, determining how much of an impact would be made on the ground was a struggle. Covenants were a nice thought, but unrealistic in terms of their impact. The market would be the final arbiter.
- Mr. Pauly explained the motivation for the State to not require more than one parking space got into a lot of big policy pictures. The reasons included too much parking was a waste of land, especially with scarce land. Greenhouse gases and the reduction of driving also played into the motivation. With limited land, the State would rather house people than cars. When writing the code for the whole state, parking was discussed at length in the rule making. The flexibility to add units, particularly in urban areas, was a goal. Parking was also a typical NIMBY concern with a real fear that any parking requirement, whether needed or not, would be used as leverage to make additional housing infill unfeasible. The current standards in the city were also one space per unit, but from a reality, the market typically built more than that where there was space.
- Ms. Bateschell added that cost could add a lot to a project, probably less so for perhaps a single-family home. One concern was the loss of revenue from the amount of space taken up by parking that was not part of the house. Another concern was infill. A lot of the bill was targeted towards infill or redevelopment in existing neighborhoods, particularly that may have been previously only zoned for single-family detached homes. Working within that space and on what could be smaller lots or lots with added units did not provide a lot of space. The more parking required as a City, along with design standards like setbacks and lot coverage, made building additional units unfeasible. The bill was about integrating diversity of housing, but also about addressing the housing shortage in the state, and the need for housing. Making

more housing possible and feasible was important. The bill also targeted infill and redevelopment opportunities, which was a prime driver of the parking standard.

Comments from the Commission regarding a new three prong approach for ensuring middle housing in Frog Pond West was as follows with Staff responses to Commissioner questions as noted (Slide 10):

- The new policy direction for middle housing in Frog Pond West was a good idea.
- Crowding more units on a smaller lot did not seem to make sense. Was there any limit on the number of reductions now allowed, such as for the tree problem, for example.
  - Mr. Pauly responded there was not a limit, the number of reductions allowed was as necessary, per the rules. While there was no limit on the number of reductions permitted for middle housing, the propensity would still be to build single-family homes based on feedback from developers, so getting all smaller lots was not anticipated. The additional flexibility would also generally be applied in large lot subdistricts, with 6400 down from 8000, because only large lots were left, particularly in the northwest corner; though some medium lots were still in play, too.
  - The aesthetics related to lot width and depth were understood, but sacrificing backyard space was not great either. Although with larger lots, there was more give.
- A suggestion was made to incentivize differently, by allowing a lot size to be reduced but only if middle housing was put on one of the normal sized lots. Smaller lots could be created as long as middle housing was put somewhere in the development.
  - Commissioners agreed the incentive was good. The lot size reduction would be allowed, but on a single-family lot, not on a middle housing lot.
  - Mr. Pauly added that the incentive would prohibit 100 percent lot reduction because middle housing had to be placed somewhere on the full-sized lot.

Commissioner Heberlein stated he was concerned about the risk of no middle housing being built with this approach. With the 10 percent requirement approach, at least some middle housing would be built, but there was no guarantee any would be built with this updated approach. Even seven units was still more than zero units and was a start.

- Mr. Pauly replied that the extra lots were a pretty strong incentive because that was what developers wanted since they were not able to maximize the number of lots they had given the lot geometries.

Chair Mesbah asked if the approach had to be one or the other, the 10 percent requirement or the refined approach with lot reductions.

- Mr. Pauly noted the 10 percent requirement could also be a disincentive and push developers to try to get in prior to November, which was a concern. Working with the developers on where the market was heading would be more successful.

Commissioner Heberlein noted if the refined approach could be put in place now, so there was a larger opportunity in Frog Pond West, he would support it because of the probability of getting more development. However, with the timing for the implementation, the three-pronged approach would only apply to a quarter of the overall Frog Pond West.

- Mr. Pauly stated he would have to talk to the developers more to understand them, but if the developers saw the approach as a big benefit, particularly the lot size component, they might wait a few months in order to have more flexibility, whereas a 10 percent requirement might lead them to race to submit their applications.

Commissioner Greenfield asked if a model or precedent was being created for Frog Pond East and South, and whether middle housing would be promoted versus being just allowed.

- Mr. Pauly replied that model was yet to be determined because the calculus for land use in East and South was going to be different because middle housing would be allowed everywhere, so careful thought would be given to each subdistrict. He believed the focus would be on allowing middle housing and designing to

push towards middle housing, especially in some areas, which was consistent with the Area Plan, but it was too early to say for sure.

Commissioner Heberlein confirmed builders had been planning to build single-family units in Frog Pond West, but Frog Pond East and South had been designed to assume denser development, which would be done by a different builder.

- Mr. Pauly noted even if the same builders developed in Frog Pond East and South as Frog Pond West, their development plans would be based on a different product mix.

Ms. Bateschell added that developers did look at the maximum lot number when starting on a development project, and often, Staff was involved with multiple site plan iterations, working with the developer to get to the maximum lot number. Staff spent a lot of time internally thinking about the requirements and what they would look like to ensure the intent of the Planning Commission and City Council was met, so she appreciated the Commission's hesitancy. Developers often assumed they were going to get that maximum number of lots, and that was what set their bottom line in terms of what their assumptions were when they bought the property and tried to get the site plan through. The intent of the incentive was not just a financial incentive, but something to put in the Code to drive the conversations for the applicant. She did not know if the incentive would pan out as hoped, whether any middle housing would be built, and she agreed there was risk involved.

Chair Mesbah noted the incentive was not much different than allowing additional maximum heights in a densely urban tower-type environment if a number of affordable units were added. The maximum potential development was being added to in order to carve out some special units, which made perfect sense.

Joe Dills, Angelo Planning Group, noted the policy choice was a "six of one, half a dozen of another" situation. The 10 percent approach provided the intended guarantee, while the three-pronged approach tried to put together what the City was hearing from the development community into the regulatory framework. He did not have advice on which approach was the best for the City. Frog Pond West was not a model for East and South, even though, he agreed it was too early to tell. East and South had so many different dynamics that this discussion was limited to Frog Pond West. He noted he would have to be on the other side of the table to express what he thought was best for Wilsonville, as there were different trade-offs with each approach. Staff had thoughtfully tried to accommodate what they were hearing in the outreach process. He added that the value of the 20 percent reduction should not be discounted in responding to site conditions like trees and slopes and other constraints. In terms of the benefits to the city from the three-pronged approach, the retention of trees, the response, the orientation according to slope as necessary, and connectivity, etc., were all good outcomes.

Mr. Pauly addressed questions regarding the updated design standards as follows:

- He clarified the glass percentage required on the side façade would be 5 percent. A building with the rear facing a street, green space, or open space, such as a double-loaded lot, was treated like a front façade in terms of the architectural detail. The Model Code did not differentiate, so whether the front or rear faced the street, the standard would be 15 percent. The proposed update allowed the side to be reduced to 5 percent in all cases.
  - Standards needed to be applied equally across all housing types per the State law, so getting the allowance to 5 percent was a bit indirect, but it worked. In other words, the Model Code stated the allowance was 15 percent, but in all cases, there was an exemption to reduce the side glazing to 5 percent.
  - Five percent was the standard window percentage on a side façade in Wilsonville, which made sense as oftentimes, the stairs and storage space were on the side façade, making it difficult to put in windows.

Additional comments from the Commission regarding the proposed ADA Access and Visitability Options were as follows with Staff responses as noted:

- Continuing to pursue the ADA options was very important. The stakeholder perspective would be interesting.

- ADA access was more than just accommodating a wheelchair, much of it was about accessibility to living in a place.
  - Mr. Pauly agreed that in adopting such code, the City needed to engage in how to address and understand a broad range of needs, including concepts around universal design and how they could be brought into the local standards.
- Commissioner Gallagher added that she would be happy to share directly some of the challenges she had faced that most people would not even think about, such as the weight of a door.

Chair Mesbah encouraged the Commission to be ready for the public hearing at the next meeting. He thanked the project team and Staff for all of their hard work.

Mr. Dills added that the middle housing package was very comprehensive with bigger picture goals of trying to diversify the housing opportunities in Wilsonville beyond meeting the State law, and he believed the opportunities were there. The City was putting the path in place to provide the opportunity for more housing. He complimented Kate Rogers, Angelo Planning Group, and Mr. Pauly on moving through the details, providing options, and framing the questions the Commission had worked through over the months.

## II. INFORMATIONAL

### A. City Council Action Minutes (July 19, 2021) (No staff presentation)

There were no comments.

### B. 2021 PC Work Program (No staff presentation)

Chair Mesbah highlighted the upcoming work items.

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, noted that because things were continually changing with COVID-19, she did not have anything new to share on in-person meetings at this point. Staff would keep the Commission posted on any policy changes.

Chair Mesbah commented on the difficulty in following the discussion with Zoom cutting in and out. He was knocked off the last Commission meeting six times. In-person meetings were easier in that respect, but he understood if the Delta variant became an issue, the City did not want to endanger anybody.

Ms. Bateschell confirmed the public forum for the middle housing project did not have any technical issues and that there had been pretty good public participation.

### C. League of Oregon Cities Training, "City Planning in Oregon" (Gallagher/Tusinski)

Commissioner Tusinski noted the League of Oregon Cities training was a three-day class held for a couple hours a day online, adding it was more technical than she had anticipated. She believed people on the DRB might get a lot out of the training, because in many smaller towns the work of the Planning Commission and DRB was a combined effort. The training emphasized thoughtful planning that was credible and defensible to the community, and she believed the training was great. Learning about what was happening in different cities throughout the state with regard to growth and planning was fascinating.

Commissioner Gallagher added she realized that Oregon was a state of extremely small towns, and she felt comfortable with many of the issues presented in the training. She appreciated how Wilsonville was incredibly organized and thoughtful. Hearing the comments of the approximately 125 people in the meetings gave her a perspective of how fortunate she was to be in Wilsonville. One of the major takeaways was the difference between communities that did not anticipate either growth or opportunity, and only met when opportunity was presented, versus communities like Wilsonville that planned ahead thoughtfully to jump on opportunities when

they arose. Another important piece was to look at what had been learned once a process was completed to see where improvements could be made.

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, thanked the Commissioners, noting she also appreciated the feedback. The League of Oregon Cities tried to provide useful trainings for the volunteer community members, some of whom had a history and background in planning, but most did not. She was glad the training could be offered and was happy to hear the training was useful and helpful.

### **III. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Mesbah adjourned the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 8:48 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

By Paula Pinyerd of ABC Transcription Services, LLC. for  
Tami Bergeron, Administrative Assistant-Planning