

Tualatin Planning Commission

MINUTES OF April 20, 2023 (UNADOPTED)

TPC MEMBERS PRESENT:

William Beers, Chair
Janelle Thompson, Vice Chair
Ursula Kuhn, Commissioner

Randall Hledik, Commissioner
Brittany Valli, Commissioner

TPC MEMBERS ABSENT:

Daniel Bachhuber, Commissioner
Zach Wimer, Commissioner

STAFF PRESENT:

Steve Koper
Erin Engman
Madeleine Nelson
Lindsey Hagerman

GUESTS:

Beth Goodman- ECONorthwest
Mimi Doukas-AKS Engineering

Melissa Slotemaker- AKS Engineering
Austin Cole- AKS Engineering
Dana Krawczuk- Stoel Rives LLP
Brendan Buckley- Johnson Economics
Todd Mobley- Lancaster Mobley
Spencer Anderson- LSW Architects

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL:

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Commission considered approval of October 20, 2022 and November 17, 2022 minutes.

5 AYE

0 NAY

MINUTES WERE APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

COMMUNICATION FROM CITY STAFF**1. Presentation on Tualatin's Equitable Funding Action Plan**

Erin Engman, Senior Planner, introduced Beth Goodman consultant with ECONorthwest. Ms. Goodman started her presentation. She explained the past history of Tualatin's recent housing planning. She explained in 2019 Tualatin adopted the Tualatin Housing Needs Analysis. She also noted the Housing Production Strategy adopted in 2021 and this project coordinate together.

Ms. Goodman explained the Equitable Funding Action Plan provides the next step toward affordable, fair, and equitable housing outcomes. She noted following presentation would

include actions that could be used to support the development of housing affordable to moderate-income households. She then spoke about the project's schedule and timeline with primary tasks.

Ms. Goodman went over existing housing conditions when comes to affordability. She explained that 52% of Tualatin's renters are cost-burdened overall. She further noted that 30% of renters who are cost-burdened are considered severely cost-burdened, meaning they spend more than 50% of their income on housing. Ms. Goodman shared several examples of how much house price and rent could be afforded by different income levels. She noted that the examples do not take into account the recent increases in interest rates and the impact that would have on buying a house. She also noted that affordable housing almost always has state or federal subsidies.

Ms. Goodman shared a graph of Tualatin's current and future households by income from extremely low to high income. She noted there are 5,000 households that are forecasted to need housing that is more affordable in order to not be cost-burdened.

Ms. Goodman explained how the City of Tualatin can directly influence factors that housing development through public policy, land and infrastructure. She noted that although cities do not typically, they can provide a small amount of capital access, through loan programs. Ms. Goodman then presented the financial tools that Tualatin could consider to increase access to affordable housing, including: A local construction excise tax (CET), urban renewal area revenue, nonprofit low income exemption, multiple unit property tax exemption, system development charge exemption, homeownership assistance, and other tools, including establishing an affordable housing trust fund.

Ms. Goodman noted that there were many other strategies from the 2021 Housing Production Strategy that were not considered in this plan. Ms. Goodman presented information about how a local construction excise tax would work, noting that it would adds revenue.

Ms. Goodman then presented information about how Tualatin could potentially use Urban Renewal Area revenue to fund its housing goals. She explained that Urban Renewal funding is generally used to pay for capital projects that support goals identified in the Urban Renewal Plan. She shared examples such as a new water line, new intersection improvements, land purchases all of which could be used to support development of new affordable housing. Ms. Goodman noted that based on the projections for the downtown Urban Renewal area there could be approximately \$2.5 million available to support housing goals.

Chair Beers asked if the \$2.5 million would be over the next five years. Steve Koper, Assistant Director Community Development, answered yes, however it would depend on how quickly tax increment is collected in the urban renewal area which is dependent in part on how quickly new development happens in the area.

Ms. Goodman moved onto a discussion of potential equity benefits and challenges of the

various available tools. She explained that a Construction Excise Tax has equity benefits in that it has the potential to provide flexible revenue that can serve low and moderate-income households. She noted the City can choose to focus on programs that have specific equitable outcomes to meet the Cities goals. Ms. Goodman then highlighted some key challenges with a CET being state statute limited as to how the funds can be spent. She also noted that a CET would increase the cost of new market-rate housing units even though it could be used to lower costs for affordable housing. She also noted that Urban Renewal can provide funding for housing for low and moderate-income households, however, the equity challenge would be avoiding concentrating lower-income residents in one area of the city and to a lesser extent the risk of displacing existing residents.

Ms. Goodman moved on to provide information about the nonprofit low income tax exemption. She explained the estimated cost to the city to exempt 100 units over five years would be \$90,000. She noted it's not a huge loss due to it being over a longer period of time.

Chair Beers asked for clarification that tax would be exempted and which taxing entity would stand to forgo the most. Ms. Goodman answered that the estimate was based on a previous example from Tigard, and that the top four taxing districts are Tigard-Tualatin School District, Washington County, City of Tualatin, and Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue.

Commissioner Kuhn asked if the tax exemption would be only on new units. Ms. Goodman answered that that is true for this tax exemption. She noted the next tax exemption (multiple unit property tax exemption) could also be applied to existing development.

Ms. Goodman then moved on to an overview of the property tax exemption multiple unit property exemption. She explained this is a 10-year exemption and the City can decide on where, geographically, it wants to place the exemption and can also place some other conditions on receipt of the exemption. She explained a private developer or property owner would apply and City Council would decide if they would exempt them or not.

Ms. Goodman moved on to an overview of the system development tax exemption. She explained that Parks and Water system development charges were the only ones examined because they are controlled by the City, in contrast to other system development charges like those for transportation or sewer. Ms. Goodman noted that exempting SDCs means that upfront development fees would be reduced. She noted that while the City could exempt SDCs it would need to provide a source to backfill the forgone revenue. She shared that the estimated cost for exempting 100 units of housing would be \$750,000 over 5 years. Ms. Goodman also shared some insights into the equity benefits and challenges of SDC exemptions.

Ms. Goodman then presented information about how a down payment assistance program might work. She shared that this could cost as much as \$500,000 due to the fact that homeownership and thus assisting with a down payment is expensive. This action could be layered with other actions for maximum benefit such as a land trust or a land bank. The equity benefits of a down payment assistance program are that it could benefit households who have

been historically excluded from homeownership, allowing those households to build intergenerational wealth through home equity. It also could benefit existing low-income homeowners in Tualatin by ensuring longer-term stability. Lastly, it could help provide resources for disabled residents and seniors to make accessibility improvements.

Some of the challenges of this program include a higher cost per household meaning that it serves relatively fewer people. Households must still meet other requirements such as qualifying for a home loan. The cost per household varies by type of assistance, and limited funding creates questions about who receives assistance.

Ms. Goodman moved on to their recommendations for building equity into the process. She noted if the City establishes revenue sources for affordable housing then it could establish an oversight committee. She explained this committee would oversight and ensure the representation of underrepresented groups. She noted another way to build equity into the process could be through a partnership with nonprofits that provide culturally specific types of support.

Commissioner Hledik asked if 30% of households are cost-burdened in Tualatin. He wanted to know if that meant new construction would need to accommodate these needs. Ms. Goodman answered that 38% of households in Tualatin are cost burdened, but that it needs to be addressed not just through new construction. She noted 30% would need housing affordable to their income level and 15% would need subsidized housing, especially new households.

Commissioner Hledik asked what and who was the developer of the Plambeck Gardens development. Mr. Koper answered that it was a non-profit called Community Partners Affordable Housing (CPAH).

ACTION ITEMS

- 1. The Planning Commission is asked to make a recommendation to the City Council on a request for a Plan Map Amendment (PMA) from Medium-Low Density Residential (RML) and Institutional (IN) to High-Density High Rise (RH-HR) located on a 9.2-acre site at 23370 SW Boones Ferry Road.**

The Planning Commission is asked to make a recommendation to the City Council on a request for a Plan Text Amendment (PTA) that would remove the locational factors from the High-Density High Rise (RH-HR) purpose statement in Tualatin Development Code Section 44.100 and revise Table 44-3 to limit the structure height to 4 stories or 50 feet in the RH-HR zoning district south of Norwood Road, which would be applicable to the subject site.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Madeleine Nelson, Assistant Planner, presented an overview of the project. She explained AKS Engineering & Forestry LLC applied on behalf of Vista Residential Partners and Property Owner, Horizon Community Church propose two land use applications located on a 9.2-acre site at 23370 SW Boones Ferry Road. A Plan Map Amendment (PMA) would change the existing zoning

from Medium Low Density Residential (RML) and Institutional (IN) to High Density High Rise (RH-HR). She explained any future development would require submittal and approval of an Architectural Review application subject to compliance with design and siting standards applicable to the RH-HR District. A Plan Text Amendment (PTA) would remove the locational factors from the High Density High Rise (RH-HR) purpose statement in Tualatin Development Code Section 44.100. She noted this would revise Table 44-3 to limit structure height to 4 stories or 50 feet in the RH-HR zoning district south of Norwood Road, which would be applicable to the subject site. She shared the proposed zoning map for reference.

Ms. Nelson highlighted the fact that the applicant has agreed to conditions of approval to construct offsite improvements including a new signal at the SW Norwood Rd & SW Boones Ferry Rd prior to occupancy of future site development. Other conditions offered by the applicant include a 60-foot buffer along SW Norwood Rd to preserve trees that do not need to be removed for the future access or public roadway improvements. Lastly, Ms. Nelson noted that the applicant has agreed to limit the height allowed at the subject site to the lesser 4 stories or 50 feet as described in the PTA.

Ms. Nelson then presented the applicable criteria found in TDC 33.070. She noted the highlights of this criteria include a requirement that the proposed amendments be in the public interest. She further noted that the amendments must conform to the goals and policies of Tualatin Community Plan. Ms. Nelson further explained that the Council will be required to consciously consider factors such as development trends, health and safety, natural resources. She also noted requirements that the proposed amendments be consistent with Oregon Statewide Planning Goals and Administrative Rules including compliance with the Transportation Planning Rule TPR (OAR 660-012-0060).

Ms. Nelson presented a summary of the applicant's arguments, which include an explanation that public interest is best protected by granting the amendments at this time due to Tualatin having few vacant lands with the ability to provide housing at the needed density established by the 2019 Housing Needs Analysis (HNA). She further noted that the applicant argued that the amendments would facilitate the opportunity for multifamily housing near an employment area (Basalt Creek Planning Area). Ms. Nelson noted that the applicant argued that there is a 27-acre surplus of RML lands and a 4-acre deficit of RH-HR land, and that the proposed amendments would address this deficit. Lastly, she presented that the applicant has argued that the public interest would be served with the installation of a traffic signal at SW Norwood Road and SW Boones Ferry Road.

Turning specifically to the Plan Text Amendment, Ms. Nelson presented that the applicant argued that the public interest is protected by granting the amendment due to the fact that areas of the city currently zoned RH-HR are constrained by public ownership, lack of direct public access and environmental factors such as the existing wetlands and floodplains. The applicant further argued that the current locational language does not allow the RH-HR zoning to be permitted in a location that is considered buildable, and in effect precludes practical application of the RH-HR zone. Ms. Nelson presented that the applicant argued that the

proposed amendment would allow RH-HR to be permitted on other properties with access to facilities, services, and without the constraints of the wetlands, floodplains and lack of public access

Ms. Nelson then presented the applicant arguments that amendment conforms to a number of goals and policies within the Tualatin Community Plan. The applicant argued that Comprehensive Plan goals and policies serve as the adopted expression of the public interest. Ms. Nelson noted that the applicant has provided arguments that the proposed Map Amendment would satisfy several existing Plan policies and goals. Specifically, Ms. Nelson went over the applicant's argument that the proposed amendments meet Goal 3.1 (Housing Supply) by ensuring that a 20-year land supply is designated and has urban services planned to support the housing types and densities identified in the Housing Needs Analysis. The applicant argued that the amendments provide the 4 acres of RH-HR housing identified in the Housing Needs Analysis. Ms. Nelson spoke about how the applicant argued that the same goals and policies would be applicable to the proposed Text Amendment. She shared the applicant argued that the existence of the locational language does not allow the RH-HR zoning to be permitted in a location that is considered buildable.

Mr. Koper shared some framing around code criteria. He noted the code requires conscious consideration of the characteristics of city, land development trends, health and safety, natural resources. He noted that the applicant's analysis concludes that the proposed amendments would have a significant impact on traffic operations at the SW Boones Ferry Road/SW Norwood Road intersection and that the installation of a traffic signal and westbound left turn lane would mitigate for that significant impact.

Ms. Nelson then shared the applicant's arguments in support of the Plan Map Amendment. The applicant argued that the site is located near public transportation bus lines, future goods and services, and employment areas. The applicant noted that the location is not in an area with known environmental constraints, and would not be in need of environmental protection. The applicant further noted it is located near areas that are experiencing housing development. (Autumn Sunrise Subdivision, Plambeck Gardens Apartment) The applicant noted that the area of the site was near adequate public services and planned improvements to include water, sanitary sewer, storm water and transportation. Ms. Nelson highlighted the applicant's argument that even if the amendments were approved, that any future development would need to go through an Architectural Review and would be required to comply with Tualatin Development Code requirements to address safety, health, and aesthetic factors.

Ms. Nelson shared the applicant's arguments in favor of the Plan Text Amendment, which highlight the locational code criteria by itself is not anticipated to have an impact on the elements listed in the code, and that considerations of those factors would be applicable to future decisions on where to apply the RH-HR zone. Ms. Nelson further explained that the applicant's Plan Text Amendment proposal requests revision of the building height for the development to limit it to the lesser of four stories or 50 feet for future projects on the subject site.

Mr. Koper explained that the applicant has argued that the proposed amendments are consistent with Oregon Statewide Planning Goals and Administrative Rules including compliance with the Transportation Planning Rule TPR (OAR 660-012-0060). He presented information on the applicant's analysis which includes a "reasonable worst-case analysis" which must be performed to show "no significant impact" of the change through the year 2040. He noted the applicant has presented information that under both existing and proposed zoning scenarios the intersection of Boones Ferry Road/Norwood Road does not meet this standard without signalization, however, the applicant's analysis concludes the significant effect is mitigated by the construction of a signal at SW Boones Ferry Road/SW Norwood Road and a separate striped westbound left turn lane.

Commissioner Thompson asked for clarification on whether the applicant's analysis takes into account for traffic trips for future development. Mr. Koper answered the applicant's analysis does take current and future development into account

Commissioner Hledik asked about the peak hours and how does the average daily traffic fit in this criteria. Mr. Koper answered the total average daily trip is generally the hardest to meet, and that with the proposed mitigations the requirements are met.

Ms. Nelson shared that staff has received a large volume of comments both in favor and opposed. She noted the comments are in the packet noted as Exhibit R. She explained the action being asked of the Planning Commission is to make a recommendation to the City Council.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Mimi Doukas, with AKS Engineering, presented on behalf of the applicant Vista Residential Partners and started her presentation with an introduction of her team. She explained they applied for the proposed amendments to allow multifamily development (RH-HR Zone) in other locations in the city. She noted they are both necessary to allow for a multifamily project at this site.

Ms. Doukas explained why the applicant choose the particular area of land. She noted the following: little residential land available, easy access to major collector roadways, bus service, proximity to the future park planned, expansion of the southern part of the City, and accessibility to jobs and close to residential projects.

Melissa Slotemaker, with AKS Engineering, explained why the applicant is proposing the RH-HR zone specifically. She shared that there are numerous State, Metro, and City policies that point to the desire to increase multifamily opportunities. She stated the 2019 Tualatin Housing Needs Analysis (HNA) identified a specific deficit of RH-HR zoning for multifamily housing. She spoke about how Tualatin has identified through its Housing Needs Analysis a need for a minimum of 1,014 units and 45% of the city's housing stock. She spoke about how currently there is no buildable RH-HR zoned land. She noted this application is an opportunity to add to the City's

inventory of buildable residential land.

Ms. Slotemaker explained that many of the City's housing goals that align with their application. She shared the Comprehensive Plan goals and policies along with some of the strategic actions. She noted how this application meets Tualatin's needs identified in its Housing Needs Analysis and Housing Production Strategy. She noted that Tualatin has a need for greater housing affordability and availability to renters, and additionally for more units of housing for people to be able live and work in Tualatin.

Ms. Slotemaker moved on to address what the applicant team had heard from the community as primary areas of concern, including traffic impacts, building height, tree removal, and lack of public parks. On the topic of traffic impacts, she explained that the applicant's traffic engineer did a full transportation impact analysis that included concurrence of the scope with the Tualatin City Engineer and Transportation Engineering staff from Washington County.

Ms. Slotemaker then addressed the topic of building height by explaining the current RH-HR Zone allows up to 6 stories and a maximum building height of 64 feet. She noted down the current Institutional zone has a 50-foot height maximum, and that the proposed amendments would not increase the allowable height for the majority of the site.

Ms. Slotemaker next addressed tree preservation concerns. She noted the applicant's agreement to provide a condition of approval to require a 60-foot buffer from the original SW Norwood Road right-of-way line. She noted if trees have to be removed applicant commits to replanting. She noted the applicant's arborist Todd Prager and Associates includes a report with additional recommendations.

Commissioner Hledik asked if the map shown of trees were accurate. Ms. Slotemaker answered it is fairly accurate as depicted.

Ms. Slotemaker then addressed concerns of lack of public parks. She noted the City recognizes the need for open space and parks in the Basalt Creek Area. She shared that there are pedestrian connections to a planned City park on the west side of SW Boones Ferry Road and that the proposed signal as part of this application would include a safe pedestrian crossing to facilitate neighborhood access to the planned parks.

Ms. Doukas shared the applicant's commitment to meeting the approval criteria as well as the applicant's commitment to meeting state and local policies as well as demonstrating compliance with transportation system requirements. She noted that this would require making a judgement call as to where the needed housing that Tualatin has identified would be located.

Commissioner Hledik asked how many units would be multifamily that are currently passed land use applications. Ms. Slotemaker answered and said roughly 300 units. Mr. Koper noted it's also in the ballpark of roughly 300. Ms. Doukas noted the Housing Needs Analysis is a

helpful reference point, which stated that the City's goal was to have 45% of housing be multifamily.

Commissioner Kuhn shared her view that there is both an ongoing lack of development land in Tualatin and also constraints specific to this land.

Commissioner Thompson asked how the applicant came to the decision to propose a Text Amendment that would remove the locational limitation for the RH-HR zone and not limit it to a specific property. Ms. Doukas spoke about the challenges of zoning in this area for multifamily. She noted that the density allowed under the RH-HR zone is not as intense as it sounds.

Commissioner Thompson asked why the intersection of SW Iowa and SW Boones Ferry is not on the list of intersections studied in the traffic study. Todd Mobley, of Lancaster-Mobley, answered on behalf of the applicant that the analysis was scoped with the City and County to determine the study intersections. Mr. Mobley noted that trips on SW Boones Ferry were accounted for, but minor street approaches such as SW Iowa are not studied as a specific intersection.

Commissioner Thompson asked if that was the same reason why the I-5 interchange in Wilsonville was not included as a study intersection. Mr. Mobley answered that it was similar and that it was far enough away from the site that the traffic from the site would contribute a relatively small percentage of total trips to that interchange and thus it fell below the minimum required by Washington County to study it further.

Commissioner Thompson asked if Tualatin Heights was a part of the traffic study. Ms. Doukas answered it was a part of the traffic study for 20-year analysis for build-out of Tualatin generally but not specifically due to the fact that the project is too far from this site. Mr. Mobley noted that a daily trip analysis was provided but that intersections have less congestion in the morning versus the evening and therefore the PM peak hour is the main focus of the traffic study.

Chair Beers asked where currently Tualatin has RH-HR zoned and if it can be built on currently. Mr. Koper answered and explained currently where it's zoned and properties currently are and that they were determined to be unbuildable as part of the City's Housing Needs Analysis.

Commissioner Thompson asked if it was taken into account that people living in the development might include students that would walk to the Horizon Christian School. Mr. Mobley stated that the traffic study did not make a specific trip reduction to account for nearby walking trips.

Commissioner Valli noted how the roadways are small to handle additional traffic every day. Ms. Doukas noted that many of the surrounding roadway facilities were in Washington County's jurisdiction and they would be involved in determining the specific intersection

improvements and standards for turn lanes. She noted that three lanes will be required from SW Norwood Road to SW Boones Ferry Road and that the applicant will work with Washington County to ensure that the roadway transition along the subject site would be smooth and maximum tree preservation. She noted that the applicant is aware of the community's sensitivity to tree removal, but the ultimate scope of that removal would be up to Washington County's final determination on frontage improvements for the property.

Commissioner Valli asked about access to the site and noted that there is nearby traffic congestion. Mr. Mobley noted traffic studies did take in account for existing and future traffic volumes. He noted Autumn Sunrise has direct access to SW Boones Ferry to the south and that the traffic study takes the additional traffic from that development on Norwood into account. Ms. Doukas that the development would provide a secondary gated emergency access to the south. She noted having two access points onto SW Norwood Road would actually add the potential for vehicle turning conflicts as opposed to a singular access point. Mr. Mobley noted one access helps with tree preservation and emergency access. He concurred with Ms. Doukas and noted that their analysis concluded that a single access is sufficient to serve the site.

Chair Beers asked whether or not the current parking standard for multifamily development is a maximum of one vehicle parking space per unit. Mr. Koper stated it is.

Commissioner Kuhn asked if parking location mattered in code. Mr. Koper answered per parking spaces location is not a requirement.

Commissioner Kuhn asked about the impact of the Plan Text Amendment's removal of locational standards for the RH-HR zone. Mr. Koper noted that Tualatin is a one-map combined comprehensive plan map and zoning map system, and therefore because each zone change would require a comprehensive plan amendment which includes a demonstration that the new zone meets applicable standards for the location, it would not make sense to have locational standards for a zone additionally, and that is likely why no other zone other than RH-HR has these standards.

Chair Beers asked if a property owner would have to go through a plan/text map amendment to add more floors or increase the building height for the RH-HR zone. Mr. Koper answered yes a Plan Text amendment.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE PUBLIC

Jackie Mathys shared comments in opposition to the proposed amendments. She noted this proposal would drastically alter the neighborhood, and limit resources and infrastructure. She also shared why she choose to live in Tualatin for twenty years.

Tim Neary shared comments in opposition to the proposed amendments. He noted the proposed height is higher than single-family homes on the other side of SW Norwood Road, and that future residents of an apartment would be able to see into homes. Mr. Neary further commented that he feels that there is a bias in favor of development occurring.

Chad Fribley shared comments in opposition to the proposed amendments. He spoke about current and future level of Tualatin's traffic, infrastructure, tolls, and emergency services. He noted that there is a need to think about if this is good for here right now.

Scott Olson shared comments in favor of the proposed amendments. He shared comments on the growth of the city and families and the importance of development of the land to Horizon Christian Church. He shared how Horizon would like to continue to provide to the growing community. He shared how hard it is to find housing in the area with rising costs.

Stan Russell shared comments in favor of the proposed amendments. He noted that a number of people that attend the Horizon Church and School give back to the community in a variety of ways. He noted the traffic signal being proposed would improve safety currently, and how hard it is to find housing in the area with rising costs.

John Pries shared comments in favor of the proposed amendments. He noted that Tualatin has grown over the years previously. He shared how he has confidence in the City planning process and was a project manager for Horizon Christian Church.

Deborah Mayes shared comments in favor of the proposed amendments. She noted her family history dating back to WWII, including previous ownership of land that was later developed into housing on the north side of SW Norwood Road. She stated that there has been considerable growth and change to Tualatin over the years and yet there was not careful planning and development like there is today. She noted sometimes difficult choices need to be made.

Armando Juanez shared comments in favor of the proposed amendments. He shared he is one of the lead pastors at Spanish speaking church and Horizon Christian Church has shared a love of serving the community. He shared how he feels about the community with hard workers and the hardships of affordable housing that would be helped by this proposal.

Joel Augee shared comments in opposition to the proposed amendments. He expressed his view that the development is not needed and that the traffic light will not solve traffic issues. He noted 940 units have been approved and the City has already met its housing goals.

Jill Hernandez shared comments in opposition to the proposed amendments. She shared her perspective living on SW Iowa that due to the nearby high school and other traffic, she does not believe that a traffic light will solve the issues.

Lorraine Hager shared comments in opposition to the proposed amendments and noted that she was previously a Tualatin City Councilor. She shared that as a City Councilor, she was part of the Basalt Creek planning and development of the concept plan and that this proposal was not part of the concept plan. She further noted that recent surveys of City residents showed that the biggest complaint is traffic.

Chris McReynolds shared comments in opposition to the proposed amendments. He noted that the proposed development is not low-income housing and shared what would actually be affordable. He opined that the City is pro-growth and against tree preservation. He shared his opinion that this proposal would not contribute to building sustainable housing in Tualatin for the long run.

Carly Cais shared comments in opposition to the proposed amendments. She shared that there is no requirement to have development now and that it should keep pace with infrastructure and traffic needs and not the pace set by developers. She expressed a desire to hit the brakes on current development and instead look to the unmet needs of the existing community.

PLANNING COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION

Commissioner Thompson shared an example of how much market-rate housing costs and that it is not affordable. She noted that she has friends that are renting in Tualatin for over \$3,000 a month. She pointed out that employees in the Basalt Creek area may not be able to afford living in this area. She also shared her concerns that traffic planning for the Basalt Creek area was done very carefully and closely and could be impacted by this added development.

Chair Beers shared his view that traffic models do not necessarily reflect reality, and from his perspective he won't drive near Tualatin High School around the time of school dismissal. He stated a model cannot capture the experience accurately. He shared a desire for more neighborhood commercial in the area and that it would be difficult to recommend approval of additional housing without services and grocery stores nearby.

Commissioner Thompson noted the need for housing but that the location of the zoning should be done mindfully. She noted about there is commuter rail only in a small portion of Tualatin. She also shared her belief that the core area should be the area with a higher density of housing.

Chair Beers reiterated his comments on the need for amenities and that it was hard to think about added units without services.

Commissioner Kuhn shared her family who goes to and works at the high school has had to deal with the challenging traffic. She noted that Tualatin alone can't do anything about it, but needed to be at the table and work with Washington County, ODOT, and Wilsonville. She also shared comments about the challenges of being able to afford to live and work in Tualatin. She concluded that there is a need for community change to happen.

Chair Beers shared his view that the locational restrictions of the RH-HR zone were written for the specific reason of having a hub-area vision for downtown Tualatin.

Commissioner Kuhn agreed with Chair Beers as to how it was written but noted that development has not proven to be feasible downtown due to the challenges for developers. She expressed her view that larger vacant parcels downtown are limited and that it is difficult

to develop there as well.

Commissioner Thompson expressed her view that it hasn't been that long since the adoption of the Housing Needs Analysis, and that change and progress will take time.

Commissioner Valli reiterated her view about the traffic challenges on SW Boones Ferry Road and whether it could truly accommodate this additional growth. She also shared her view that this is not affordable housing, there is limited public transportation and traffic issues. She noted that despite the developer's intent there would be a traffic increase on Boones Ferry and I-5.

Commissioner Hledik shared his thoughts on the request. He shared a pre-prepared written statement. He noted the proposed multifamily is not regulated affordable housing or designated to be affordable to cost-burdened renters. He shared his view that that the proposal does not meet Goal 3.1 of the Comprehensive Plan because the Housing Analysis only identifies a deficit of four acres and the applicant proposes to provide 9.2 acres. He shared his belief that until we update the Housing Needs Analysis we don't have enough data to support this proposal. He concluded that Chapter 10 of the Comprehensive Plan was not met in that its purpose for the RH-HR zone suggested that it was intended to support housing types with the greatest access amenities and how this proposed location doesn't have in his view the greatest access to amenities.

Commissioner Valli shared her view that 2040 is a ways away and provides time to build out the area in the future. She feels the current infrastructure of the area does not support the growth rate.

Chair Beers made MOTION for a recommendation to City Council to deny PMA23-0001/PTA23-0001 and add in Commissioner Hledik's comments to the City Council packet. Commissioner Thompson SECONDED the motion.

4 AYE (Beers, Thompson, Hledik, and Valli)

1 NAY (Kuhn)

THE MOTION PASSED 4-1.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn was made by Chair Beers and seconded by Commissioner Kuhn.

5 AYE

0 NAY

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY. The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p.m.