



# **PLANNING COMMISSION**

## **WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 13, 2021**

### **I. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

A. Consideration of the September 8, 2021 PC Meeting Minutes

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 2021  
6:00 P.M.**

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

**Minutes**

---

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

Chair Kamran Mesbah called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m. Those present:

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

City Staff: Miranda Bateschell, Ryan Adams, Daniel Pauly, Kimberly Rybold, Phillip Bradford, and Georgia McAlister

**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 August 11, 2021 Planning Commission minutes  
The August 11, 2021 Planning Commission minutes were accepted as presented.

**II. PUBLIC HEARING**

A. Town Center Streetscape Plan (Bradford)

Chair Mesbah read the legislative hearing procedure into the record and opened the public hearing at 6:12 pm.

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, stated she was honored and excited to introduce the Town Center Streetscape Plan, which was near and dear to her heart because she was the project manager for the Plan over the course of three years and had worked with the citizens of Wilsonville. Thousands of people had engaged in the project to develop a vision for the Town Center and for the future of the heart and hub of the Wilsonville community. The community wanted the space to be bright and active, connected, and an accessible place for the community to gather; to be vibrant not just in form and design, but also in terms of activity and economic vibrancy. The Town Center would transform over time. Placemaking was a priority in helping to achieve the community's vision through social programming in the Town Center, but also in the public realm design. A major implementation action coming from the Town Center Plan was the Streetscape Plan, which had been presented at a few work sessions prior to tonight's hearing. The Streetscape Plan had come together in a beautiful design that suited the City of Wilsonville with the design features that had been prioritized over time. The Streetscape Plan would help the City in guiding developers in their projects and as the City worked on its own capital improvement projects to help bring the public realm to life in the Town Center.

Philip Bradford, Associate Planner, stated the Town Center Streetscape Plan was the result of nearly a year's worth of community engagement, work sessions with the Planning Commission and City Council, and technical advisory meetings with City Staff, culminating in a final product that would create a cohesive and attractive

look for the streets within the Town Center. Over the next few decades as the Town Center redeveloped, the Streetscape Plan would help Town Center achieve the goals of being a vibrant community hub of the Town Center Plan. He thanked the Planning Commission and City Council for the feedback provided during the work sessions held on the Streetscape Plan since March of 2020, City Staff from SMART, Public Works, Parks and Recreation, and the Engineering Division for all their input throughout the process, and the members of the public, who had participated in the surveys, public forums, and stakeholder interviews conducted as part of the community engagement. All of this input had shaped the design to be in line with the same community-driven spirit of the Town Center Plan that this project was implementing. He believed the end result had taken into account all of the feedback received and once constructed, Town Center would be a beautiful place to live, work, and play. He also thanked the consultant team from SERA Architects for all of their hard work on the designs.

- He noted the exhibits and attachments that had been entered into the record, adding that the public hearing materials were posted on the website one week prior to the hearing and notices were mailed to property owners within 250 ft of the Town Center project boundary. Staff also provided additional notice of the hearing via e-mail to the interested parties list for Town Center and posted notice within the *Wilsonville Spokesman*, thus meeting all noticing requirements for public hearings.

Mr. Bradford presented the Town Center Streetscape Plan via PowerPoint, reviewing the project's background and context, how the Streetscape Plan implemented the goals and aspirations of the Town Center Plan, the changes made since the previous work sessions with the Planning Commission, as well as next steps and the Staff recommendation as follows:

- As mentioned, the Town Center Streetscape Plan was a key implementation item of the Town Center Plan. The development of a streetscape design plan was a priority place making strategy in the implementation matrix and was one of the first items the City was implementing as a result of the listed implementation items within the Town Center Plan.
  - Due to the robust public engagement in the Town Center Plan, the project team drew from the aesthetic preferences residents preferred with a palette of stone, wood, brick, and glass, and a modern design direction reflective of a newer community, along with other preferences noted in the Signage and Wayfinding Master Plan which also impacted Town Center. The project team began with three preliminary concepts in the fall of 2020 and moved forward with refining the concepts in the winter of 2021, utilizing additional surveys on *Let's Talk Wilsonville* and confirmation from the Planning Commission and City Council. The final result was a hybrid concept that incorporated the River Environment concept and included elements of the Technological Innovation concept, as numerous public comments noted that the sidewalks and motive space of the Technological Innovation concept provided clear and direct connections throughout Town Center. In line with the project schedule, the final draft was now presented for adoption.
- He reviewed a sampling of the public engagement activities conducted as part of the planning process. (Slide 4) The team had to think creatively in terms of conducting public engagement for this plan, as the project kicked off just as stay-at-home orders and social distancing measures began in Oregon. All of the engagement activities were held remotely via Zoom or utilized surveying on *Let's Talk Wilsonville*. In addition, there were five Planning Commission work sessions, three City Council work sessions, and two stakeholder interviews.
- The Streetscape Plan accomplished many of the goals found within the Town Center Plan. (Slide 5) The first goal was accomplished by the selection of resilient tree species and opportunities for lush planting and stormwater facilities throughout Town Center. The second goal was accomplished by the attractive streetscapes in the Plan by creating three different investment levels which would be cohesive and provide a drastically improved condition compared to the current streets. While the Town Center Plan and Development Code increased the mixed-use opportunities within Town Center, the Streetscape Plan would build upon that foundation and provide an attractive streetscape for the future mix of uses. The direct connections, accessible surfaces, and multi-modal focused design of the plan would also work to accomplish Goal 4, making Town Center more accessible for everyone. Goal 5 would be satisfied through the compelling designs for future spaces, like the promenades and plazas through Town Center, for which the

Streetscape provided design guidance. Overall, the adoption of the Town Center Streetscape Plan would lead to further business development and prosperity within Town Center as an attractive public realm, and accessible streets would help attract activity and investment within Town Center.

Ben Weber, SERA Architects, thanked Mr. Bradford for the introduction and background on the past year of work, as well as the Planning Commission for its attention and focus on the project and valuable input throughout previous work sessions and meetings. He continued the presentation, reiterating the number of community forums, Planning Commission work sessions, and other events through the winter of 2020 and into the early months of 2021 involved in getting to the preferred concept design of blending the River Environment and the Technological Innovation hybrid approach, which was first presented to the Planning Commission for approval in March of 2021.

- The design represented a clarity and linearity to the motive space, shown in blue and purple on the diagram, punctuated with landscape and stormwater accent pieces within the street in the green planters and elsewhere. (Slide 6) He highlighted the more detailed plan view included on the bottom left of the slide and noted that the project team was starting to narrow down and refine the tree selection, concrete patterns, benches, and other furnishing elements that would define and build out the concept.
- After the March 2021 meeting and into April 2021, at Mr. Bradford's initiation, the concept was rendered and modeled out and presented to City Council to help the project team flesh out a number of the spatial details and the configuration of the different design elements, including trees, lighting, and bench design, and how the elements interacted with the multi-modal street improvements. (Slide 7) Along with design, consideration was given for how the streetscape investment supported the six key goals of the Town Center Plan, such as how the streetscape interacted with private site development and eased mobility to buildings and plaza spaces, as well as how it emphasized walking and biking access, traffic calming, and bringing ecology into the streetscape environment, for example. The project team hoped the rendered image reflected and represented the ways the Streetscape Plan included not only a design, but clear implementation steps to bring to fruition all the different street types around the Town Center.
- Specific designs had been done for seven different prototype locations, all consistent with key locations identified in the Town Center Plan. By using all seven of the prototypes, and with the input of the Planning Commission, the project team was able to capture a wide range of street types, locations, and three investment levels, Signature, Enhanced, and Standard.
  - He highlighted three different prototype locations in the Town Center:
    - Some Signature investment features of the Promenade (Slide 8) included custom built and installed bench areas, significant landscaping and stormwater features running along the spine of the Promenade, the custom concrete pattern with tessellated shapes, and key elements like the two-way cycle track, part of the Emerald Chain connection. The prototypes were intended to test and display how the concept and material and furnishing elements would be applied in specific locations and would be tailored to the unique conditions. The Promenade was not a vehicular street, but more of a linear park and yet was still a key part of the mobility network and important in acting as the front porch for a number of the businesses and residential uses that would be redeveloped to the north and south of the Promenade.
    - The Park Place Redesign (Slide 9) was a minor realignment of the street, but also an inclusion of the continued cycle track as part of the Emerald Chain. The Enhanced streetscape investment tied into an open space and into buildings and private plazas, shown at the top and bottom of the image, and related to a number of different contexts within the Town Center.
    - The Signature design served a different blend of mobility needs. (Slide 10) The Park Place Extension was an extension of the main street, and, as there was no road there, the Extension was a proposed new alignment through an existing parking lot. The Extension was a more traditional configuration of a main street with shared vehicular lanes, wider sidewalks, marked and improved crossings, and an overall investment in the pedestrian network, the bicycling network with abundant bike parking, and the creation of a lot of spaces for businesses to spill out into cafés and street seats. The street design had a lot of flexibility overall with gathering spaces, landscape

and stormwater spaces that reflected the investment in the street and created welcoming gathering and lingering places for people to live, work, and play along the street.

- The other four example locations were in the complete Streetscape Plan and reflected some of the Enhanced and Standard investment levels, and the project team hoped the designs showed the way the Streetscape investments and projects could bolster the vibrancy of the Town Center over time.

Mr. Bradford continued the presentation by covering the minor changes made since the previous work session and Staff's recommendations with the following comments:

- The key design element selections for each investment level were linked in the Plan and also included in Appendix E. (Slide 11) The product selections included bike racks, pavement types, benches, tree grates, ADA tactile pads, water fountains, trash and recycling bins, and bollards, for example. All of the selections directly linked back to the community's preference for a modern, natural aesthetic, captured by the product selections, regardless of the investment level in which they were utilized.
- The investment level map included in the packet incorporated some of the feedback from the last work session. (Slide 12) The Promenade locations were now extended to meet the public streets to which they connected. The Rebekah intersection, the primary north/south bike lane through Town Center, would receive an Enhanced intersection with Wilsonville Rd to be set apart as a gateway into the heart of Town Center but slightly less so than the main street. An Enhanced level would also be included south of the I-5 Pedestrian Bridge Plaza to further differentiate the area. Otherwise, the map would remain primarily consistent with what was shown at the last work session.
- The Lighting Plan had now been revised to include the PGE product in all of the renderings except one that now showed the Rama product. (Slide 13) He highlighted the aesthetic trade-off between the PGE-compliant list and the fixture the project team believed was the best fit for the other design choices in the Plan and met the aspirations of the community for Town Center.
  - Full build-out for Town Center would involve long-range implementation, so it was uncertain when development in Town Center might occur; however, after construction of the new Public Works facility, there might be potential to store custom fixtures, like the Rama.
  - Some language in the Plan had been changed to add further flexibility to state that at the time of development, the Rama fixture would be preferred, if there was capacity to store custom fixtures. Otherwise, the team would move forward with the PGE Option A and render those fixtures in the plan. As the fixtures were subject to change because PGE was in charge of maintaining the list, the project team's preference was to move forward with a more contemporary option if one became available on the PGE list at the time of development.
- Changes had been made to the street trees and accent trees within the Streetscape Plan. (Slide 14) There had been further alignment with the Urban Forest Management Plan, and additional tree species shown to be resilient through this year's heatwave and ice storm had been included. These additional trees would provide additional flexibility and resilience going forward. The selection focused on tree species that were more columnar, taking into account that Town Center would have taller buildings with minimal setbacks which would remove any interference with the trees as they grew. The tree list within the future UFMP would serve as a guide for tree selections in the future if any issues with availability arose at the time of development.
- Staff recommended that the Planning Commission forwarded a recommendation to City Council to adopt the Town Center Streetscape Plan as an appendix to the Town Center Plan, a sub-element of the Comprehensive Plan. (Slide 15) The project would then continue to City Council for a public hearing on October 4, 2021.

Commissioner Heberlein:

- Asked if a cycle track would extend through the entire length of the Emerald Chain or just from the bridge landing to IN.12 (Slide 8) and through the Town Center Park area.
  - Mr. Bradford replied the Emerald Chain would have a consistent cycle track from the bridge, through Town Center, utilizing the Promenade (IN.12), and then heading south adjacent to Town Center Park,

continuing east, down Courtside. The cycle track would then head south towards Memorial Park as it exited Town Center on Town Center Loop East.

- Noted that answered the questions he had been emailing back and forth about regarding the consistency of the cycle track.

Chair Mesbah called for public testimony regarding the Town Center Streetscape Plan. There was none.

Mr. Bradford confirmed public testimony had been received via email today from Susan Myers of Capital Realty, which had been emailed to all the Commissioners and would be entered into the record tonight.

Chair Mesbah closed the public hearing at 6:45 pm and called for discussion from the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Willard asked if it was possible to use the recommendation made via public comment for the bus shelters.

Mr. Bradford noted the text would be changed per the community member's recommendation between now and the presentation to City Council. The language in the draft plan stated that SMART and the City of Wilsonville were considering other transit shelter products specific to Town Center. He believed Susan Myers' email requested the wording be stronger to state that SMART and the City of Wilsonville shall develop a Town Center-specific transit shelter that worked more closely with the designs of the Streetscape Plan. He noted the shelter included in the Plan was the shelter SMART currently used within Town Center. The plan was to move forward with using that shelter; however, SMART wanted to apply for grant funding for a more unique design that worked with the Streetscape Plan in the future, so the current design would not be used and instead, something that looked much more in line with the aesthetics that had been chosen for the Streetscape Plan. The design would be dependent on different funding mechanisms available in the future.

Chair Mesbah asked if the default shelter would be used if no funding was found.

Mr. Bradford replied that was possible, but he was uncertain because he was not familiar with the different funding grants available to SMART that might come up in the future. He confirmed that if no funding was received to develop a custom design, then the current design would be the default shelter.

Commissioner Greenfield said he appreciated Ms. Myers' comment and noted that having the support of an interested party who represented a major player in Town Center was helpful. He added Ms. Myers had been a major player in the planning efforts for years. He did not find anything drastically different in the language offered by Ms. Myers from the language already in the report. Planning reports and resolutions did not typically use the language of "shall" which he believed was more of a very direct and restrictive legislative language. He believed SMART was already contemplating the language included in the report, and while he did not object, he did not see a need to strengthen that language.

Chair Mesbah noted specific design decisions had been made for Town Center in everything like lights, seats, and sidewalks, for example. He believed the spirit of Ms. Myers' comment conveyed that the bus shelter should have a special design as well. The City should do everything it could to ensure the bus shelters also had a theme that went with the rest of the Town Center, which might entail fundraising if money was not available.

Commissioner Heberlein noted the picture in the presentation showed a stark color for the bus shelter. He had gone on the Oregon Corrections Enterprises website and found a brochure for their bus shelters, which came in different frame and roof colors, and different options could be utilized without a significant expense. He was okay with the Plan language as stated because it said other transit products were being considered. The products should fit in with the rest of the look and feel, and not stand out from everything else in the Town Center.

Commissioner Gallagher agreed with a cohesive overall design, whether that was a bus shelter or anything else. She suggested including a clause to the overall proposal that anything that would be inserted into that area of the Town Center would have to be approved as cohesive to the overall design of the project.

Ms. Bateschell noted that as the Commission's discussion moved toward a motion, the suggested "shall" language could be considered, or color could be noted as something that could change, and the shelter that was across from and adjacent to City Hall could be used as guidance in making the decisions moving forward.

Commissioner Heberlein noted in the packet on Page 36 of the streetscape packet or Page 29 of the Streetscape Plan, the second paragraph for the transit stop said, "No additional products are specified in the Streetscape Plan, but colors and material selection should be consistent with those used elsewhere in Town Center." He believed that was the language necessary to say a design would fit in with the rest of the development, and therefore, he recommended no language needed to be added to the current proposal.

Commissioner Greenfield agreed no language needed to be added.

Commissioner Woods also agreed, adding he did not see a need to make any changes.

Chair Mesbah stated Staff should note that the Commission definitely wanted to make sure that the design choices were consistent throughout the Town Center, as it would be a special place.

Commissioner Heberlein moved to adopt Resolution LP21-0002. Commissioner Tusinski seconded the motion.

Commissioner Greenfield believed the report was very complete and beautiful. He commended SERA Architects and the Wilsonville Planning Staff for their complete and careful process that produced a beautiful result. He believed the document was durable and a good guideline for what would be a long developing project, adding he was prepared to declare his full support for the project.

Commissioner Woods noted a lot of time had been spent on the very comprehensive and detailed plan, which would set the stage for the City for years to come. He expected some minor changes that fit within the whole planning scheme while the Plan was implemented, but he supported the Plan.

Commissioner Willard noted she looked forward to seeing the Plan play out in real life.

Commissioner Gallagher agreed, adding she approved of the plan.

Commissioner Tusinski stated she was very excited to see the Plan play out, particularly as someone who had just bought her first house in the last five years and planned to spend the next 25 years in Wilsonville. She was thrilled that the Plan would take the city in the cultural and business direction she believed it needed to go.

Commissioner Heberlein noted that having been part of the initial Town Center planning process, he believed the Plan was a great addition, noting that Staff continued to do a fantastic job.

Chair Mesbah noted he had also started with the task force five or six years ago. He believed the Streetscape Plan was maturing and developing very well due to the good work of the consultants and Staff.

The motion passed unanimously.

#### B. Middle Housing (Pauly)

Chair Mesbah confirmed the legislative hearing procedure did not need to be reread into the record and opened the public hearing at 7:00 pm.

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, noted housing was a critical component to the community and to how each individual lived their daily lives; it was also a key part of planning. Living in an inclusive community, which Wilsonville had declared itself to be, meant the City needed to look at inclusive housing and housing opportunities that met the needs of everyone living in the city. Inclusion also involved undoing exclusionary policies by looking back at existing policies and seeing where changes were needed. Taking a fresh look was always important when looking at policies, which had been done over the years in Wilsonville. The work being presented tonight was very important, and the Planning Commission had taken that importance to heart working with Staff over eight work sessions in the past year to get the work done right. The work needed to comply with statewide House Bill 2001 and the new regulations from the State of Oregon. Additionally, it also needed to further diversify the housing in the city of Wilsonville, moving into the future and meeting the needs of both current and future residents, while also implementing the recently adopted Equitable Housing Strategic Plan to broaden opportunities to more people in the community for housing and homeownership in the future. She noted the packet presented tonight was quite large, and its size exemplified the amount of work Staff, the project team, and the Commission had put into the project, as well as the monumental nature of the work. She thanked the Commission for its work and everyone who had engaged in the project over the past year.

Daniel Pauly, Planning Director, introduced the project team and presented the Middle Housing in Wilsonville Project via PowerPoint, reviewing the project's background and process, the definition and types of middle housing, the updates and actions related to implementing middle housing, as well as the desired project outcomes, with the following comments:

- He noted Attachment 9 included the Planning Commission record, which included all the meeting materials to date and written public comment received up to the publication of the Staff report. Any subsequent public comments, which included several received on Friday and another received this morning, would also be entered into the record, as well as an additional memo from Staff he would discuss later. All these materials had been sent via email to the Planning Commission. He noted the review criteria regarding regulatory compliance was in Attachment 8 on Pages 1 and 2, copies of which were available online and otherwise as requested.
- The project team began with an audit of the existing Code to find the compliance issues and that audit led to looking at siting and design to ensure the look and feel of existing and future neighborhoods was maintained. Public involvement in siting and design helped contribute to the current recommendation. Public involvement had informed the Code and Comprehensive Plan amendments now being presented for adoption. Prior to adoption, additional input had been received from the community, and what the community and stakeholders had offered was appreciated.
- Middle housing in this context was a range of smaller attached or clustered housing types typically built at a similar scale and mixed with single-family homes. Middle housing was often referred to as "missing middle" largely because it had been missing from city neighborhoods since World War II, prior to which neighborhoods had more housing variety.
- Regarding the State rules and laws and how the definitions were manifested in the updated Code, he reviewed the different types of middle housing as follows:
  - Duplexes were two units on a lot, and the equivalent of a duplex, but with the units detached was a two-unit cluster or cluster housing.
  - A triplex was three units on a lot, and a quadplex was four units on a lot, both of which had a detached equivalent.
  - Townhouses were the most common type of middle housing seen in Wilsonville today. The townhouse term encompassed the four- to six-unit townhouses seen in Villebois, but also attached single-family, such as found around the golf course in the middle of Charbonneau with common wall units that were otherwise fairly traditional single-family homes.
  - Also regulated by the State, and included in the definitions, was cluster housing, which was a group of smaller homes, typically 900 sq ft or smaller that were clustered around a common green space and had some specific rules.



- The recommended actions were to allow middle housing throughout the City's residential areas, establish new design standards for residential development, enable middle housing land divisions, establish the Old Town Residential Zone (OTR), and also establish standards and processes for planned developments in all zones to become legal-nonconforming.
  - The actual documents being updated to implement the recommended actions were shown on Slide 7. He noted that the Frog Pond East and South Master Plans were not yet updated, as they were still under development. The Zoning Map amendment was related to the Old Town Neighborhood.
- The updates were broken down into four categories to help clarify what to focus on. (Slide 8)
  - Category 1 involved the large group of updates that were direct requirements for State compliance with no significant local flexibility. These updates were noted, but not discussed in great detail, aside from what State requirements were being implemented.
  - Category 2 included indirect requirements by the State without a lot of local flexibility, such as making middle housing feasible and ensuring the Code standards were workable and did not inadvertently prohibit the housing the City was required and trying to allow.
  - Category 3 updates involved a lot more discussion, and many work sessions had been spent on these requirements of State compliance with local flexibility, such as the standards around master planned communities and design standards.
  - Category 4 updates were not necessarily for compliance or feasibility related to middle housing, but were intended to improve or fix the Code. Many of the updates revolved around direction received to clean up the parking standards, for example.
- He emphasized there was no budget or time to do a wholesale change to plans. The focus was on honoring past planning efforts, as a lot of amazing planning work had been done in the City's residential areas over many years. The scope of the project was to make refinements that remained consistent with existing plans, while reflecting the Equitable Housing Strategic Plan actions and complying with new State law. In broader changes, there would have also been a broader public engagement process that was not within the scope of this project. The overall idea was to comply and refine, while remaining consistent with all of the previous decisions from Old Town to Frog Pond to Villebois and to the City's general infrastructure, such as the transportation system.
- He provided further explanation of the recommended actions with these comments:
  - Allow Middle Housing (Slides 11-13). These actions were tied to specific State requirements. House Bill 2001 specifically required cities to allow duplexes on all lots that allowed detached single-family homes. Other middle housing, such as triplexes, quadplexes, townhouses, and cottage clusters, was allowed in areas that allow detached single-family homes. "In areas" meant that while duplexes must be allowed on every lot regardless of size, cities could limit the allowance of the other middle housing types by such things as lot size. For example, triplexes were only allowed on lots over 5000 sq ft.
    - Special considerations existed for master planned communities that were under development, which came into play for Villebois and Frog Pong West.
    - Middle housing was not subject to density maximums and had no ceiling for development with regard to density, as long as they met other siting and design standards.
  - Based on the requirements and meeting the City's aspirations and goals, the specific approaches recommended were broken down by different considerations:
    - The General approach included the planned development residential zones that applied in much of the city. In these zones, middle housing was already allowed and had been allowed for decades. The changes acknowledged specific wording that reflected the State requirements and the different types of middle housing. The largest change regarded process, which would be explained later. In addition to attached middle housing, there was a broad allowance of the detached equivalent referred to as cluster housing.
    - In Old Town, middle housing was already allowed as well, but rezoning was required for each proposal, which would not be compliant with the HB 2001 requirements. The allowance was kept, but the process was also changed.

- During the rule making process, the City worked with the State to create rules to allow master planned communities like Villebois and Frog Pond West to continue as planned, as some housing variety already had been planned into them.
  - Ultimately, Villebois would have minimal change, as it was almost built out. The City must allow for duplexes on any of the unbuilt lots, and redevelopment of any lots in the future would be allowed for middle housing, which was not likely for some time because of the type and newness of the development.
  - Currently, about half of Frog Pond West was unbuilt, but by the time the updates were implemented, maybe as little as a quarter of the area would not have land use entitlements. Duplexes would be allowed on any unbuilt lot and triplexes on corners, some cottage clusters, but not quadplexes. Like any other area in the city, any redevelopment must be allowed for any middle housing type, which was again, not likely due to the newness of the development.
- As far as the process update, currently, most middle housing required a public hearing and notice to neighbors in Wilsonville, but the State directly required the process to change. Middle housing must be reviewed using the same review process as detached single-family, which meant if there was no land division for an existing lot or a subdivision had already been established, only a building permit would be required with no notice to neighbors or the public. A building permit for a triplex could be pulled the same as for a single-family home. Land division still required notice, even middle housing land divisions, with opportunities for neighbors and the public to comment. However, the land division did not need to identify what would be built on the lots, and the building permit process was the same as a single-family home.
- Design Standards were an important part of the project, and a big focus was to develop design standards to help the different housing types blend in neighborhoods and maintain the look and feel of current and future Wilsonville neighborhoods. These standards were intended to be direct to meet a purpose, while not unduly increasing the cost of construction.
  - A key concept was that the same standards needed to apply to detached, single-family as well as middle housing, except for some specific model Code provisions defined by the State, which drove how the design standards were built.
  - Two new design standards were proposed for single-family detached homes and middle housing throughout the city:
    - Façade variety, which built off existing variety standards in Villebois and Frog Pond that had worked well to avoid monotony or having repetitive design.
    - Architectural consistency and interest. A single building needed to have one style, so even with a shared wall type unit, the entire structure needed to have a uniform design. Larger building façades needed variation to create visual interest.
  - A lot of thought went into how design standards could help middle housing look similar to existing detached single-family and, as previously discussed at Planning Commission, the current proposal appeared to strike the balance of meaningful standards that were not too costly.
  - For middle housing, the City was allowed certain standards defined by the State that were specific and varied to each type of middle housing, so standards were different for townhouses than triplexes or quadplexes, for example. The standards focused on entrance orientation, the number of windows, and parking configuration, which could vary depending on the type of unit. The standards had followed the State Model Code and worked well with the City's Code, even though they were based on the same Model Code, because the same type of standards applied to development in Frog Pond under the Residential Neighborhood Zone.
- Middle housing land divisions was a new concept in the Code that allowed a lot to be divided for platting and property transfer purposes to allow individual units, such as in a triplex or duplex, to be sold to different owners. The zoning regulations would be applied to the parent lot, so things like setback or lot coverage were applied to the parent lot, and the individual units within the parent lot did not have to meet those standards, only any Building Code property line standards.

- The land division did not change the type of housing unit. A duplex divided down the middle could technically meet the definition of a townhouse, but did not change from being a duplex just because it was divided. For certain types of units, the land division changed the regulations that could apply. Even if the land underneath a unit was divided, the unit remained the type of housing it was when developed.
- The State required land division to be allowed for new middle housing starting in the middle of next year. Based on feedback from the Commission, Council, and through the public review process and the desire to have more options for homeownership at a lower price point, in particular, the City was expanding the allowance to both existing middle housing and accessory dwelling units (ADUs). The State required a special expedited review for land divisions associated with new middle housing. However, middle housing land divisions not required by the State would go through the existing Class 2 process with public notice and appeal possibilities, as partitions and other land divisions currently did.
- The Old Town Residential Rezone fulfilled an action item from a resolution adopting the 2011 Old Town Neighborhood Plan and resolved a process compliance issue for middle housing to ensure that middle housing did not go through a more complex, cumbersome, and time-consuming process than single-family homes in Old Town. The rezone also followed the existing Old Town residential design standards and only made changes specifically required by State law.
  - The yellow portions of the map showed the slightly less than 20 acres of property in Old Town to be rezoned to the new Old Town Residential Zone. (Slide 19)
- Planned Development Non-Conforming Process and Standards. Similar to the Old Town changes, these modifications resolved some process compliance issues. Currently, if a planned development approval was received for a neighborhood back in 1983, for example, the standards applied in 1983 essentially applied forever. The proposed standard allowed applying current standards to redevelopment in the planned development, and any changes to the planned development needed to come closer into compliance with current standards. The proposed standard would apply not only to residential, but also to industrial and commercial development in the city, as noted in the public notice.
  - Two methods were proposed to make planned developments legal nonconforming:
    - Threshold. When a new code was adopted, such as for Town Center, virtually every numerical standard changed. A threshold had to be met if the majority of the standards were changing, so that any existing planned developments would then become legal nonconforming. [1:23:10]
    - Specific Council designation was an option as part of a Development Code update or a standalone. Part of the package recommendation was to designate existing residential developments to be legal nonconforming which would enable middle housing development, as well as any redevelopment meeting current standards.
  - Middle housing was exempt from any density maximums designated in any of the previous residential planned developments, which was a State compliance issue.
- He reviewed how the desired project outcomes had been reached as follows: (Slide 21)
  - To support a thoughtful, inclusive built environment, the project thoughtfully considered the new siting and design standards to ensure they contributed positively to the look and feel of Wilsonville. The standards incorporated diverse viewpoints and citizens' needs, including quite a bit of input from the Latinx community.
  - To comply with HB 2001 and the related administrative rules adopted by the State, the City completed the audit and made the necessary changes identified in the audit. The Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) staff had reviewed the proposal, met with the project team, and did not have any substantial concerns and therefore chose not to provide written comment. The City appreciated the State's valuable partnership, including the funding of \$95,000 in grant money to support the project.
  - To increase the opportunity to develop more middle housing to help meet the housing needs of Wilsonville's diverse community, the project removed regulatory barriers, allowing more opportunity for development of diverse housing. The City recognized this was only one aspect of a much broader

effort to meet housing needs and was one of a number of action items identified last year in the Equitable Housing Strategic Plan and it fulfilled one of those priority action items.

- Including public outreach to inform middle housing design, particularly from historically marginalized communities of color, was another desired outcome. A number of targeted community meetings were held, and information was shared widely through online engagement, such as *Let's Talk Wilsonville*. For the Latinx outreach, the City partnered with Centro Cultural of Washington County with the support of a Metro grant and included a series of Saturday afternoon focus groups, as well as Spanish language surveys. The project team was mindful to ensure the input received from all the sources had meaningful project impact and appreciated how the input came together to inform the project.
  - Attachment 7 provided information about all of the outreach efforts and specific impacts on the package before the Commission tonight.
- To update the infrastructure plans needed to support additional middle housing production, the City worked with consultants who had worked with the infrastructure plans previously to do sensitivity analyses. Generally, the system could handle the incremental changes anticipated. The full analysis was in Attachment 6.
  - An additional study was needed for Frog Pond as part of the East and South Master Plan that was already scoped, funded, and in progress. Potential additional middle housing in Frog Pond West would eat up more of the infrastructure capacity in that sector of the city which needed to be thought through as part of the Frog Pond East and South master planning, but sufficient infrastructure would accommodate anything that would happen in Frog Pond West.
- The object of usable standards was to ensure the standards created had a high likelihood for use. Staff and the consultant team as well as the Planning Commission, City Council, and developers all offered feedback on what the key components were of usable standards.
- Minimize Parking Congestion. Substantial effort was put forth to evaluate and update parking strategies and policies to minimize parking congestion. Parking was a major focus of the online survey.
  - Parking constraints included limited land which competed with other needs outlined in the online survey outreach report, such as back yards, space between houses, and open space. In addition, per State requirement, cities could require no more than one space per unit, although most development built above that minimum.
  - Parking opportunities included making parking spaces more usable and accessible, such as ensuring the correct size and avoiding obvious conflicts, such as storage or trash containers. Garage parking should have specific requirements, such as the garage being kept clear and used for parking. Additional parking was encouraged as appropriate in constrained areas. For units over 1000 ft or larger developments, a preference of two spaces per unit was encouraged though could not be required, and development partners would be made aware of the City's preference.
  - Outreach pointed to a desire to have visitor parking options. Visitor parking needed to be designated or it would become extra vehicle parking. If 10 percent or more of lots did not have adjacent on-street parking in a development, the developer had an option to add additional parking that must be within 200 ft of a lot and be owned and maintained by an HOA. The land would come from incentivizing trade-offs of slightly reducing lot size and open space to enable additional space for shared visitor parking.
- In summary, the proposal was compliant with new and existing State regulations, Metro regulations, and local policies and regulations. The compliance findings were included in Attachment 8.
- He noted a memorandum had been emailed to the Planning Commissioners noting a number of minor edits made to the proposed Code amendments, which he reviewed as follows:
  - Striking the language pertaining to old housing numbers that were no longer applicable.
  - An undefined reference to "specified middle housing" did not specify the middle housing. The language was clarified to point out that when discussing density ranges in the Comprehensive Plan, middle housing, as well as ADUs, were either exempt from density or, in the case of townhouses and cottage clusters, had some type-specific density limits, which were further defined and delineated in the standards for each of the zoning districts.

- The missing word "development" was added to single-family residential in reference to single-family subdivisions in commercial and industrial zones as part of larger planned developments to clarify the developments were subject to allowing middle housing and updated standards.
- Language was added for a new standard requiring waste container storage outside of the parking area for the garage to clarify the containers would be those provided by the franchise hauler, to include solid waste, recycling, and yard debris, for example.
- Staff recommended approval to City Council of all of the different components discussed. (Slide 31)

Joe Dills, Angelo Planning Group (APG), commented that the comprehensive Code update was done comprehensively, adding it would take time for developers to pick up on it and for the proof of the work to play out on the ground. He believed it was well put together, thorough, and infused Wilsonville values.

Kate Rogers, APG, noted the packet before the Commission was large and detailed. The project team had focused on getting the details right and had met with DLCD to review the proposed Code amendments to ensure they complied with the rules and with HB 2001 legislation. DLCD was supportive of the changes and did not identify substantive compliance issues.

Commissioner Tusinski noted a citizen had asked if there had been any discussion about noncompliance and what would happen if the City did not comply with the State.

Chair Mesbah also asked for clarification regarding the delegation of authority from the State to the City for planning. He understood the City did not have the right to make its own mind, but rather that delegation was from the State.

Ryan Adams, Assistant City Attorney, noted home rule was what applied. Home rule was an imprecise term to describe a city's or a county's power to form its own government and to a certain extent, to define the scope of its own powers, but just like any rule or right, there were limitations. The principle of preemption said that if a state legislature adopted a law, then a city did not have the authority to override that law; it was black letter law and that was well-established. In this case, if the City did not adopt the updated ordinance, then Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) would apply its own model ordinance. The choice was to adopt what had been worked on or the direct revisions to that work, otherwise the State's model ordinance would take effect. He understood the frustration of local citizens saying local ordinances should be local, but when the State acted and adopted a law, ordinances were taken out of the City's hands. The fix was not necessarily to pick a bone with the Planning Commission or the City Council. The extent of the citizens' concerns needed to be addressed at the ballot box or taken to the legislature.

Commissioner Tusinski:

- Noted she was asking purely for the citizens who had questions about what would actually happen to Wilsonville if the City did not adopt the rules.
  - Mr. Adams responded the model ordinance would apply. The City would give up its right to adopt its own ordinances, and the State would take over and adopt whatever model rule was put forth by the LCDC.
  - Mr. Pauly added that the rules allowed the City to do some tailoring to specific circumstances, as done with Old Town, Frog Pond, and Villebois, for example. If the legislation was ignored, the State Model Code would come into effect and would apply citywide. More broad allowance would be included during initial buildout in Frog Pond West, for example. Design standards would be limited, and design standards would be implemented that might not work well in Wilsonville's context. Many components were the same either way, but the rules did allow the City to tailor the standards to Wilsonville where allowed.
  - Ms. Bateschell noted that in terms of process, the State could come in and mandate the changes to the City's Code, but prior to that, the City could not implement any of the standards that were contrary to the State Code. Even if the City's Code said a duplex was not allowed on a lot or had to go through

the Development Review Board process, those Code items could no longer be required of an application was based on the new State law. Those processes and standards would no longer apply because they were contrary to State law, and doing so would put the City in a risky legal situation where the State could take the City to court.

- Explained the responses were helpful to have on record based on the citizen comments received via email so they would understand what the City was up against, regardless of what the City wanted.

Chair Mesbah noted home rule was present when building a house. Electric code required an outlet every four feet, but did not say exactly where, and otherwise, no occupancy permit would be issued. Though an individual might believe they should be able to build their home however they wanted, codes existed all over to prevent endangering the health and safety of others. The State's policing power ended up being the planning tools that determined where to build or not to build and that was what was at stake. Doing whatever was wanted did not work anywhere, whether in driving, building houses, or living.

Mr. Adams noted the policy was set by the legislature. In 2004, the voters adopted Measure 37, which was significantly curtailed in 2007 by Measure 49. The State recognized the problem and was doing its best to address the problem with a legislature fix, which did not work. Like the United States, the City was an experiment in democracy. He commended Mr. Pauly and the consultants for developing Code that was compliant with HB 2001.

Mr. Pauly noted some formatting issues with Attachment 2, the Frog Pond West Master Plan. While he had struck out all references to the expanded 10 percent requirement, one reference remained on Page 13 of Attachment 2 in the PDF which would be struck out as well. The section would be corrected as follows: "...This expands the previous limited requirement for large, which requires 10 percent of units. ~~The 10 percent requirement has been expanded to include all subdistricts.~~" He confirmed there were no other references to the 10 percent requirement.

Chair Mesbah called for public testimony on Middle Housing Resolution LP21-0003.

Dorothy Von Eggers stated she was on the original 2014 task force working with the Angelo Planning Group. She was in the HOA of the Landover neighborhood, which was surrounded by Frog Pond West, East, and South. Back then, the issue was high-density housing versus medium- and low-density housing. After hearing that middle housing was exempt from any density maximums, she was uncertain what that meant. Back in 2014, there were hours and hours of verbal testimony, as well as pages and pages of testimony, mostly against high-density housing. The proposed changes were reviewed ad nauseum and went on for years. She did not believe there was a need to recreate the wheel, but she asked that all of the testimony regarding high-density housing be entered into the record for the middle housing project.

- In regard to the different housing projects, she requested to vote separately on each of area of the city, such as Villebois, Frog Pond West, and Old Town, etc., rather than looping the areas in as one decision encompassing all three areas.

Michele Sandlin noted opportunities were mentioned regarding the minimized parking congestion to make parking spaces more usable and accessible, and she asked whether usable and accessible were defined in detail. She also asked what constituted constrained and appropriate with regard to additional parking in appropriate constrained areas. She concluded that knowing what terms meant was important.

Sparkle Anderson confirmed she did not want to provide testimony.

Ms. Bateschell confirmed there was no further public testimony.

Chair Mesbah asked Staff to address Ms. Sandlin's questions about the specifics related to parking maximization.

Mr. Pauly explained the terms Ms. Sandlin asked about were specifically defined, but he had used discretion not to go into a lot of detail for the sake of time. For example, usable and accessible were defined by such things as specific size, such as a defined size of 9 ft x 18 ft, and spaces needed to be clear to get into and not conflict with walkways and storage areas. Usable and accessible meant having a requirement or covenant preventing long-term storage if the parking was in a garage to keep the garage clear for parking. The intent was to have those terms defined. Constrained referred to a lack of on-street parking and was defined in the Code where it applied. He noted he had used generic terms for the sake of brevity, but the terms were defined in specificity in the Code.

Ms. Bateschell asked Mr. Pauly to address the question from Ms. Von Eggers about the meaning of middle housing being exempt from any density maximums, and to also speak to the lot standards in Frog Pond West and how that intersected with the density exemption.

Mr. Pauly stated the lot standards were the key, and the lots were the one key thing kept the same in Frog Pond West. The lot sizes and the number of lots were both kept the same. The envelope that could be built to remained the same, so things like setbacks and lot coverage all remained the same, the number of lots remained the same, and minimum lot sizes for the different subdistricts remained the same. In that same envelope, which might have been previously a single-family house could be a duplex within the same footprint. The design standards were also written as such that the duplex would have a similar look and feel to the single-family that was envisioned. The overall look and feel of Frog Pond and the perceived density from an urban design standpoint would be substantially the same. What happened within the walls of the building was where the exemption applied, where additional units could be added within the envelope without restriction.

Chair Mesbah noted the question was what did the exemption do to density or units per acre. The goal was to bring up the density in Frog Pond from what it would be at full development to something higher and asked what those numbers were.

Mr. Pauly noted there were some options, depending on whether the Model Code applied or whether those options were tailored specifically to Frog Pond. Frog Pond had the option of allowing some level of additional density or defaulting to the base standards, which would be even more density. For example, if density was not increased from 6.5 units to 8 units per acre, then quadplexes would be allowed on any lot, and the default would be a much bigger increase than 8 units per acre. The chosen approach was most consistent with the Frog Pond Master Plan and its established density, which was the intent. [Inaudible] the previous planning effort as much as the regulations and current policy direction allow.

Ms. Bateschell confirmed the lots remained the same in terms of the overall number of lots that were allowed to be subdivided when developed. The number of lots did not change. The State law was exempting middle housing from density, so at a base level, if a density maximum was applied on a development project, the middle housing applicant would not be denied just because they went over the density. What still applied were things like setbacks, lot coverage, and the fact that only certain housing types could go on certain lots of certain sizes, etc. Other factors came into play, and density did not just now allow four to seven times the amount of density allowed before. Everything would operate within the same density envelope. The City could not say a unit had to be a single-family home; a unit proposed as a duplex must be allowed.

Mr. Pauly added the change to the Code ended up being simple. For Frog Pond, the number of units range for each subdistrict was changed to a number of lots range in order to meet the 8 units per acre while staying as close as possible to the Frog Pond West Master Plan.

Chair Mesbah closed the public hearing at 8:11 pm and called for Commissioner discussion.

Commissioner Greenfield noted a question had been raised by a member of the public regarding breaking out the separate pieces of the resolution for individual adoption, such as the updates to the Comprehensive

Plan, Frog Pond West Master Plan, etc. He asked if that was even feasible. He believed the updates had been approached in a fairly holistic way, and consistency had to be maintained across the city in the zoning approach and in the accommodation of the middle housing requirement. He doubted it was possible to break out more precisely the impacts of the various planning documents that existed.

Mr. Adams agreed on keeping the resolution together. He did not see any issue with breaking the resolution apart but believed it was cleaner to keep it together.

Ms. Bateschell added that historically, the resolutions had always been kept together to tie the intent to the changes. If later, clarity was sought on a change in a document or what a Code standard meant, the history of initial adoption and how it changed could be tracked to this specific resolution, which was tied to HB 2001, middle housing compliance, and the Equitable Housing Strategic Plan. Separating the resolutions would be challenging with the record because the changes were intertwined. Changes to the Comprehensive Plan related to changes in the Development Code, which related to design standards. The Old Town Plan was tied to the rezoning, which was also tied to the Development Code. All of those elements were interrelated and the standards correlated with one another to allow what was needed, and the testimony received was related in relationship to how those standards functioned. Keeping public input and the record apart would be difficult. The record could be duplicated and have multiple motions, but in effect, the end result would be the same.

Chair Mesbah added a public hearing had been held on the subject resolution, but not on any new separate resolutions.

Commissioner Heberlein noted the public hearing would have to continue and have new resolutions, which would only be something to do if the Commission felt there was a need. He believed his vote would be the same regardless of whether the resolutions were separate or together, unless there was going to be a change in one that would impact one and not the rest.

Chair Mesbah agreed, adding that theoretically, voting no to Old Town would still not meet the State mandate. All resolutions would have to be accepted because the City as a whole needed to come to the required standards to be in compliance.

Commissioners agreed the resolutions should be kept together and not separated.

Commissioner Greenfield moved to adopt Resolution LP21-0003. Commissioner Gallagher seconded the motion.

Commissioner Heberlein moved to amend the main motion to include the following refinements:

- Adding the memorandum from Daniel Pauly dated September 8, 2021 noting minor edits to the proposed Code Amendments.
- Removal of the 10 percent requirement expansion to all subdistricts on Page 13 of Attachment 2.

Commissioner Gallagher seconded and the amendment to the main motion was unanimously approved.

The main motion to adopt Resolution LP21-0003 as amended was unanimously approved.

Chair Mesbah noted the Commission had worked hard on the project and tried to thread the needle. He could understand that most interested parties of the public, perhaps had better things to do than to follow all eight work sessions it took to build this project and the debate involved to make sure the flavor was very much a Wilsonville flavor.

Commissioner Gallagher said she appreciated the comments made about distinguishing between what the State was requiring and what the City's options were with home rule. A lot of the dissatisfaction she had heard about had come from the fact that people in the community did not understand there was an option and things



were not just being done arbitrarily. The discussion was helpful and something for which the public should be made aware, that the choices were to amend the Code according to State ruling or to lose the option to have any input and be overridden. The public would benefit from having that information. She also appreciated the extra time Mr. Pauly took to bring her up to speed, being new on the Commission. The Staff had done an extraordinary job under very difficult circumstances.

Chair Mesbah agreed citizens needed to be educated more on what could and could not be done. He congratulated Staff and the consultants for a magnificent job, and for being responsive to the types of concerns the Commission raised. On every issue, a consultative process was used to try to get to the root of the issue and to make the Code amendments work in the least destructive way with the best fit.

Commissioner Heberlein thanked Staff and the Planning Commission for all of the work on the project. He noted the work had been a grind for everyone, and so far, the hardest thing he had gone through as part of the Commission. He believed that in the long run, a good job had been done in trying to meet the needs of all of the constituents in the city.

Chair Mesbah called for a brief recess and reconvened the meeting at 8:33 pm.

Ms. Bateschell noted she did not get to extend her congratulations before the recess and wanted to briefly do so before the work session. The Middle Housing Project was an amazing feat of work in a way that the City had not done before. The City had other big projects, such as Town Center, which was a lot of work over two years, but it did not involve eight work sessions in ten months on very detailed Code provisions. She personally wanted to acknowledge the amazing effort of Mr. Pauly, who kept the project on track and consistent with State code. The project was finished on time and on budget, and the whole team, including the Planning Commission, deserved congratulations. The seven volunteer members of the Planning Commission had contributed countless hours in particular to this project and had looked critically at the Code with good, thoughtful planning that was best suited and best fit for Wilsonville, which was invaluable to the community and the residents. She expressed her gratitude and thanked the Commission for its work.

### **III. WORK SESSION**

#### **A. Urban Forest Management Plan (Rappold)**

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, noted the Urban Forest Management Plan (UFMP) had come before the Commission around the same time House Bill 2001 was launching. The original intent was to present the plan to the Commission in the spring of 2021, but the massive ice storm in February 2021, as well as other different climate-related events over the past year and a half prompted the project team to want to revisit the Plan to make sure it was reflective of those recent events and what the City needed to be doing moving forward.

Kerry Rappold, Natural Resources Manager, introduced Consultant, Chris Peiffer, and noted the delay had allowed a couple of opportunities to be presented over the last five or six months. Since the winter storm in February, a winter storm response team had been working internally with the City. A couple interns with the Public Works Department had been updating the street tree inventory that was done back in 2018, and the project team hoped to incorporate the information from that report. Some new software had recently become available that allowed for using tree equity scores, and the team would be able to incorporate some of that information as well. Over the last year, various elements of the project had been worked through. The project team did its own inventory which looked at about 2400 trees and re-inventoried some of the trees included in the 2018 study and added some new trees, especially within Town Center. Information in the UFMP had been helpful to the Town Center Streetscape Plan. The team had also been working on some of the various planning elements that would be presented to the Commission tonight, specifically in regards to the goals and actions.

- The project had fairly extensive public involvement, including two virtual surveys and open houses conducted last fall in which nearly 100 people participated. Specific outreach was also done with the Charbonneau community. The photo contest was quite exciting where people could submit photos of individual trees and groves of trees within Wilsonville. There were more than 80 photo submissions, and

three prize winners were selected, along with their photos, to be featured in the draft UFMP which would be presented at the Commission's October work session.

- The project team wanted to get the Commission's initial input on the goals and actions, and how they should be prioritized to help target the years in terms of implementing the goals and actions. The UFMP was a 25-year plan, so not all of the items would be done right away, but the team wanted an idea about what the Commission, as representatives of the community, and community member believed were the most important actions to move forward with the goals. The Commission would be able to provide input on the overall draft UFMP in October and a public hearing on the UFMP was planned for November.

Chris Peiffer, PlanIt GEO, presented the UFMP via PowerPoint, reviewing the project's background and approach; its visions, goals, and supporting actions; the key findings in the focus areas of Town Center and Charbonneau; and a brief summary that outlined the next steps.

Mr. Rappold clarified that within the focus areas, the draft Plan contained both lists of trees that should be preserved and ones that should be removed based on their condition. The Plan also had a variety of planting lists, one specific to climate change, for instance, and others specific to the focus areas, etc. He reiterated that some of the information was used as the basis of the Streetscape Plan. He noted some areas within Town Center were not surveyed based on the budget to survey only a certain number of trees, but some areas within Town Center were not likely to redevelop, such as the post office and community college, or it was driven by the proposed street network.

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

- How much detail would the tree equity scoring tool provide for neighborhoods since a lot of neighborhoods had lost trees, and would the report include recommendations for specific types of trees?
  - Mr. Rappold noted the project team hoped to use the tree equity information within the Plan, but he believed the scoring tool would be revisited moving forward over the 25-year planning period. Using the scoring tool would be a key discussion as part of the urban forest working group that would be established to coordinate between Parks and Recreation, Community Development, and Public Works.
    - Regarding tree recommendations for neighborhoods, over the last year and a half, a new partnership was started with the Friends of Trees Neighborhood Trees Program. Two events this fall would involve 100 trees per event, and City Staff would work closely with the Friends of Trees in terms of selecting trees within those neighborhoods. The Plan referenced a list of trees created by Friends of Trees for climate adaptive trees. All of those pieces would fit together moving forward in terms of how the City worked within the various neighborhoods in the community.
  - Mr. Peiffer noted one recommendation was to consider developing master tree planting plans in the focus areas and perhaps extending that to neighborhoods, working with partners like Friends of Trees. Decisions should be made using the recently updated inventory data, along with the recommended tree list in the draft UFMP which would help to inform species and diversity, so pests and diseases that came through would not wipe out a complete neighborhood block of one species. He added that follow-up canopy assessments were also recommended. The tree equity score was a starting point. Future canopy assessments might look more closely at the neighborhood level or even down to a parcel level to know the percent canopy and potential planting space where more trees could go. There were ways to really refine data to identify some priority areas to address equity, surface temperatures, reduce stormwater volumes, and other variables. Many tools were available, but the tree equity score tool was a good starting point for getting the 36 percent tree canopy by 2046 draft goal in place.
  - Mr. Rappold added a more extensive report would be provided about the revisiting of the street tree inventory. Some information had been shared internally already, and he believed the community would find it interesting.
- Mr. Rappold noted the Plan probably would not get to the level of directing design standards so trees were placed in a location where they could mature in place without causing conflicts, such as being too

close to a home or nested with water lines and cable lines, for example. Some things would need to be followed up on when looking at the Development Code or standards, and those would follow a separate path. Information specific to Town Center and Charbonneau could be used, because the team looked at those trees in regards to site constraints and other things that could be an issue. Site constraints would come into play when looking at redevelopment within Town Center. The focus area information could be used going forward to inform future discussions about the Code or standards, but there were no specific citywide types of recommendations.

- Mr. Peiffer explained the project team did not initially have canopy assessment data to set the overarching goal of 36 percent tree canopy, which drove other goals and actions in the UFMP. American Forest completed the tree equity score, which resonated across the country in terms of what urban forest could do, and where gaps were in canopy. Often underserved/lower income areas had less tree canopy. The tree equity score looked at a number of different criteria to get a score from 0 to 100. Citywide, Wilsonville's score was 77 out of 100, but when looking at all of the census block groups, which was the geographies the tree equity score utilized, more than half were under 75, the recommended level for tree equity. The 36 percent tree canopy required 27,000 trees, which would bring all census blocks to at least a score of 75, which would address canopy, income levels, age, race, human health, and a variety of other factors.
  - Mr. Rappold added the new partnership with the Friends of Trees and its Neighborhood Trees Program would hopefully enable more events that could target some of the deficient areas within neighborhoods, but the Planning Commission, City Council, and the community had to agree upon the goal.
- Trees were a consistent area where neighbors struggled with problems with specific species that were in the Street Tree Plan or a general lack of understanding of good tree maintenance, for example. The UFMP goals and actions should align with more active outreach with homeowners associations to ensure they had the tools necessary to help support residents. The Plan should help homeowners maintain the trees they had and if possible, provide active revisions of street tree plans for different homeowners associations by helping to define alternate trees for problematic species trees when something new needed to be planted. The key was developing that information and making sure to actively pass it to the homeowners associations so they could share it with residents.
  - Mr. Rappold noted part of the winter storm response team's discussion was recognizing that there could never be enough education in the community about proper tree maintenance. Some of the issues with the winter storm were related to a lack of proper maintenance, such as necessary pruning over time, for example.
  - Mr. Peiffer added that one of the recommended actions in the draft was to create manuals that laid out the industry standards and best practices for maintenance and proper planting, which could be supported by the recommended tree list drafted as part of the project.
  - Mr. Rappold noted Friends of Trees had gotten some funding to conduct workshops in the community that would help people understand the best practices and how people should be dealing with trees.

Chair Mesbah:

- Noted that when he first moved to Wilsonville, he was surprised to find out the street trees on French Prairie Rd were his responsibility as a homeowner. Where he came from, street trees belonged to the City. The City maintained them and pruned them. If street tree maintenance was left to the homeowner who could not afford the maintenance, it would not happen. Adding 6 percent to the tree canopy was fine, but who was paying for it? Maintenance all falling on the homeowners, or the homeowners association who then dumped it on the homeowners, meant affordability would go out the window. He understood why cities depend on homeowner associations to take the load off in all manner of public works activities, but in a big part of the country, such activities were the City's responsibility and paid for by property taxes.
- Noted incentives and funding for training was one thing, but funding for maintenance was also going to be necessary in at least some situations. Most homeowners in Charbonneau might not need it, but having such a broad coverage in neighborhoods designed for affordable housing could very well end up becoming an onus for property owners.

- Mr. Rappold noted options had been discussed during the project planning on what it would cost the City to take on more of the responsibility, which went back to whether funding was available and what it would entail in terms of the number of staffing. Currently, the Public Works crew was responsible for the street trees they maintained, but only a small percentage of their time was devoted to tree maintenance; nobody was devoted full-time to tree maintenance. He noted Chair Mesbah's point was excellent, but it required the buy-in and support of City Council in how to go about funding it.
  - He agreed finding some efficiencies, such as discounted rates for HOAs or other groups, could be helpful from time and cost perspectives.
- Suggested manuals and guidelines would be helpful to establish clear standards. Certifications should be considered for arborists who were familiar with the standards the City wanted enforced, so a homeowner could easily find a City-trained arborist to maintain their trees without question. Maintenance work could later be checked to determine if the arborist needed to be put through the certification training again. A certification system would be much easier and less confusing than having multiple calls, starts, and stops with an arborist.
  - Mr. Rappold agreed that standardizing and creating awareness and expectation of how things were done would be helpful.
  - Mr. Peiffer added that many cities had a registration list or licensing for ISA-certified arborists, and those were the only arborists to call on for street trees.

Chair Mesbah stated the plan had a nice framework. He looked forward to seeing the draft UFMP next month and confirmed the public hearing would be held in November.

#### **IV. INFORMATIONAL**

##### A. City Council Action Minutes (August 2 & 16, 2021) (No staff presentation)

There were no comments.

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

Chair Mesbah highlighted the Planning Commission's upcoming work sessions.

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, expressed her appreciation of Assistant Planner Georgia McAlister, who had helped run a seamlessly, unflawed meeting tonight, providing support during the absence of Administrative Assistant Tami Bergeron. She appreciated not having to multi-task tonight, commending Ms. McAlister for a job well done.

#### **V. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Mesbah adjourned the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 9:23 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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