PLANNING COMMISSION

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 10, 2024

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

2. Consideration of the December 13, 2023 PC Meeting Minutes

PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
December 13, 2023 at 6:00 PM
City Hall Council Chambers & Remote Video Conferencing

Draft PC Minutes are to be reviewed and approved at the January 10, 2024 PC Meeting.

CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

A regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission was held at City Hall beginning at 6:00 p.m. on Wednesday, December 13, 2023. Chair Heberlein called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m., followed by roll call. Those present:

Planning Commission:	Ron Heberlein, Jennifer Willard, Andrew Karr, Kathryn Neil, and Nicole Hendrix. Kamran Mesbah arrived during the Public Hearing.
City Staff:	Miranda Bateschell, Amanda Guile-Hinman, Daniel Pauly, Mike Nacrelli, Zach Weigel, Cindy Luxhoj, and Mandi Simmons.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

CITIZEN INPUT

This is an opportunity for visitors to address the Planning Commission on items not on the agenda. There was none.

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. Consideration of the October 11, 2023 Planning Commission Minutes

The October 11, 2023 Planning Commission Minutes were accepted as presented.

PUBLIC HEARING

2. Wastewater Treatment Plant Master Plan (Nacrelli)

Chair Heberlein read the legislative hearing procedure and called the hearing to order at 6:06 pm.

Mike Nacrelli, City Engineer, stated tonight's presentation would recap information previously presented to the Planning Commission with additional details about why the membrane treatment technology had been selected.

Mr. Nacrelli and Dave Price, Project Manager, Carollo Engineers, presented the City of Wilsonville Wastewater Treatment Plant Master Plan via PowerPoint with the following comments:

- The master plan was primarily motivated by the need to accommodate anticipated growth between now and 2045, which was projected to be the build-out period for the city and the reserve

areas planned for growth and eventual annexation to the city. The analysis also considered existing industrial dischargers who have permits with the City and the impact of those discharges at the maximum permitted amounts. To accommodate the additional flows and loads of the treatment plant, hydraulic modeling was used to identify any hydraulic deficiencies that needed to be upgraded. Aging equipment was also assessed to determine what required replacement due to reaching the end of its useful life. Seismic retrofits were also considered for resiliency. Subsequently, all these projects were estimated for cost and scheduled according to when they would be needed based on the projected growth.

- The growth scenarios were consistent with other master planning efforts, particularly the 2014 Wastewater Collection System Master Plan, which had been modified per the Basalt Creek Concept Plan to exclude the far north area, which would be served by the City of Tualatin in the future. The projected population growth between now and 2045 would roughly double with an average annual growth rate of just under 3% per year. (Slide 3)
- The Buildout Service Area for 2045 included the city limits and the surrounding reserve areas, as well as the land use assumptions for those areas. (Slide 4)
- All data regarding the current and projected flows and loads to the treatment plant at the end of the growth period were almost double and exceeded the existing plant capacity during the planning period. (Slide 5)
- The physical constraints for expanding the treatment plant site included existing development to the north, park property on the west and south, and ODOT land to the east, which posed a challenge in accommodating such significant growth, so the most viable technology in that limited space was membrane bioreactors (MBR).
    - Different intensification technologies for advanced methods of treatment were considered that went beyond conventional processes. Intensification technologies require a smaller footprint or less space and generally produce high-quality effluent. An important advantage of the membrane technology selected, MBR, was that the membranes essentially replace the tertiary filters at the plant over time or in part. In contrast, the other two alternatives still required consideration of how the effluent would be filtered before its discharged to the river. (Slide 7)
        - While membranes were a fairly expensive technology that required additional protective processes upfront and had high power and chemical costs, the IFAS process lacked sufficient capacity for the projected 2045 conditions and would require significant modifications to the existing structures.
        - Concerns regarding the BioMag process regarded the use of magnetite to help enhance the settling of the solids. The process also involved the use of iron, which raised concerns about the solids handling and drying equipment on site. No examples of this process were found being utilized for a municipal facility the size of Wilsonville's, but in industrial mining operations, reports indicated some concerns with the solids smoldering.
    - The project team's evaluation concluded that, membrane technology was the best application for the city's needs at this time, and that was the recommendation carried forward in the Master Plan.
- The overall capital improvement plan and Master Plan recommendations also included a secondary process expansion that entailed expanding the existing aeration basins and adding additional blowers. This expansion would precede the implementation of membrane technology and be the first phase of the expansion. As flows increase, a cooling tower would need to be added to meet

temperature limits and some hydraulic capacity limitations in the UV disinfection system would also need to be increased.

- In addition to capacity improvements, asset replacement projects would replace a considerable amount of existing old and in many cases, obsolete equipment; much of which was no longer supported by suppliers. (Slide 9)
  - For example, the secondary clarifier mechanisms were getting worn out and needed to be replaced. Similarly, the solids handling equipment, the thickening and dewatering processes, would likely need to be replaced in the second half of the planning period. The UV disinfection system had one unit installed in 1997 that was definitely obsolete and near failure, and the newest unit, installed in 2014, would also need to be replaced by the end of the planning period. The solids dryer was nearing the end of its useful life but would be retained as a backup unit when the new, more reliable dryer unit was added. Having a second one on hand would provide redundancy in cases of outages or maintenance requirements.
  - Seismic retrofits were also planned for several existing structures to withstand the seismic events identified in the Oregon Resilience Plan. Ground improvements had been identified to stabilize the structures and minimize the ground shift and settlement that could occur.
- A site map identified the improvement projects that were color-coded according to type (Slide 10):
  - Blue represented all the capacity improvements, which included the new aeration basin, fine screens, and blowers that would go in, as well as the aeration basin. He indicated the membrane bioreactors would be in the middle (#11) and a new cooling tower (#12) designated to handle temperature limits as flows increased.
  - Purple indicated the operations and maintenance (O&M) asset replacement projects to replace old and worn-out equipment.
  - Green identified the structural improvements for the seismic resilience of existing structures.
  - The City had also identified plans to eventually bring fiber optic cable to the site, and a project was outlined to bring the conduit up to the property line, so it would be available when the fiber is eventually brought to the site. (#18)
- A capacity trigger plot developed by Carollo illustrated the flows and loads and indicated when the limits would be reached, and which project would be needed. (Slide 11)
  - The capacity trigger plot allowed for tracking the actual increase in flows and loads over time and verifying the accuracy of the curves. If the growth rates differed, adjustments could be made to the timing of the projects accordingly. The team could keep track with real-life data and adjust the timing of the improvement projects as the data indicated.
- Several projects in the near term totaled approximately $17 million and then the biggest project was the first MBR project, followed by some equipment replacement and hydraulic upgrade projects toward the end of the planning period. (Slide 12)
  - Projects highlighted in red would need revisiting as growth occurred and technology improved to determine whether those projects would still be needed in the future. Based on the current projections, those improvements would be necessary; however, the actual flows and loads would be tracked to see whether the projects were still needed by that time.
- The Estimated Cash Flow graph showed the cash flow required to fund the projects in the Master Plan and the significant spike indicated the first membrane bioreactor project around the year 2030. (Slide 13)

- After the Master Plan was adopted by City Council, the next step was to complete the rate and system development charge (SDC) study to figure out the details about how to finance the Master Plan projects.

Commissioner Mesbah arrived at 6:14 pm.

Commissioner Willard suggested that the City consider dense packing any new structures to provide some incremental space for expansion beyond the planning horizon, adding this could be done during the detailed design when the projects were triggered. As depicted, there were many access routes around each of the structures that might not be required by Code.

- Mr. Nacrelli acknowledged a certain amount of space was required around each structure to allow access for long-term maintenance. Fortunately, the membrane process allowed for incremental expansion. He believed the final phase of the membrane improvement projects would likely provide some cushion for additional growth should the current projections be exceeded.
- Mr. Price affirmed the need for access due to certain facilities needing to accommodate equipment that might require boom trucks or cranes for maintenance. He acknowledged and understood the message about maximizing any available space.

Commissioner Karr:

- Asked about the frequency of technological advances in wastewater treatment and the cost difference between the new and the old.
  - Mr. Nacrelli understood with membranes in particular, there were continuous improvements to allow them to handle more loading, which was why the final phase of the membrane installation might not be needed if the cartridges being installed could handle more capacity, which would reduce costs by requiring fewer cartridges. He deferred to Mr. Price to discuss how the technology had evolved up to this point.
  - Mr. Price highlighted the rapid evolution of wastewater treatment technologies over the past two decades, with once groundbreaking solutions like UV disinfection and membrane technology becoming commonplace. In the last four months or so, as the project team was finalizing costs, membranes were identified that had higher flux rates, basically the amount of water that could pass through each unit. He could not identify just how quickly the technology changes, but there was a lot of motivation amongst equipment suppliers to constantly out compete one another, so it was challenging to predict how quickly technological advancements might occur.
- Inquired about incremental costs between old and new technologies, for example, could the projected $70 million cost increase to $120 million in 10 years, or would advancements in membrane technology reduce that significant cost compared to the membranes' functionality.
  - Mr. Price replied that depended on what the process application is, but in the membrane world, he did not expect the cost of units to decrease, but rather, a need for a smaller number of units due to increased capacity for each unit due to better technology.
- Asked how often the Wastewater Treatment Master Plan was reevaluated.
  - Mr. Nacrelli replied the Master Plan would be revisited every 10 years to account for changes in growth assumptions, regulatory requirements, etc.
- Expressed concern about the substantial differences between the Wastewater Master Plan and the Collection System Master Plan that were discussed with City Council, noting the lower assumption

from the Wastewater Master Plan was chosen. He asked what would happen if the Collection System Plan proved to be more accurate for industrial inflows.

- Mr. Price explained there was a fundamental difference in how collection systems and treatment plants were planned. When laying out a collection system, many linear assets needed to go into, typically, city, county, or state roadways and no one wanted to undersize those, only to come back to dig up the street and put a larger pipe in. At a treatment plant, improvements could be phased as they were needed. In evaluating the actual flows coming from the industries within the city's service area today, the project team believed the estimates in the Collection System Master Plan were very conservative. Depending on the industries the City attracts in the future, the City would need to reassess if high water-use industries emerge to understand the impacts relative to the assumptions and recommendations made in the Wastewater Treatment Plant Master Plan. Some of agencies he had worked with over the years had attracted food processors that generated high quantities of waste, but that did not have a significant impact their treatment facilities. Typically, industries locate in service areas where they would not hit a worst-case scenario estimate in a collection system master plan. Rather than overbuilding Wilsonville's wastewater treatment plant, Carollo phased development based on actual flows and loads into the plant.
- Mr. Nacrelli noted that while the years on the capacity trigger plot were estimates for anticipated flows and loads, the projects could be adjusted based on the actual flows and loads because they were tracking real-life data.

Commissioner Hendrix appreciated the thoroughness of the work and inquired about the correlation between regulatory requirements, particularly with Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) and the permits, and the project cost sheet. How would the regulatory changes, such as permit renewals, impact the timeframes and costs outlined in the project cost sheet? (Slide 12)

- Mr. Nacrelli replied Staff had a pretty good handle on what to expect with regard to the regulatory requirements, barring any unforeseen surprises and the MBR technology, was well-equipped to handle for instance, new nutrient limits or any pollutant regulations. The technology could target almost any pollutant that might be regulated. However, if the City's permit limits were drastically reduced beyond expectations, it could shift the improvement projects forward in time. The capacity limits were based on what the City could legally and safely discharge.

Commissioner Karr asked if the City received advanced notice about upcoming regulatory changes and how much time the City typically had to react.

- Mr. Price replied the answer was complicated in Oregon because DEQ had been behind in terms of permits updated. The City had its permit updated relatively recently compared to some dischargers. DEQ had been considering regulations on nutrient removal for years, which would require some capacity which the Master Plan accounted for. The membrane process was chosen for its adaptability to such changes. The temperature limitations for effluent discharge at a brewery were also accounted for. Additionally, Mr. Nacrelli and others stayed informed about potential regulatory changes through different association and clean water agency meetings as well.

Chair Heberlein asked if the triggers on the plot indicated when the new systems needed to be online or when the work needed to start to bring the systems online.

- Mr. Price clarified the triggers on the plot indicated when the equipment or facilities were expected to be in place, so cash should be expended prior to the date shown, which was reflected in the cash flow projection.

Chair Heberlein called for public testimony regarding the Wastewater Treatment Master Plan and confirmed with Staff that no one present at City Hall or on Zoom indicated they wanted to provide testimony. He closed the public hearing at 6:41 pm.

Commissioner Hendrix moved to adopt Resolution No. LP22-0001 as presented. Commissioner Willard seconded the motion. Following a roll call vote, the motion passed unanimously.

WORK SESSION

3. Coffee Creek Assessment (Luxhoj)

Cindy Luxhoj, Associate Planner, updated on the Coffee Creek form-based code assessment via PowerPoint, which involved the four completed development projects in Coffee Creek. She reviewed the steps completed to date, noting Staff determined no modifications were needed to the land use review tracks and process, and presented the proposed modifications to six form-based code standards in Table CC-3 Site Design and Table CC-4 Building Design. The modifications were detailed in Attachment 1, including one proposed modification to the base design of the building not included in the Staff report. (Slide 9) The proposed modifications would come before the Planning Commission for public hearing in February 2024 and before Council for adoption in March or April.

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

- Overall, the Commission was satisfied with the proposed modifications.
- Initially, the potential for dramatic changes was a concern, but the adjustments were acceptable, and Staff's judicious approach was appreciated.
- Ms. Luxhoj confirmed the short-term parking standard modification only applied to parking on an Addressing Street, not additional parking for employees in the back or on other streets, such as supporting streets and through connections. The goal was to limit the extent of the parking on the Addressing Street to maintain a more personable public realm.
- For the next meeting, Staff was asked to provide an example of a five-ft offset to provide a clearer understanding of what that would look like in the real world. (Slide 7)
- What was the purpose of defining a maximum but allowing adjustment? Why not just define the maximum as what the City actually wanted the maximum to be?
    - Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager, agreed it was a good question, especially for the legislature. If an adjustment standard was written, but there was no standard for that adjustment, then it was the maximum, so it might as well be written as the maximum.
        - The difference was some rationale must be provided to get an adjustment. Big picture is important, because often, when creating clear and objective standards to make the process easier, a number had to be chosen, so allowing some flexibility for that number to be a broader gray line often made sense. However, the City still defaulted to whatever number was identified until the rationale for changing it, such as improved design, was provided.

The goal was to make the process easy and not trigger a full public hearing for minor changes.

- Ms. Bateschell citing the Panattoni building project in Coffee Creek where multiple interrelated waivers were triggered to preserve a cluster of trees that both the applicant and the City wanted to save. From a design perspective, it was a much better project, but it went to the Development Review Board (DRB) creating a longer process for the applicant.
- The form-based code was intended to create an administrative path for industrial buildings. While 15 ft was the standard for canopy height was a 12-ft high canopy unacceptable when a great project resulted?
- The idea was to create some small buffers above and below the desired number. Providing flexibility in a project that delivers a better result was fine; it was close to the other number, but the City wanted a reason for it, rather than just approving waiver requests with no discussion about how the decision was made. Approving a waiver could allow things the City did not want to see on every project site, but in Panattoni's case, the better site orientation preserved the trees.
- The clear and objective standard was what the City wanted to see, but adjustments provided the planning director some wiggle room when site conditions made it difficult for the project to meet those standards to grant, if justified, the requested modifications without a full public hearing process.

- Staff was asked to carefully examine the modifications, and if adjustments were allowed, to ensure there was a clear reason that would trigger the adjustment to be acceptable. If not, the language should be changed to an actual maximum or revise the language to differentiate between the recommended and maximum values, because it was not a maximum if there was an allowance to adjust it later.
- Ms. Luxhoj clarified that the scope of adjustments would be applied downward for minimum standards, and upward for maximum standards. An adjustment to a minimum height would allow for a reduction in height and if the scenario regarded a maximum height, the adjustment would allow for an increase in height.
- Discussion continued about the need for the Code to be clear about the rationale for accepting adjustments if a Code minimum or maximum was provided and what triggers the variance to be something acceptable to approve.
  - The purpose of a variance/adjustment was to provide flexibility, and if that flexibility was limited to only certain items, then the flexibility is reduced. Unless a specific list of all the possible justifications for variances was created, there was no way to justify the adjustment. The idea was to look at the different circumstances of each site, and some adjustments result on a much better design based on the Staff's justification to allow the requested variance. As noted, a specific justification might be a cluster of trees. Listing all the possibilities was impossible.
    - Mr. Pauly did not believe listing all the possibilities for variances would be necessary, the justification would be similar to the City's waiver criteria. Applicants had to provide a reasonable statement justifying their request based on the purpose of the Code or the Planned Development Standards, such as taking advantage of improved technology, making a better site plan, etc., rather than a specific list of qualifications.

- Ms. Bateschell noted criteria already existed in the Code requiring applicants to show how the original intent of the standard within the form-based code was being met in order to obtain the adjustment.
    - For the Black Creek project site, parking beyond the maximum allowed on Garden Acres Rd, the Addressing Street frontage, required a waiver and therefore, had to go through the hearing process. The project still had to meet the Code's intent, which was to not have a sea of parking out front, not that much depth before getting to the building and have it oriented in a certain way. Because of the waiver, additional landscaping and screening was required to diminish the view of the parking lot. The design standards and handbook of the form-based code provided some criteria for how to evaluate such adjustments.
- Knowing something in the Code outlined the process for obtaining an adjustment was helpful and having staff's documented justification of the Black Creek project addressed concerns about adjustments being approved willy-nilly; otherwise, the City was setting a precedent by waiving a rule without justifying it properly and the next applicant would expect the same.
- Ms. Luxhoj explained the thoughtful approach taken in the recommended modifications to the form-based code without losing sight of its intent while also providing the waiver process. Based on discussions with former applicants, considerations were made about what could be tweaked to reduce the number of requested waivers, such as having a wider width on a secondary driveway, while keeping the primary driveway at the narrower width.
    - The aim was to balance adjustments that made compliance more feasible for future projects while preserving the Code's intent and maintaining waivers for more substantial changes, like extensive parking or tall retaining walls, where proper justification would still be required through the waiver process.

Commissioner Mesbah commended Ms. Luxhoj for her clear explanation of the rules and codes, without any reference to the public good that should come from enforcing the Code, noting the potential for such regulations to become overly bureaucratic.

4. Frog Pond East and South Implementation-Development Code (Pauly)

Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager, continued the discussion on the Frog Pond East and South Implementation Code Amendments via PowerPoint, updating the Commission on specific draft Development Code amendments for Siting and Design Development Standards, further describing the removal of minimum lot sizes, as well as updating other key standards, including front setbacks, maximum building width, and draft floor to area ratios (FARs). (Slides 3-18)

- He clarified the State rules requiring the allowance of three-story middle housing was only if parking was required; the City could limit the height to two-stories if parking was not required, which would be the case in Frog Pond. As the Code continued to be refined, the maximum building height could potentially be adjusted down. The 35-ft height maximum was based on an old, traditional 10-ft story and current development patterns now had slightly higher ceiling heights. (Slide 9)

Comments from the Planning Commission on the Draft Development Standards topics were as follows with responses to Commissioner questions as noted:

- Mr. Pauly confirmed the subject proposal to have no minimum lot size was just for Frog Pond East and South, not the entire city.
- “Building the lot to fit the home, not the other way around" was an effective way to explain why a minimum lot size was not needed, but rather, “here are the homes we are going to build, now let’s make the lots for the homes.”
- Mr. Pauly confirmed residential Development Code adjustments for building height might be addressed in the future. (Slide 9)
- In response to a question about the commercial area potentially surpassing three floors, particularly in light of discussions about a four-floor building area,
- Mr. Pauly clarified that the standards outlined in the Draft Standards Table on Slide 9 did not apply to the commercial zoning on the Brisbane main street, which had its own set of height standards. (Slide 9)
- The overall direction of the proposed Code was acceptable and the additional flexibility to benefit individuals involved in development processes.
- If side yard setbacks were reduced, it was important that utilities were not located in those setbacks.
- If the minimum lot width was scaled so small, what was its purpose? Urban Form Type 3 had a 5-ft side minimum which meant the minimum house width would be 5-ft on a minimum 15-ft lot width. Perhaps, the minimum lot width requirement should be eliminated with the side yard minimums retained.
    - Mr. Pauly agreed further examination might be needed, noting that even with a skinny house, which was just wide enough to have a garage, the extreme would be a 10-ft-wide house, which would realistically be more like 15-ft or 16-ft wide, resulting in a 30-ft lot width. However, the minimum house width also applied to townhouses, which could be much narrower, so essentially, all the standard would guarantee is a garage and vehicle access to the lot, not much else.
    - A townhouse with a garage was required to have a specific lot width, regardless.
        - Mr. Pauly explained the wider vehicular access was the key rationale for the minimum lot width. There was a connection between lot width and size, especially in the context of larger buildings, where the minimum building width drove the overall lot width. The question was, what options was Staff not thinking about that someone else might? The street needed full, meaningful frontage, not a small 1-ft frontage.
        - Ms. Bateschell noted the minimum lot width standard allowed flexibility, particularly for standard housing types with narrow frontages. But, if there were places where accessory dwelling units (ADUs) were being developed and/or partitioned or small units, each time the City required something larger and bigger, it forced a larger and bigger housing type. She believed further discussion and evaluation was needed to determine whether such low numbers were even needed, such as with regard to minimum lot size.

Chair Heberlein called for public comment.

Mimi Doukas, AKS, representing West Hills Land Development, stated West Hills had spent a lot of time with Staff talking through these details and how the Code was going to work, specifically for the West Hills site.

- She distributed the Preliminary Layout 36-Phasing Plan, West Hills' latest site plan as an exhibit, noting the primary change that was important to Staff was the addition of a view vista into the park along 60th Ave as one traveled north. This matched what was envisioned in the Master Plan, but also still maximized how the park related to the BPA corridor, so that could really be a continuous amenity.
  - She also noted the urban form districts were overlaid on the exhibit to see how that mapping related to West Hills' actual site plan. The brownish color in the middle indicated Urban Form 1, the orange was Urban Form 2, and the yellow was Urban Form 3, and now one could see how the housing types relate to it relate to the draft standards table.
  - Staff had already made a few changes that they had talked about or identified, and one area they still needed to work through was the maximum building length facing a street and she believed there were several ways to achieve it.
    - In the Urban Form 2, the maximum building length facing a street was currently shown as 120 ft. The apartment buildings on Stafford Rd were about 180 ft deep, which West Hills believed was the right urban form. The length of those buildings essentially allowed for an eight-unit floor plate with two sets of stairways; so, there was a reason for that the dimension. She did not believe that standard should necessarily be across all of Urban Form 2, but that it was very specific to Stafford Rd, so West Hills would work with Staff on some potential solutions to see how that could be resolved.
- The other discussion item was the maximum building height. The townhomes shown on the site plan along the Brisbane Street extension were envisioned to be three-story townhomes. The 35-ft height maximum was a bit snug to be able to do that. Depending on topography and the roof form, it is measured to the midpoint of the roof, so it would be a bit more comfortable if that maximum was 40 ft, or somewhere between 35 ft and 40 ft. So, getting just a little more relief on the height would be helpful, specifically for Urban Form 1.
- The number of stories in buildings was not specified in the Code table, but was in the descriptions of Urban Forms 1, 2, and 3. For Urban Form 3, the yellow district, it was described as a two-story maximum, which she believed was intended to be at the street.
- West Hills had a unique situation in this site as one area needed to be served by a sanitary sewer private pump station based on elevations of sanitary sewer and so forth. So, in order to develop that land, a private pump station was really the way to go, and multifamily was the type of housing that is permitted with that. West Hills would prefer that those be three-story buildings. West Hills could work on some site planning, as there was some flexibility for how those multifamily buildings would relate to Advance Rd, but that was something they were still working through. She just wanted it on the Planning Commission's radar as something everyone needed to wrap their heads around.
- West Hills was still running some calculations for the FAR standards. The FAR for Urban Form 3 felt too low for the for-sale homes, though she believed West Hills could make it work for the multifamily, depending on how that site planning worked out. However, for continuity of housing type, West Hills was struggling a bit on what that FAR was; from a policy perspective, she believed it was worth considering exempting ADUs from the FAR calculation, which might help incentivize the ADUs.
- Side yard setbacks for attached homes could be discussed a bit later as West Hills was still talking with Staff. However, the way the Code was currently written worked pretty well for the detached

homes with the shared use easement. Otherwise, she believed the Code work was headed in a pretty good direction, adding Dan Grimberg wanted to talk a bit about mobility units.

Comments, clarifications, and responses to questions were as follows:

- Mr. Pauly clarified ADUs were exempt from the FAR calculation, which was also in the Middle Housing rules.
- Ms. Doukas confirmed that West Hills anticipated four-story buildings on Brisbane St., but she was uncertain of the actual height, noting that was the mixed-use zone. They were still working through things, but she would be surprised if the building height reached 60 ft high.
- Mr. Pauly confirmed Staff was open to considering uniform front setbacks extending throughout Brisbane St.
    - Ms. Doukas said she had concerns about the setback on Brisbane, but noted another table stated setbacks on specific streets, and that Brisbane was the public utility easement (PUE) or a maximum of 10, which she believed supersedes the table in the presentation. Extending the front setback to 59th St instead of 60th St would meet the requirements.
- Mr. Pauly clarified slight variations would still occur even if requiring a uniform front setback, adding too much variety results in a hodgepodge appearance. With a range of 5 ft to 10 ft, as well as incorporating variety in the architecture and architectural features, the right balance could be achieved.
    - Ms. Doukas noted the minimum and maximum, and added many of West Hills' homes were alley-loaded homes, so the alley façade, which had been set at an even 18 ft to allow for parking, so the front façade would vary a bit depending on the home design.
    - Mr. Pauly confirmed the front setbacks were not identical.
- Ms. Doukas confirmed West Hills' current plan was to incorporate ADUs into the end units of their front-loaded townhome housing type, which were slightly larger in size. The small, single-level, mobility-friendly ADUs scattered through both Urban Planning District E5 and E6 helped meet a lot Housing Variety requirements in those districts; multifamily was proposed in District E4.
- Ms. Doukas deferred a question about ADU parking to Mr. Grimberg, given his familiarity with the housing footprints. She noted there was on-street parking throughout the district, and the alley-loaded homes provided ample space for on-street parking which would not be broken up by garage driveways.

Dan Grimberg, West Hills Land Development, stated the developer was working diligently with Staff and having robust discussions on what works and what does not, and attending these meetings were important in determining whether West Hills' plan was feasible. West Hills had not had a chance to talk with Staff on some issues being discussed tonight, and some of the minimums and maximums in the tables did not work. In discussing the issues with Staff, one response was that this was what the Planning Commission was looking for, but West Hills did not get a chance to talk about it. It was not a criticism, but just how the process works.

- West Hills greatly supported flexibility. While there needed to be standards, markets change, and West Hills needed to respond to what people are looking for in homes, including affordability, etc.
- Regarding the maximum building length on some apartment units, West Hills believed articulation could effectively address appearance issues instead of strictly adhering reducing the length of a building to a 120-ft limit. Early in the process, West Hills had presented examples of building with a lot of articulation, which he believed the Planning Commission found favorable. The buildings were

broken up and had different materials, windows, and articulation, which was more important than building length. He asked that the Commission be open for further discussion, noting West Hills would provide some examples to consider.

- The accessible units were also an issue for West Hills, particularly the partial mobility accessible units, which required a living room, bedroom, kitchen, and bathroom on the main floor; however small homes on small lots had limited footprints, and those requirements really limited what could be done with the home. The criteria might be met, but it could result in a terrible floor plan no one would buy, so West Hills was very concerned. He urged further discussion and offered to provide some plans. The tables show a minimum number of accessible units, which was a large portion of West Hills' single-family homes, and if the footprint affected the market for those units, the project would not be feasible. Pre-sale units would be fine, but requiring minimums would be a problem.
- Due to the smaller lot size, ADU parking was typically on the street. Most of West Hills' units were alley-loaded, which provided an attractive street scene with parking behind the unit and an open curb line with no driveway cuts, ensuring ample street parking.
- Having the ADUs with the townhomes was a practical approach to providing smaller, more affordable homes in the neighborhood. The space constraints of the small lots limited the feasibility of separate ADU structures, which would typically be in the backyard of a large lot.
- He clarified that the townhomes in Frog Pond would be about 20-ft wide with the ADUs situated on the ends rather than as interior units. Typically, West Hills would have a three- or four-plex in a townhome building with 80 ft of parking.

Mr. Pauly continued his presentation updating on the Housing Variety Standards, noting he would address Subdistrict and Urban Form Type Boundaries and Yard and lot line definitions at another time. He clarified for the record that double counting was allowed. For example, a mobility-ready townhouse less than 1500 sq ft would meet all the Housing Variety Standards. He described the details and requirements in the Minimum of Target Housing table. He also explained that housing unit types had replaced housing categories, and noted Staff had done the calculations and provided the answers for the minimum number of housing units in the Code.

Commissioner Willard asked how the diagrams West Hills provided tonight and at the last meeting compared to the Housing Variety Standards outlined tonight.

- Mr. Pauly stated while he did not have the specific calculations, he believed the diagrams were very close to the Variety Standards, which did not create a barrier to what West Hills had shown. In West Hills' work as well as other demonstrations that the Housing Variety Standards were workable at the level proposed at this point. One tweak was that mixed-use apartments were counted differently than standard apartments, which helped that subdistrict meet the standard. Staff was still working on the amount of Middle Housing in that district, which currently had none.
- At an upcoming work session, Staff would share some other demonstration plans that were done with another consultant to see another alternative about how the area might lay out.

Chair Heberlein confirmed there was no public comment.

Commissioner comments on what Staff might provide for future work sessions was as follows:

- Having the subdistrict map in the packet to remember the subdistricts was helpful.
- More noodling time would be good.

- The public comments were appreciated to know whether the standards would result in buildable projects, especially since West Hills had the largest development, but having input with smaller developments would be good.
    - Mr. Pauly noted that testing and demonstration plans had been ongoing for a year for smaller developments as well. Despite initial expectations, much of the time was dedicated to testing, demoing, and refining the plans. Because certain infrastructure needed to be built before development could occur, the extended time period proved beneficial for the City, allowing thorough consideration before construction to get the Development Code as right as possible.
- Seeing West Hills' site plan example evolve over time to fit into the City's standards had been great. It would be interesting to see other potential development plans for other subdistricts and how they would be shaped under the same standards.
- Regarding the Definition of Lot Line and Yard topic, Mr. Pauly clarified the corner lot definition in the first paragraph of Section 4.001.xxx defined what an actual corner lot is, and the second half of Paragraph 3 described how to figure out what the front lot line was in the case of a corner lot, which could be a pretty involved exercise.

INFORMATIONAL

5. City Council Action Minutes (October 2 & 16 and November 6, 2023) (No staff presentation)

6. 2024 PC Work Program (No staff presentation)

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, commented on the commitment and sacrifice required of volunteers in the Wilsonville and commended both Commissioner Neil and Commissioner Mesbah for their service on the Planning Commission and in other arenas at the City. She briefly overviewed Commissioner Mesbah's contributions on the Planning Commission, acknowledging his talents and invaluable professional expertise and influence for better plans and community results. Recognizing him as an avid learner, inquisitive listener, and a kind, funny person, she hoped for continued collaboration in the future. On behalf of the City of Wilsonville, including the Planning Division Staff, she extended their gratitude and presented each with a small award commemorating their service.

Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager, thanked Commissioner Neil for stepping up to the Planning Commission, expressing appreciation for her thoughtful approach and excellent listening skills. He acknowledged the considerable amount of information Commissioner Neil had to manage during her time on the DRB and the Planning Commission. Despite the time commitment as a volunteer, he noted Commissioner Neil's energy, consistent presence, and dedication to the city, and her fellow DRB members and Commissioners. He wished Commissioner Neil all the best in her future endeavors.

Chair Heberlein thanked Commissioner Neal for her outstanding service on the Planning Commission and wished her all the best in her next adventures. He noted he and Commissioner Mesbah had the longest working history together on the Planning Commission, and it was amazing to work with him at every meeting, noting Commissioner Mesbah's insights, knowledge, and thoughtfulness that he consistently brought to each meeting made him think in different ways. He appreciated everything Commissioner Mesbah had done for the City adding he would be missed.

Commissioner Mesbah expressed gratitude for his work on the Planning Commission, which was his love and passion. Despite deviating from the typical path by starting directly on the Commission rather than first serving on the DRB, he announced he would now be transitioning to the DRB. He praised Staff for their excellent work and recognized the vital role of volunteers in informed decision-making. He thanked everyone for their contributions, emphasizing the honor and enjoyment he experienced during his tenure on the Commission.

ADJOURN

Commissioner Mesbah moved to adjourn the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 8:35 p.m. Commissioner Neil seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

By Paula Pinyerd of ABC Transcription Services, LLC. for
Mandi Simmons, Planning Administrative Assistant