

Tualatin Planning Commission

MINUTES OF January 19, 2023

TPC MEMBERS PRESENT:

William Beers, Chair
Janelle Thompson, Vice Chair
Ursula Kuhn, Commissioner
Zach Wimer, Commissioner
Randall Hledik, Commissioner
Daniel Bachhuber, Commissioner
Brittney Valli, Commissioner

TPC MEMBERS ABSENT:

STAFF PRESENT:

Steve Koper
Erin Engman
Lindsey Hagerman

GUESTS:

Mimi Dukas, AKS Engineering and Forestry

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

September 15, 2022 minutes were approved.

6 AYE

0 NAY

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE PUBLIC (NOT ON THE AGENDA)

Tim Neary, Byrom CIO Interim President shared his opinion on overall on Basalt Creek Developments. He shared the CIO's concerns about traffic and broadly encourage quality of life and walkability of the community for Basalt Creek area.

COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF:

- 1. Continuation of Planning Commission consideration of a recommendation to City Council on the Basalt Creek Employment (BCE) Zoning District Industrial Code Project: PTA 22-0001/PMA 22-0001.**

Erin Engman, Senior Planner, started her presentation with an overview of the project scope with showing a map of the Basalt Creek area. She explained the project overview on map that

<p>These minutes are not verbatim. The meeting was recorded, and copies of the recording are retained for a period of one year from the date of the meeting and are available upon request</p>

this project affects land that is currently designated Manufacturing Park (MP), limited to the Basalt Creek Planning Area and located south of SW Tonquin Loop Road, west of Basalt canyon, north of Basalt Creek Parkway and east of the P&W rail track. She explained currently the Manufacturing Park (MP) district permits a limited range of uses in support of large-scale specialized manufacturers and research campuses. However market trends have shown a decline in this type of development.

Ms. Engman explained the zoning project builds on a decade of previous planning work that culminated in adopted plans such as the Basalt Creek Concept Plan, an Economic Opportunities Analysis, and the Southwest and Basalt Creek Urban Renewal Area. She noted the projects aspirations for the City involve the following: expanding and modernizing uses over what's currently allowed, to encourage employment dense development that strengthens the local tax base and minimizes conflicts with nearby residential land.

Mr. Koper, Assistant Director Community Development, spoke about previously historically expressed aspirations for the area which include key planning: Basalt Creek Concept Plan in 2018, Economic Opportunities Analysis (2019). He noted this concept plan expected to accommodate almost 2,000 new jobs. The City went through Economic Opportunities Analysis in 2019. He spoke about final recent planning of Southwest and Basalt Creek Development Area Plan in 2021 held by Johnathan Taylor, Economic Program Manager. He noted part of that plan is to encourage land development that provides high density employment opportunities.

Ms. Engman spoke about the project scopes team that was all involved in the aspirations for the area. This included Code audit to review the existing Manufacturing Park (MP) zoning against current economic data, land development trends, and adopted goals; Public engagement opportunities that afford members of the Council, Planning Commission, public, and stakeholder groups an opportunity to provide feedback on recommended changes; and Map and code amendments for City Council consideration, with the goal of adoption.

Ms. Engman went through Council direction received during work session on May 23, 2022 with the following feedback: Limit warehousing uses and corresponding truck traffic, particularly on Boones Ferry Road; Encourage flexible multi-tenant, multi-use development; Incorporate neighborhood commercial uses; and Maintain greenspace or trail connectivity for employees to enjoy. She noted the outreach opportunities throughout with summary included as Exhibit C4.

Mr. Koper explained the reason why the Manufacturing Park Zone best fits in comparison to other Industrial Zoning Districts. He explained the differences on with a graph and what is limited for each different Industrial Zone.

Ms. Engman spoke about in response to the stakeholder feedback, staff is presented the

<p>These minutes are not verbatim. The meeting was recorded, and copies of the recording are retained for a period of one year from the date of the meeting and are available upon request</p>

Planning Commission with several additional code scenarios. She let The Planning Commission know they may choose to reiterate their prior recommendation, or may consider incorporating parts of the code scenarios and stakeholder feedback in reevaluating their prior recommendation to the City Council.

Ms. Engman went over Scenario A. builds on the previous Planning Commission review and motion, with a minor amendment to require vegetative screening along non-decorative fences viewable to the public, which is shown on the next slide.

Ms. Engman opened the floor for Commissioners questions.

Commissioner Hledik said he likes this addition capturing design standards for fencing. He noted the design standard cedar doesn't have to be the decorative type required.

Ms. Engman went over Code Scenario A. pros and cons. She explained this scenario encourages development, expands range of uses under current MP designation and supports Council's desire to limit warehousing uses which may conflict with nearby residential land. She went over cons that this may be too aspirational to encourage near-term industrial development.

Ms. Engman moved onto Scenario A1. and explained based on economic statues of the state the City developed this scenario. Johnathan Taylor, Economic Manager, spoke about development code's distinction between light and heavy manufacturing uses no longer aligns with ho the state categorizes industrial use. He noted the differences between 1980s' verses how it is today.

Commissioner Hledik asked about definition of advantaged technology distinction and shared his concerns with nearby residential. Mr. Taylor answered and gave examples of different types of technology manufacturing currently in the zoned area. Ms. Engman noted they could add a tool of parcel distance. Mr. Koper noted the difficult of regulating zoning and the con of can minimize impacts of heavy manufacturing nearby residential.

Commissioner Wimer noted that he would appreciate a more distinguished definition for advanced verses non-advanced heavy manufacturing. He asked what defines an accessory use and percentage of gross floor. Mr. Koper answered it's the same as Scenario A where heavy manufacturing area would be allowed. Traditionally The City requires a conditional use when something is in question for code. He noted impacts of heavy verse light industrial use is hard to tell and noted two philosophies could be more conservative or broader.

Commissioner Bachhuber asked what the difference are in tax basis for each scenario. Mr. Taylor answered in terms of use the more have in a building the more get from taxes. He noted

<p>These minutes are not verbatim. The meeting was recorded, and copies of the recording are retained for a period of one year from the date of the meeting and are available upon request</p>

majority manufacturing subsidies at a greater rate than surrounding cities. Mr. Koper answered asset value under Urban Renewal Plan based on the Manufacturing Park (MP) zone.

Commissioner Hledik asked if it was possible to generalize and not adopt specific uses for heavy and light manufacturing. Mr. Koper answered yes that's possible.

Commissioner Hledik expressed his opinion that he's more interested in Stakeholders idea right now for a scenario. He stated if nothing is allowed outside it gives industrial developer flexibility and City permits under regulations. He asked about performance based regulations and design standards required with the addition of applicable environmental standards.

Mr. Koper let commissioners know design standards would be another project and area of discussion.

Commissioner Hledik asked if any outdoor use would be allowed in this zone. Ms. Engman answered provision for outdoor storage is over 10 % threshold proposed it would be set to a Conditional Use Permit.

Ms. Engman went over Scenario B. based on Stakeholder Feedback. She noted this included warehousing and wholesale sales uses are conducive to a successful flex industrial space development. This scenario includes those uses with size limitations that approximate the example. She went over pros and cons of this scenario. She noted if the balance of development encourages market rate development "pays its own way" there may be limited opportunities for expenditure on other projects that meet the plan purpose of increasing the tax base in the area.

Commissioner Hledik asked Mr. Taylor what products would be sold under industrial wholesale. Mr. Taylor answered an example of this would be Columbia Corrugated.

Commissioner Thompson asked about job density change under Scenario B. Mr. Engman answered there is not an exact science. Mr. Koper noted zoning is a broad brush and multiple uses in a building more likely to meet job density.

Commissioner Valli asked what size of the Amazon warehouse fulfillment is. Mr. Taylor and a public member answered 225 acres.

Ms. Engman moved onto Scenario C, based on additional stakeholder feedback. She noted this scenario incorporates greater flexibility for warehousing and wholesale sale uses. She shared a potential development would look like along with pros and cons. She noted the only type of development allowed by code, it may not get built. Conversely, unless a less desired

<p>These minutes are not verbatim. The meeting was recorded, and copies of the recording are retained for a period of one year from the date of the meeting and are available upon request</p>

development type is limited by code, it may get built to the exclusion of other uses. Staff is looking to the Planning Commission for guidance as to what is the most appropriate balance of these considerations.

Commissioner Wimer asked what % the City would fall under job density for the Urban Growth area. Mr. Koper noted it's hard to say where some would be more job dense. He noted to keep in mind of aspirational goals for Urban Renewal area.

Mr. Koper explained the next steps if the Planning Commission recommends moving forward with a plan with key dates for a final recommendation in March or April.

Commissioner Hledik shared his opinion about the land development and urban renewal. He pointed out scenario opening up limited spending what happens then. Mr. Taylor spoke about TV&FR spending increase 2% funds left over now have to give funds back to tax. Future development no debate tax districts missed opportunities. He noted the money can be used in the next thirty years.

Mimi Doukas, representing Schnitzler Properties, Stakeholder started their presentation by introductions of everyone involved in Stakeholders project. She went over their goals and overview of project for updated code.

Ms. Doukas noted where their data came from the following, Johnson Economics, Kittelson and Associates. She explained their support in Option B with adjustments to percentages. These percentages being minimum of 30% manufacturing and to have a mix of warehouse with wholesale sales permitted for a site.

Flex industrial hit market support existing business and build the community with new development. She noted without development hurt current employers, raise rates and Urban Renewal area is successful.

Brendan Buckley, Johnson Economics spoke about the market dynamics and trends for manufacturing, warehouse, wholesale sales and flex industrial use. He spoke about job dynasty and wage levels and uncertainty. He noted it's hard to say what will happen and what will be achieved. He spoke about low vacancy and increased rent due to low supply and available space.

Kristine Connolly with Kittelson and Associates spoke about transportation review of flex industrial. She showed a graph with AM and PM peak hours for trip comparison for Scenario C. She shared a possible transportation impact trip distribution on a map.

<p>These minutes are not verbatim. The meeting was recorded, and copies of the recording are retained for a period of one year from the date of the meeting and are available upon request</p>

Commissioner Hledik asked clarification for the map location. She noted anticipated trips in blue vehicle assignment/ personal vehicles and orange truck trips. Mr. Koper clarified the map presented is not for the whole district but property they own.

Ms. Connolly noted they expect roughly 1600 total trips in pm hour.

Commissioner Wimer asked if the calculation of 575 per hour. Ms. Connolly answered yes and noted many of traffic would be coming and going to residency.

Ms. Dukas shared modified Option B1. and noted their flexibility in uses. Ryan Schera with Schnitzer Properties spoke about retaining businesses and attract new business. He spoke about being a catalyst project to develop. He noted about banks not lending out to not having flex space.

Chair Beers asked about size location for building. Ms. Connolly answered it allows up to 150,000 square feet.

Vice Chair Thompson asked if there are restrictions set there might not be commercial. Mr. Schera answered that is a possibility.

Commissioner Hledik asked for clarification on reducing light/and or heavy manufacturing to minimum of 30%. Mr. Schera answered at minimum guaranteeing at least 30%. He noted they project more % for each use.

Commissioner Hledik asked if there was any outdoor use. Mr. Schera answered everything is indoor use. Ms. Dukas noted that impact for neighbors would be greatly reduced due noise, and environmental factors being low. Mr. Schera shared a current warehousing companies and its current location with visuals.

Commissioner Hledik noted it's hard to write it all down in code for flexibility. Ms. Dukas noted that writing code is simple for variety of materials and variation. She spoke about quantitative code writing.

Commissioner Bachhuber asked when Schnitzler bought the properties. Mr. Schera answered just over the past year.

Commissioner Kuhn shared that an existing place like Ancestry Brewing where they have a retail front but a working warehouse was a good example of a mix of industrial and retail.

Chair Beers asked about where they got their numbers for expansion. Mr. Schera spoke

<p>These minutes are not verbatim. The meeting was recorded, and copies of the recording are retained for a period of one year from the date of the meeting and are available upon request</p>

about expansion in how businesses would have to leave. He shared he would like area to be flexible with uses for business to come and grow.

Public comment stakeholder, Peter Watts spoke about zoning and the difficulties in current zone. He noted the shortage for zoning for development.

Public comment stakeholder, Tim Curry spoke in favor and spoke about land owner value.

Public comment, Tim Neary spoke about traffic and manufacturing concepts not having a huge impact on the community.

Public comment, Holly Stuart spoke about keeping in mind the community impacts and people's investments.

Public comment, Annalise Jackson of the Tualatin Chamber of Commerce spoke about restrictions limiting developments and need for flexibility from businesses from the chamber.

Public comment Chris McReynolds spoke about significant effect 400 trips for traffic impact. He also noted to keep in mind the topography and infrastructure of the roadways. He noted any development will impact the residents.

Chair Beers asked for the commissioners thoughts.

Commissioner Thompson asked about their last proposal.

Mr. Koper spoke about how the planning commission is in grassroots of decision making. He summarized that the City is in alignment or agreement of spectrum to balance meeting market demands.

Mr. Koper asked if the Commissioners were interested in design standards being added.

Commissioner Hledik shared his personal thoughts. He said he personally likes the idea of performance zoning and addresses residential and setbacks 63 and presentation of industrial design issues. He also noted about potential noise of loading and unloading addressed in code with sound barriers and somehow addressed. He said that this would be an impact to residents.

Mr. Koper clarified all development has to go through traffic study. He spoke about daily and nightly trips for manufacturing zoning. He noted worst case scenario reduced trips over the manufactured zoning.

Commissioner Thompson shared thoughts on development and improving infrastructure.

<p>These minutes are not verbatim. The meeting was recorded, and copies of the recording are retained for a period of one year from the date of the meeting and are available upon request</p>

Commissioner Bachhuber asked about the history of Basalt Creek being Urban growth boundary. Mr. Koper spoke about where the market is heading and Urban Renewal is funded to build improvements. He noted it's a policy question of where the development is headed. Mr. Taylor spoke about the feasibility study 2019 and did not anticipate this need. He noted the feasibility study was anticipating to do expansion of Leveton.

Commissioner Bachhuber noted on holding off to make a decision.

Chair Beers asked about Commercial zoning.

Mr. Koper spoke about requirements Title 4 and push it to not overburden traffic and identify uses that are feasible.

Commissioner Hledik shared his opinion to go with Stakeholders proposal and limit light and heavy uses, consider all uses undercover, met performance standards along with design standards. He spoke about protecting the public realm.

Vice Chair Thompson asked about the traffic study if Commercial was included. Mr. Koper stated Commercial was a part of the traffic study. He noted they wouldn't have written scenario B if knew about Stakeholders wanting a campus like manufacturing.

Commissioner Wimer noted about taking suggestion from Stakeholders.

Chair Beers let everyone know comment was most of the City roads are County roads. Mr. Koper spoke about a bypass Wilsonville is proposing with more development in the area.

Member from the public asked about Grahams Ferry from Ibach a route to get to I-5 or restricted. She wanted to know about any road restrictions. Chair Beers answered there are no restrictions that they are aware of. Vice Chair Thompson noted that's everyone's concern of traffic in the area how it will pan out.

Mr. Koper noted about scoping a transportation update and area to study. He noted a future safety improvements for an update.

Vice Chair Thompson asked if they will present to City Council the past presentation with some background. Mr. Koper answered they will present overall ideas addressed and keep in mind time limit.

<p>These minutes are not verbatim. The meeting was recorded, and copies of the recording are retained for a period of one year from the date of the meeting and are available upon request</p>

Commissioner Bachhuber noted he would love to see more data about job density and living wage to work in the area. He noted about the land being prime and more opportunity to wait for more.

Stakeholder reiterated importance and reason of expansion reason behind Scenario B1. Mr. Koper noted the City is neutral on Scenario C and the stakeholders variation and staff plans on presenting both to the City Council.

Commissioner Bachhuber spoke about job wages and choosing one that supports growth. Mr. Koper noted that with rise of technology wages on manufacturing are falling to meet rising housing prices. He noted from another project 2017 wages for food beverage and apparel manufacturing average \$105k, Misc. manufacturing average \$60K. He noted an average family of four wouldn't be buying a house off one income from manufacturing in the area.

Mr. Taylor stated unfortunately there is no land currently that will produce the level of income job supporting housing prices. He noted tier one properties in Clark County.

Commissioner Kuhn suggested to give City Council findings and noted tonight's meeting is not final decision but a recommendation. She stated it would be in the site builders best interest to have everything required and for neighborhood.

Chair Beers made MOTION in recommending to amend the code to provide some level of design standards; use buffering between the BCE zone and future residential zoning to the north; reiterate the application of Chapter 63 environmental standards; scenario A1, which allows for all manufacturing uses as they are considered advanced manufacturing

The following parts of Scenario C: 150,000 s.f. maximum building size, at least 30 percent of building square footage on a site devoted to manufacturing uses and; the PC is seeking Council guidance on whether the remaining 70 percent of building square footage should be the following: a maximum of 35 percent each warehousing and wholesale sales; or a maximum of 70 percent of any combination of warehousing and wholesales sales.

7 AYE

0 NAY

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS

<p>These minutes are not verbatim. The meeting was recorded, and copies of the recording are retained for a period of one year from the date of the meeting and are available upon request</p>

Mr. Koper spoke about upcoming meeting March 16, 2023 and said that he would provide an update on the state climate friendly and equitable communities legislation and implementation progress.

ADJOURNMENT

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

7 AYE

0 NAY

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY. The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

These minutes are not verbatim. The meeting was recorded, and copies of the recording are retained for a period of one year from the date of the meeting and are available upon request