

## Tualatin Planning Commission

### MINUTES OF October 15, 2025 (UNOFFICIAL)

---

**TPC MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Janelle Thompson, Vice Chair  
Zach Wimer, Commissioner  
Allan Parachini, Commissioner  
Randall Hledik, Commissioner  
Justin Lindley, Commissioner

**STAFF PRESENT:**

Aquilla Hurd-Ravich Community Dev. Director  
Madeleine Nelson, Associate Planner  
Erin Engman, Senior Planner  
Lindsey Hagerman, Office Coordinator

**TPC MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Ursula Kuhn, Commissioner

**CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m., and the roll call was taken.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS & PLANNING COMMISSION COMMUNICATION**

Vice Chair and Chair was unanimously voted to Vice Chair Thompson and Commissioner Wimer (5-0)

**ACTION**

**1. Presentation to introduce a project to update the Tualatin Development Code (TDC) to comply with Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) 197A.400 requirements related to clear and objective standards for housing.**

Madeleine Nelson, Associate Planner, presented an overview of a project to update the Tualatin Development (TDC) code to comply with Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) 197A.400 requirements related to clear and objective standards for housing.

Ms. Nelson shared the city has partnered with the consultant group MIG to assist with the audit and draft code development. She shared the city has previously worked with MIG on several past code update projects, including the Climate Friendly and Equitable Communities (CFEC) project that Erin Engman, Senior Planner, will be discussing later in the meeting. She let the Commissioners know this current project is funded by a grant through the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD).

She went further into detail explaining the Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) 197A.400 mandates that local governments regulate housing development using clear and objective standards, conditions, and procedures. This statute is designed to reduce discretionary barriers, uncertainty, delays, and costs that could discourage housing development.

Ms. Nelson provided an example comparing discretionary and clear and objective language. A discretionary standard might state that “new buildings must be compatible with the character of surrounding development.” In this example, the terms compatible and character are subjective and open to interpretation depending on the reviewer. In contrast, the ORS requires clear and objective language, such as “building facades must include at least 30% windows or doors on street-facing elevations.”

Ms. Nelson shared the timeline of this project includes a final audit expected to be completed by January 2026. Staff will return to the Planning Commission to present findings, seek feedback, and receive policy direction. A draft code update is anticipated in June 2026, followed by another review and recommendation period with the Commission. The final code updates are expected to be completed by August 2026, leading into public hearings and formal adoption in fall 2026.

Chair Thompson asked if one of the challenges in this process will be determining how Tualatin will interpret and define provisions that were previously vague.

Ms. Nelson said yes, that is correct. Aquilla Hurd-Ravich, Community Development Director, noted that, with the assistance of the consultant, draft suggested language will be presented for review. The Planning Commission will have the opportunity to provide feedback on these proposed revisions.

Ms. Nelson noted that there are three planners on the City’s planning staff. The goal of establishing clear and objective standards is to ensure that, regardless of which planner reviews an application, the outcome and interpretation remain consistent.

Commissioner Hledik asked whether developers or home builders would be consulted during the development of clear and objective standards, such as requirements for building glazing percentages.

Mrs. Hurd-Ravich responded at this stage, there is no specific stakeholder groups have been identified for feedback. The Planning Commission and City Council will primarily serve as the main bodies providing input and direction on policy decisions. However, staff acknowledged the value of early engagement and noted that stakeholder feedback could be incorporated during the initial review phase if particular standards are found to have significant implications.

Commissioner Hledik asked what options would be available to a builder who does not wish to follow the clear and objective standards — for example, if a builder prefers not to meet a requirement such as 30% window glazing. Mrs. Hurd-Ravich noted that while the specific process has not yet been determined, the city currently provides options under its architectural single-family review process. For example, applicants may choose to meet a set of required design elements or pursue an alternative review, such as a Type II process.

Mrs. Hurd-Ravich explained based on discussions with the consultant, staff indicated this may become a policy decision for the Planning Commission — whether to maintain the existing two-

track system (clear and objective versus discretionary) or consolidate the process. Staff also reminded the Commission that variances remain an available option in the code, citing the Cabela's sign variance reviewed last December as an example of seeking exceptions to standards.

Commissioner Lindley shared the importance of retaining some level of flexibility for applicants who wish to pursue alternative designs, suggesting that a discretionary review process should remain available.

It was also clarified that the clear and objective code update applies only to residential development; non-residential projects will continue to include discretionary review components.

**2. The Tualatin Planning Commission is being asked to provide a recommendation to the City Council on a city-initiated code amendment to comply with state-mandated rulemaking known as Climate Friendly and Equitable Communities (CFEC) Walkable Design Standards under PTA 25-0002.**

Erin Engman, Senior Planner, presented the Climate Friendly and Equitable Communities (CFEC) Walkable Design Standards. This state-mandated is aimed at reducing greenhouse gas emissions from transportation. The CFEC program includes several components, beginning with the designation of Climate Friendly Areas, defined as high-density, mixed-use areas. Tualatin has satisfied this requirement through compliance with Metro's 2040 Growth Concept. The city also completed the parking reform component in 2024 with the adoption of Ordinance 1486-24.

Ms. Engman explained the Walkable Design Standards builds upon the recently adopted 2045 Transportation System Plan (TSP), approved on August 11, 2025. The City requested and received an extension from the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) to allow additional time for policy discussions with City Council regarding the code concepts for auto oriented uses. The approved extension, included as Exhibit 6, moves the adoption deadline to December 2025.

She went on to explain the City received a technical assistance grant from DLCD to complete this project, similar to the Clear and Objective Code Update project. The city worked with the consulting firm MIG, who conducted a code audit and assisted in drafting the proposed code amendments. The purpose of the project is to implement Oregon Administrative Rule 660-012-0330 through a set of development standards that encourage compact, pedestrian-friendly, and mixed-use land development patterns.

Ms. Engman explained the proposed code amendments considered the code audit (Exhibit 4), the DLCD Walkable Design Standards Guidebook and Model Code (Exhibit 3), feedback from community stakeholders, and direction from City Council work sessions. The rules are organized

into four key topic areas: neighborhood connectivity, residential neighborhoods, commercial and mixed-use districts, and auto-oriented uses.

Ms. Engman spoke about public engagement efforts that included two stakeholder meetings conducted by MIG in late 2024 and early 2025, with participation from transportation advocates and development professionals. These groups expressed support for shorter block lengths, safety standards for mid-block accessways, and setback reductions, as detailed in Exhibit 5. Additionally, the City held three work sessions with City Council to gain policy direction and general project acceptance. The project is also featured on the Tualatin Planning website, which includes an informational flyer and project updates. Public noticing will be conducted as required under the City's legislative process, outlined in Development Code Chapter 32.

Ms. Engman provided further detail on the code amendment addressing the Neighborhood Connectivity Rules, which apply to land divisions that include new streets. These rules require that development include a connected network of streets, paths, and accessways that ensure safe and convenient pedestrian and bicycle connections both within neighborhoods and to neighboring districts.

Ms. Engman then spoke about the Commercial and Mixed-Use Districts rules, emphasizing compact development patterns and direct access to pedestrian, bicycle, and public transportation networks. To align with the state's model code, proposed amendments reduced minimum setbacks, as well as added new maximum setbacks and entry standards within the Neighborhood Commercial and Central Commercial zones (Chapters 51 and 53). Additionally, amendments to Chapter 73A would require main commercial building entries to face public sidewalks, further promoting walkability.

Ms. Engman noted the project also clarifies requirements to avoid conflicts between pedestrian areas and vehicular areas, while adding parking location standards that prohibit parking between the public street and the primary building façade. These standards are already applied in the City's Mixed-Use Commercial Zone and will now extend to all commercial zones. Exception language has also been added to allow flexibility when compliance is impractical, or when alternative designs equally or better meet the intent of the standards.

The final code concepts pertain to Auto-Oriented Uses, including drive-through facilities and other motor vehicle-related uses such as fueling, maintenance, and sales. The proposed amendments expand Chapter 73A requirements for drive-throughs to ensure compatibility with walkability and accessibility standards. State rules require that such uses provide walk-up

service areas or equivalent pedestrian access that meets or exceeds the convenience of vehicle access—examples include walk-up windows or walk-in lobbies.

In addition, state guidelines and model code recommend prohibiting drive-through facilities in pedestrian-oriented zones. Tualatin currently has two such zones: the Central Tualatin Overlay Zone (downtown) and the Mixed-Use Commercial Zone. Since drive-throughs are already restricted in the Central Tualatin Overlay Zone, staff sought Council direction regarding whether to extend this prohibition to the Mixed-Use Commercial Zone. Following a work session discussion in September, City Council directed staff to prohibit drive-through uses in the Mixed-Use Commercial Zone under PTA 25-0002.

As part of this process, Measure 56 notices will be sent to impacted property owners to alert them to changes that may restrict their zoning and property rights. A detailed analysis and findings for PTA 25-0002 have been included in the meeting packet as Exhibit 1, demonstrating that the proposal complies with relevant state, regional, and local approval criteria.

Ms. Engman concluded with an outline of next steps, including undertaking public noticing as part of the legislative process, with a tentative City Council hearing scheduled for November 24th.

The floor was then opened for questions.

Commissioner Hledik asked about the current approval process for driveways, how the proposal changes it, and the reasons for those changes. Ms. Engman explained Chapter 31.060 defines a driveway approach as the portion of the driveway within the public right-of-way, including the throat and apron, but not the driveway on private property. These applications historically fell under the engineering department's purview, with processes that were in practice but not formally codified. The proposed amendments aim to codify the existing driveway approach review process.

Ms. Engman noted that public comments raised concerns about how the Type 1 review process might apply to larger developments, such as industrial or commercial projects. For example, there was concern that removing a gate for a large development could be handled under this permit type. She clarified that such changes—especially those affecting fire, life, and safety access or transportation network capacity—would be reviewed under a Type 2 application, as they involve impacts to both private development and the public transportation network. The Type 1 review proposed is limited to new driveways for residential development that take access off of a street with a Local classification and for existing driveway approaches that are being reconstructed. Ms. Engman concluded that the concerns raised during public comment would be subject to the Type 2 procedure under the proposed review process.

Vice Chair Thompson asked if this proposal would affect residential driveways and how the process is being replaced. Ms. Engman explained it would be a clearer and easier path for residential driveways with the Engineer department. Mrs. Hurd-Ravich explained the past process required to modifying residential driveway approaches required that a homeowner carry a substantial amount of insurance to complete work in the right-of-way. Because of this, our Engineering department was seeking to make the process easier on residential homeowners under a separate process that was not codified. This proposal seeks to codify the easier process for homeowners.

Commissioner Parachini asked if based on public comments that it would be easier for residents to have needs for driveway replaced. Mrs. Hurd-Ravich answered that is correct.

Commissioner Hledik asked for clarification on Chapter 44 to change the name of the zoning district and where it might be applied under a new corridor description. Ms. Engman answered the intent would be that if somebody were to consider rezoning their land along a collector or an arterial that would be the corridor.

Commissioner Hledik expressed concern about extending high-density zoning beyond the city downtown core into corridors that may lack adequate services, amenities, and transit access. He shared that he felt it could lead to inappropriate development, referencing past issues such as the Norwood project. He suggested that the city table this item and revisit the evaluation under the Housing Production Strategy.

Ms. Engman noted renaming the district would better reflect building size limitations of the district and felt more appropriate in comparison to High Rise. She understood the corridor concerns of the commissioners and further explained that an application to rezoning a property would be subject to approval criteria and evidence that adequate services would be in place to support the development impact of the new zoning district. Commissioner Hledik asked if similar setback and density standards are being proposed for both High Density and High-Density High Rise Zones. Ms. Engman confirmed.

Commissioner Wimer asked if tabling the issue, would prevent us from complying with the state requirements. Ms. Engman shared that we could table the proposed changes to the title and purpose statement, while proceeding with setback amendments to address that state requirements.

Vice Chair Thompson, Commissioner Wimer, and Commissioner Hledik shared that the amendments proposed to the zoning title and purpose statement felt like a larger policy discussion. Ms. Engman stated it was great feedback. Chair Thompson shared it seems all

Commissioners are comfortable with moving forward if do not change the name or purpose statement.

Commissioner Hledik shared he would like feedback with the developers, architects, and transportation group included in the stakeholder group. Ms. Engman let the Commissioners know the city hasn't begun the legislative noticing process for the project yet. The required noticing involves reaching out to the DLCD, the CIOs, public agencies and special districts, as well as posting a newspaper notice in the Tualatin Times. She confirmed that staff could additionally notice the stakeholder group for additional public review.

Commissioner Parachini addressed concerns regarding the use of scooters and e-bikes on sidewalk, bike lanes, and street, noting uncertainty about their legal status in these areas. Mrs. Hurd-Ravich answered there are some regulations in place and Lime scooters have maximum 15 mph and definitely a concern that has been brought up. The City is having conversations on how to best address the conflicts.

### Public Comments

Brett Hamilton thanked staff and Commissioners for clarifying the driveway approach process. He commented the proposed setback changes in the Medium-Low Density Residential (RML) zone. He shared he lives in an RML area off Tualatin Road, where there are only a few single-family pockets and wants to ensure our neighborhood's interests are represented. He shared he feels improving walkability should focus on adding multi-use paths and neighborhood routes, not reducing front setbacks.

He shared it's his understanding that the setback changes are not required by state law but are being proposed at developers' request. Such changes should involve more public notice and input. He encouraged the city to seek feedback from residents in affected RML zones.

Ms. Engman shared the CFEC lawmaking process conducted by the state included an extensive public engagement effort to develop the rules, guidance, and model code. In many ways, the state has already handled the broader outreach, and now local governments are directed to implement the new requirements based on the provided guidelines. While there is some flexibility for local adoption, the state has largely determined the overall direction.

This process stems from the city's code audit and the need to align with state regulations. It's important to note that the proposed setback changes do not apply to single-family detached homes, duplexes, townhouses, triplexes, or quadplexes. The changes affect multifamily developments (five or more units), conditional uses, and other permitted uses not specifically listed. The updated setback requirements are based on building height and represent a reduction—for example, structures under 25 feet in height will now require a 10-foot setback instead of the previous 25 feet. So,

while there is a change, it is limited to certain housing types, primarily multifamily or similar developments within the affected zoning areas.

Commissioner Lindley asked if it's low-density zone the setback is not changing. Mrs. Hurd-Ravich answered that is correct.

Commissioner Lindley asked for clarification on if a single-family development were to convert to duplex, it would not get a setback reduction and that would be a disadvantage for infill or redevelopment potential.

Vice Chair Thompson asked if the city has tried going for the middle of the road and more cautious approach to lower density zones to not go over state guidelines.

Ms. Engman answered that is the city's approach to not overstep the state guidelines. Ms. Engman and Mrs. Hurd-Ravich shared this could be explored with Housing Production Strategy to encourage more housing.

Mr. Hamilton asked if single-family detached duplex, townhome, triplex and quadplex setbacks minimum are shrinking. Mrs. Ravich-Hurd answered that no amendments are proposed to those setbacks.

Commissioner Hledik made a MOTION to recommend the release of public review of PTA 25-0002, to amend the Tualatin Development Code to implement Climate Friendly and Equitable Communities Walkable Design Standards and comply with the OAR 660-012-0330 with the following caveats:

1. That the members of the two focus groups be included in the notification of the public hearing.
2. That the proposed changes to the title and purpose of TDC Chapter 44 be tabled and the application of the HD-HR zone be evaluated for appropriate areas of the city at a later date.

Chair Thompson SECONDED. It was unanimously passed for recommendation. (5-0).

#### **COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF**

Mrs. Ravich- Hurd updated The Commissioners on upcoming dates would be sometime in January.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Thompson made a MOTION to adjourn. The motion was SECONDED by Commissioner Parachini. The Commissioners voted unanimously to ADJOURN the meeting at 9:00 p.m. (5-0).