



# **PLANNING COMMISSION**

## **WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 2022**

### **ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

1. Consideration of the September 14, September 28, October 12, and October 19, 2022 PC Meeting Minutes



## PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

September 14, 2022 at 6:00 PM

City Hall Council Chambers & Remote Video Conferencing

---

*Draft PC Minutes were corrected and are to be reviewed and approved at the November 16, 2022 PC Meeting. Corrections are in bold and underlined.*

### 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, September 14, 2022. Chair Heberlein called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m., followed by roll call. Those present:

Planning Commission: Ron Heberlein, Jennifer Willard, Aaron Woods, Andrew Karr, Breanne Tusinski, and Olive Gallagher. Kamran Mesbah arrived after Roll Call.

City Staff: Miranda Bateschell, Amanda Guile-Hinman, Daniel Pauly, Mike Nacrelli, and Mandi Simmons.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

### CITIZEN'S INPUT

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

### ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. Consideration of the July 13, 2022 and August 10, 2022 Planning Commission Minutes

This item was addressed after Informational items.

Commissioner Mesbah noted the following corrections to the July 13, 2022, minutes:

*(Note: additional language shown in bold, italicized text)*

- Page 2 of 10, second bullet, fourth sentence, "The Dewatering Performance Optimization project did **not** yet have a dollar amount..."
- Page 3 of 10, eight bullet, last sentence, "...assuming people would **not** be as wasteful as they were today?"

**Commissioner Gallagher moved to approve the July 13, 2022, minutes as corrected. Commissioner Karr seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.**

The August 10, 2022, Planning Commission Minutes were accepted as corrected.

### WORK SESSION

## 2. Airport Good-Neighbor Policies (Bateschell)

**Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director**, reminded that the purpose of the project was that the City of Wilsonville has interest in airport resource, the French Prairie District south of the Willamette River, and potential growth that may happen at the airport and adjacent to it. In order for the City to have a voice at the table as an affected jurisdiction in any planning, or discussions around growth that may happen there, the City needed adopted policies to help provide City Staff and other leaders with guidance on how to give direction about Wilsonville's interests and position when at the table. The project involved developing those policies, but also aligning them with the role of the Comprehensive Plan. The project team was challenged in working with larger encompassing discussions with many community members and knowing how to dial the feedback from citizens into the City's role, particularly since the airport was not within the city; knowing how to align the policies with the role of the Comprehensive Plan, and that the policies being put in place were both relevant to the City's interests and concerns, but also written in a manner that aligned with the scope consistent with Wilsonville's role as a neighboring city and the role of the Comprehensive Plan. The draft policies presented to the Commission were developed as an Area of Special Concern in the Comprehensive Plan. After a lot of discussion with the Planning Commission, City Council and amongst the project team, they landed on maintaining it as an Area of Special Concern for a couple of reasons since that component of the Comprehensive Plan was to outline areas with special considerations when development occurred in that area. While there might be broader impacts in the city coming from activity at the airport or potential growth, the impact area might be different than the Area of Special Concern because the area map depicted the development area where the policies would guide the City's review and participation, which was why the policy objectives were presented as an Area of Special Concern as opposed to distributed across the Comprehensive Plan. The Commission's task was to advise on any missing components within the draft policies and whether the draft policy objectives captured the City's scope of influence and aligned with the Comprehensive Plan. The next step was a public hearing in November.

**Chris Green, Senior Planner, HHPR**, presented the Airport Good-Neighbor Policies via PowerPoint, highlighting interests, concerns, and feedback received while engaging the community, stakeholders Planning Commission and City Council. He also reviewed the draft policy objectives and the proposed boundary for the Area of Special Concern.

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

*Are there any key policy objectives or special considerations missing?*

*Do the policy objectives reflect the City's scope of influence?*

- How would the City enforce the Good-Neighbor Policies, seeing that the subject area was in the Comprehensive Plan but not in the city? How would the policies work in actuality?
  - **Mr. Green** explained that as an affected jurisdiction, the adopted policies would give the City something to point to as a starting point in regional conversations around issues and objectives that have been identified. The policies did not enforce things outside the city boundary.
  - **Ms. Bateschell** added that as part of the City's Urban Growth Management Area Plan agreement with the County many years ago, a shared area of interest was established, and that

boundary included the airport and this area of the county, which actually expanded beyond Area O, and anytime a development application came forth in that area, the City was required to be notified per that agreement. The City did have an opportunity to review development applications proposed adjacent to or in the surrounding area of the airport, whether it was airport-related or not. In reviewing the development proposals in Area O, the City would look to the policy objectives in that area to help guide Wilsonville's concerns and interests as a City and its standing in reviewing those applications. Reviewing for things like rural development, consistency with regional and state policies, how development should occur in EFU land, and provide public comment consistent with the Comprehensive Plan policies for things like adequate services. Staff had done that on a number of applications to date in the county. Having the adopted policies in the Comprehensive Plan gave the City a bit more standing when the comments were being reviewed by the deciding body and/or any appeals body. The City did not necessarily have control over that land, and could not control exactly what happened there, but it provided us with that the information in terms of how the City should review and comment, and how those comments might be treated.

- **Amanda Guile-Hinman, City Attorney**, confirmed the City would have comment with standing, legally speaking. Another component was that the State had agency coordination programs, which included the Oregon Department of Aviation. As an affected jurisdiction, requirements had to be met, not only in providing notice, but coordinating if there were conflicts the affected jurisdiction noted, which pointed to what the Comprehensive Plan stated. Right now, that was silent for Wilsonville, and so this was a way for the City to be clear about its objectives and where it might point to identify where there might be conflict.
- Would there be a special area of concern between the airport and the city boundary? What happened if growth was proposed, not as part of the airport, but as a peripheral to the airport, such as a convention center?
  - **Ms. Bateschell** believed that would be outside the scope of this project. The Airport Good-Nighbor Policies came about due to concerns about ensuring the City had a potential role in the airport master planning process and that Wilsonville was an affected jurisdiction, someone who's a part of that conversation. Any concerns about rural development in general would spark a conversation about illegal urbanization of rural land. At that point, multiple other enforcement layers would be at play, it may not be needed at the City necessarily, because it would be private development at an urbanized level that would not be allowed by the County or State. If other bodies were not enforcing it to the degree that Wilsonville had concern over, the City could address and discuss at a later point in time or under a different project: would the City want to have another area that addressed private development in French Prairie as a whole.
  - A high functioning airport like this begs for an adjacent convention center, which was big bucks and not far-fetched in terms of long-range, regional development. Dealing with development as it came was a good approach.
- Was this a document that would be shared with the airport commission and Marion County, or was this an internal document for the City to use in the event it was notified? It seemed that notification would be required to those impacted by any adopted policy.
  - **Ms. Bateschell** clarified this language would be adopted into the Comprehensive Plan. She was uncertain about legal notice requirements but will follow up with legal counsel and confirm whether the airport commission and Marion County would be on the notification list. If

providing public comment on a development or through the planning process, the City would likely share its position, which would be founded in the Comprehensive Plan.

- She clarified the City's position had not yet been formulated in the City's policies and Comprehensive Plan.
- Were flight patterns and safety part of the conversation? Were they an issue?
  - **Mr. Green** responded Cities were limited in what they could do directly. One objective was to coordinate with agencies that enforce some of the rules about noise and safety. The federal regulations have a Part 150 that federally addresses what could happen around airports in terms of noise. A type of study, done once in Oregon for PDX, was mentioned in the objective to the extent that it made sense for the City and Comprehensive Plan to discuss it. A lot of the regulation occurs at the federal and state levels.
  - Noise abatement studies were funded by federal grants through the FAA, so it would be a matter of convincing state, but likely federal government to fund that type of study. The grant cycles came up from time to time, so it would be a matter of advocating for that type of study to be done for the Aurora State Airport. The programs and criteria for awarding the funds changed with each cycle. The objective was written to be flexible about any potential funding opportunities, but not because money was currently available.
- **Ms. Bateschell** clarified this was the final draft document, which could change based on feedback from the Commission. The intent was to have a public hearing at the Commission's November meeting.
- The potential negative impacts to the development of industrial land in Wilsonville was not clear. What connection existed between potential development around the airport and that harming Wilsonville's development of industrial land? Were there companies that the airport would be poaching from the City's industrial land?
  - **Mr. Green** explained that within Wilsonville and Metro, the adopted industrial development standards require certain levels of infrastructure, zoning that has design standards, etc., and the project team was uncertain how that would necessarily play out in a hypothetical, industrial area next to the airport. As far as companies being poached, developing within an already urbanized area that was providing the necessary services versus something that was close to an airport but did not have that infrastructure in place could be a lower cost option, but then the cost would be in those impacts to the environment around it, including Wilsonville.
  - Development in Aurora, Butteville, or any other areas around Wilsonville would also be a concern, so it was not just an airport specific concern.
  - **Mr. Green** noted that being a city, Aurora already had municipal services and zoning specific to that type of development, but area around the airport was not municipality.
- With regard to the resiliency, how would an increase in runway length or any other practical change in the configuration of the airport, impact its function in emergency response?
  - **Mr. Green** replied it might not, but the idea was given its close access to Wilsonville, the emphasis was on providing those general aviation services versus becoming a different type of airport, essentially prioritizing different types of air traffic.
  - Was the assumption that the airport would become a regional or international airport? A longer runway would allow for a potentially larger airplane to land, which would aid in disaster response, not make it worse.

- **Mr. Green** responded the objective was not in response to a longer runway specifically, but anything that could come up in the airport planning process that would impact general airport operations.
- **Brad Kilby, HHPR**, clarified the project team was not putting this objective necessarily forward to stop them from building a longer runway, but trying to highlight considerations that Wilsonville would like the airport to consider in any discussions about how it continues to grow. This specific objective recognizes that the airport provides a benefit to the community, and probably the region at large, for having a runway that was available, though helicopter pads were probably more relevant currently. There was talk about reclassifying the Hillsboro Airport as a new type of airport due to its activity and size, but he did not foresee that at the Aurora Airport at any specific time in the near future given the high cost to bring in the urban services for water/sewer that would be needed before considering altering it. The objective just noted the City's concern and reason for the concern, not specifically to stop the airport from building a longer runway.
- **Chair Heberlein** stated he was struggling with finding a conceivable scenario that would result in a negative impact to emergency operations, and the extended runway was the most prominent example available. Even a change in designation would not impact the airport's ability to serve as a disaster relief airport, so why should that be put in the Comprehensive Plan as an actual concern?
  - **Mr. Green** said he did not believe it was meant to anticipate a specific change, as much as it was a benefit the City wanted to retain. It was probably not one where they could draw a direct line that extending the runway would be bad for emergency services, because it would not; but if something happened in the future, this at least, records the community's interest in having those things based there.
- **Chair Heberlein** replied, without a plausible scenario, how could the City have a concern?
- **Commissioner Karr** noted this Area of Special Concern extended beyond the airport. Any development in that area that impacts the airport's ability to deliver those emergency services was a concern to the City. The roadway and infrastructure were rural, so if development continues around the airport to a point where they were straining that infrastructure, making it less likely that the airport could provide those emergency services, that was the City's concern.
- **Chair Heberlein** suggested rewording of the draft language to reflect the concept that it was a concern more about the infrastructure around the airport than the airport itself.
  - **Ms. Bateschell** asked whether the rewriting should be to the final bullet on Page 2, which would be the issues or potential impacts, or Policy Objective 6, which was an interrelated policy objective that seemed to address the matter.
  - **Chair Heberlein** stated his concern was about the verbiage regarding the potential impacts in the preamble. He clarified he was okay with Policy Objective 6.
- **Commissioner Mesbah** noted that limiting the concern to development around the airport itself was too limiting. The objective was a heads-up that this airport was a resource for emergency delivery and that function must be maintained. It did not need to be a specific scenario. It was just one of the issues of interest to the City. While development around and clogging the roadways, etc. would be one scenario, if that was the only focus, other stuff might be missed. The whole idea was that this was open-ended, so whatever happened, this was one thing on the checklist to watch for and ensure it was covered. That seemed to be the intent of

the objective, not as an impediment for the airport to function as an airport and a resource, which would continue.

- **Chair Heberlein** stated if the City had specific concerns, they needed to be stated along with the potential impacts. If the City could not come up with a conceivable potential impact that made sense, then what were the merits of including the concerns?
- **Mr. Green** read the proposed change of the second sentence in the last bullet on Page 2 of Attachment 1 as follows: "Changes to the configuration of the Airport, type of operations housed there, or development-related impacts to surface transportation connections between Wilsonville and Area O, ~~would~~ **could** diminish the overall benefits provided by the Airport."
- **Commissioner Willard** noted the language should state, "changes to the configuration of the ~~Airport~~ **Area of Concern**," because it was not exclusive to the Airport.
  - **Mr. Green** agreed, adding it said surface transportation, but if there were other development related impacts to air navigation from that development, it would already be covered by FAA.
- **Commissioner Karr** questioned the need for the second sentence as the first addressed Commissioner Mesbah's point of making sure the City was protecting the integrity of the emergency services. There could be unexpected uncertainties, but did the Commission want to hamstring the City by putting in that second sentence?
- **Mr. Kilby** reminded the draft policies would be in the Comprehensive Plan. It was not a regulatory document, but a framework document that acts as a foundation that the City's regulations were built on. The intent of this whole process was to show both the impacts and benefits to the citizens of Wilsonville from activities at the airport. The document would help remind future City Staff and Commissioners about this discussion.
- **Commissioner Mesbah** noted that looking at the benefits of the airport, if he were the airport, he would approach the City about collaborating, which was why he liked the checkboxes.
- Objective 3 should be updated to reference, ~~FAR Part 150~~ **14 CFR Part 150**, because it was Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations Part 150, and other Part 150's were throughout the Code of Federal Regulations.
- Objective 4, if the airport was in Marion County, why would Clackamas County policies be referenced?
  - **Mr. Green** replied that would potentially be part of the area that would be impacted. The City would be looking to review the Area of Special Concern, but those impacts were related to the rural reserves that Clackamas County designated in between Wilsonville and the airport. He understood that was outside of Area of Concern O.
  - **Ms. Bateschell** clarified this was a technical reference to the rural reserves, which did not exist in Marion County. The reference reflected the City's desire to protect rural reserves, which were agreed upon by the region and Clackamas County. The policy could be made clearer to apply to EFU in Marion County and rural reserves in Clackamas County to capture both.
- Why would the Area of Special Concern be larger than the airport perimeter and the through the fence area? That was the area of development that would occur at the airport, anything else outside of that was something that could happen regardless of whether the airport was there. What was the likelihood of an airport-related development across the highway? And, if that was not likely, why include it within the Area of Special Concern?

- **Mr. Green** replied some probability or possibility of growth happening was anticipated if there was an expansion of the airport area, resulting in the development area potentially expanding outward as well.
- He clarified these were not necessarily trying to anticipate specific events happening that would lead to development in those areas. It was saying development in the area around the airport, such as an industrial development located one parcel away from the through the fence, might occur due to its proximity to the airport.

**Ms. Bateschell** clarified the project team had a work session with the City Council on Monday to review the draft policies and get Council's input. The collective input received would refine what came before the Commission in November.

### 3. Wastewater Treatment Plant Master Plan (Nacrelli)

**Mike Nacrelli, Senior Civil Engineer** updated on the progress of the Wastewater Treatment Master Plan (WWTP) process via PowerPoint noting the growth projections presented to the Commission in July were based on lower growth projections from Metro. Following discussions with the Planning Commission and internal with management, the project team [we] went back and looked at the higher growth curve, which was just under 3 percent annually, and reran the numbers for the modeling of the flows and loads at the plant, as well as the impact on plant capacity and the capital investment required to handle that level of growth, which resulted in substantial changes. (Slide 3) An updated project phasing schedule and cost estimates were created for the projects and all the other portions of the Master Plan document impacted by these changes were being updated as well. An online public open house would begin September 28<sup>th</sup> for any members of the general public who wanted to provide input.

**Dave Price, Carollo Engineers**, continued the PowerPoint presentation on the WWTP Master Plan process, reviewing the updates made to the Facility Capacity Assessment and Unit Process Capacity Summary, given the higher growth projections from Metro; the Alternatives Evaluation and Recommended Plan for the required improvement projects, including new capacity upgrades, as well as the now more accelerated Project Phasing Schedule. With the higher growth scenario, the Project Costs had increased to more than three times the approximately \$31 million reported in July. The Draft Cash Flow chart provided a visual representation of the Project Costs along the timeline. (Slide 10)

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

- Looking at the Draft Cash Flow, the membrane bioreactor (MBR) was the biggest outlay of cash in years. Was the City doing any pro-planning of the funds that would be needed for that?
  - **Mr. Nacrelli** replied that upon completion of this plan and part of next steps, the City planned to do a rate and SDC study within this current budget year to look at the details of how to fund the improvements through a combination of rate adjustments and SDCs, and maybe other mechanisms available.
- Assuming some monies were already in reserve, at what point would the rate and SDC changes need to happen for the monies to be there for the 2028, 2029, 2030 MBR expenditures?



- **Mr. Nacrelli** replied the timing was one of the question the study would have to be able to answer. He suspected rate and SDC increases would be phased in over time, but that would have to be fleshed out in that study, accommodating the growth expected and how those rates would have to be adjusted as growth occurs in order to provide the necessary funding. Once the study and public involvement process were completed, and the fee increases adopted, the new rates would probably have to start right away to make those adjustments.
- How would rate changes for future expansion be explained to existing customers?
  - **Mr. Nacrelli** stated that was ultimately a Council decision. He agreed the majority of the investment was driven by capacity needs; however, some components involved replacing old equipment, so it was not entirely growth driven. He anticipated the impact on SDCs would be far greater than the impact on rates.
- **Mr. Nacrelli** confirmed the improvements would be triggered by threshold population growth; as growth reached a certain place, a new unit gets triggered which provides some flexibility, so the project costs/schedule were not cast in concrete
- Regarding the cost of growth, this was an interesting exercise because in simulating a doubling of the size and the cost tripled, which slows growth because some of the growth occurs because it was competitive price wise. People come to Wilsonville because it was cheaper than Tualatin, for example, and the city has a growth spurt. Growth slows as costs catch up. The schedule was not cast in concrete, growth triggers the decisions for these units to come in.
  - **Mr. Nacrelli** displayed the Capital Planning and Expected Growth – 2045, explaining the numbers in the table on the left were for the orange curve, but the numbers presented in the PowerPoint were based on the purple curve, which was the same growth rate Mr. Price mentioned was used in the 2014 Collection System Master Plan, as well as the Water Treatment Plant Master Plan, and possibly several other planning documents. (Slide 14)
- **Commissioner Mesbah** noted in a previous life, he would be reviewing the Master Plan. A community's Comprehensive Plan was a wish that did not necessarily come true. A cost-effective analysis was needed of some of this projection, growth, and units, especially since by taking this population growth curve, the City had managed to say the only option was the MBR treatment, which was a more expensive treatment, which he understood was to meet higher water quality standards. It was taking away a lot of choices that the City may do well to consider. Maybe the City decides it does not want to double in size—ever—to avoid dealing with higher water quality impacts on city water. These were necessary to explain to rate payers in a comprehensive and understandable way why the City was planning what it was planning. Questions like, “Am I paying for someone else’s growth?” were divisive and not helpful to a sense of community. This was a community service, and it should be approached as a benefit for all and the environment that was receiving the City’s treated waste.
- In terms of the current analysis for flow rates and the details in some of the earlier slides, what baseline population numbers were used as the starting point, 2021 or 2015?
  - **Mr. Price** explained typically 5 to 6 years' worth of data were used, adding this could be considered a 2021 number. When looking at existing data, they often analyzed the flow meter and data being collected from operators at the plant, then they projected out using unit factors and numbers that were conservative to a certain extent, making sure it provided for some flexibility in terms of how the facility was being planned. If the numbers being used were too conservative, and growth did not occur as that particular projection envisioned, then the Plan needed to adjust to that.

- The projected flows made sense, but did the City really expect to be at that 2045 population level to drive all the necessary infrastructure requirements that had been defined. (Slide 14) In July, the projection seemed low and now, was it too high? Was there a middle ground that was a more realistic growth scenario or, if that were to come to pass, would the system's design be done differently from a planning perspective if 45,000 people were expected rather than 52,000.
  - **Mr. Price** responded not necessarily, given the space available at the existing treatment plant site. The City would likely wind up with the same recommendation.
  - **Mr. Nacrelli** noted it might push the timeline further into the future, but to serve the ultimate build out, whether that happened in 2045 or later, there was no more space to do something different.
  - **Mr. Price** agreed, adding they had looked at other options to provide capacity and other processes to intensify secondary treatment, and the conclusion was that the MBR was the direction the City should go no matter the timeline. This was a plan the team believed would provide a very robust facility that the City could feel confident would meet its requirements on the water quality side, while also being flexible to the degree to which it could be made flexible; some additional variations could be added should different criteria or scenarios apply over the next 23 years. At this time, the July and this current proposal bracketed the range of options.
  - **Mr. Nacrelli** stated the Rate and SDC Study would certainly look at how the funding would be impacted by changes in growth. If growth slowed way down for some reason and the projected flows were not achieved, then the City would likely push some of these projects out. To serve the ultimate population within the UGB around Wilsonville with the limited existing site, what would be built would not change, just possibly when things were built.
  - **Mr. Price** noted none of the scenarios accounted for any significant changes on the regulatory side. There were processes in place, underway, or pending to potentially look at other pollutants that might be regulated. This particular plan provided a very firm basis upon which to build, which was why the aeration basin was proposed first as opposed to going right to the membranes. Having that additional volume and capacity in the plant would provide flexibility for the City in the future in being able to address potential future regulatory concerns.
    - He noted that when the membrane facility was in place, the filters and the two secondary clarifiers that are not demolished would effectively become redundant facilities because the MBR would produce effluent that would not be necessary to run through clarifiers and filters because of the process of the liquid separation that occurs with the membrane.
    - The membrane facility was chosen due to the site constraints at the treatment plant, but when the facilities are in place, some space would be freed up providing the City with some flexibility in the future should additional regulatory issues arise in addition to the growth.
- **Commissioner Mesbah** said he wanted to clarify his earlier comments. The proposed plan was based on population that was currently baked into the City's plans and would eventually happen, so the projects would be necessary. As long as this plan was based on need and the projects were pushed out if the population growth did not happen, it was a sound plan. The City still needed to explain it very clearly, so it did not create an impression that this was cost for newcomers versus cost for what was not done before, etc. He was unsure whether the fiscal impacts of growth were looked at ahead of planning. Since it was a separate process, it did not get considered when the City adopted new areas to grow into. He suggested doing this kind of thinking before adding areas would be helpful in the overall process.

- **Commissioner Karr** believed the original concern with following the orange line was the fact that the Commission knew of future developments that were going to exceed the orange line. If those developments come to fruition, the orange line was not usable, and that becomes the problem of, "It's an essential service and it has to be in place". Even though there was a timeline, it sounded like the project list would not change, only the timing of the project list and representative costs. He proposed amending the chart on Page 3 to state, "***potential*** timeframe based on expected growth" to provide a clearer picture. Since the expenditures for these projects depended upon seeing the anticipated growth, the timeframe should be a little more 'squishy'. (Slide 9)
  - **Mr. Nacrelli** confirmed that whether build out was reached around 2045 or 10 years later, the facilities would still be needed, but perhaps not as soon. (Slide 9)
  - **Chair Heberlein** suggested adding "estimated timeframe" as well as "estimated costs" to clarify there was no hard date.
  - **Mr. Nacrelli** stated that even with the orange population curve, the aeration basin would be done fairly soon.
  - He clarified the first few projects before the aeration basin were not substantial and that the funding for those first few was available, adding the projects were not necessarily even growth projects. (Slide 9)
- The new aeration basin was more growth driven than current population, replace secondary clarifier mechanisms was maintenance, but all the "new" projects were growth-driven. The majority of the estimated cost was growth related and if the timeline was not certain, it would be better to state an estimated timeframe instead of a timeframe which leads people to think a project was certain to happen at that point.
  - **Mr. Nacrelli** agreed that could be presented better and they would make it clear in the document.
- Rather than 'squishy' the project team was encouraged to use 'commensurate to population threshold numbers' and hopefully, the team could show at least a range population levels that would trigger an action, so that it gave some guidance to decision makers.
  - **Mr. Price** agreed including an assumed population column would be helpful.
  - **Mr. Nacrelli** reminded there was a significant element of industrial use in the projections, so population could be a guide, but it was not 100 percent.
- **Commissioner Gallagher** said she fully supported taking care of infrastructure, but she reacted to the projection of growth. Did the City really plan on doubling the population of Wilsonville? Is that what was wanted? Was that what this was all about or was that what the City was concerned about?
  - **Mr. Nacrelli** displayed the City Land use Designations Map, noting most of the service area was mostly already within the city limits. If the available land developed as planned, the projects in the Master Plan was what would be needed, unless there were Zoning or Comprehensive Plan changes.
- The Commissioners discussed where 50,000 people would come from, noting Frog Pond would be 6,000 people. If the study area was based on this Land Use Map boundary, then the population estimates should be based on that boundary as well. Either the boundary or the population estimate was off, as well as what the density would permit.
  - **Mr. Nacrelli** clarified these numbers were consistent with the planning done for the sewer system, as well as the water treatment plant currently under expansion. The numbers were not really a departure from other projections the City had been using to plan for infrastructure.

- As long as it was timebound, or population or use based, then it was okay. This was the plan for infrastructure when Wilsonville needed it, regardless of what the boundary said.
- If the team low balled it and blew the water quality standards because the City was now discharging raw sewage or polluted wastewater, it would penalize the City, and potentially put a total stop to any new growth, etc. until it was addressed. The City did not want to be in that position, which was why planning was done ahead of time.

The Planning Commission took a brief recess, reconvening at 7:48 pm

#### 4. Frog Pond East and South Master Plan (Pauly)

**Dan Pauly, Planning Manager**, stated this was the Commission's eighth work session on the Frog Pond East and South Master Plan. He introduced the project team and began the PowerPoint presentation, noting tonight's discussion would be around infrastructure, continued discussion on Housing Variety Policy, next steps, and what the finish line looked like at this point.

- He explained the preliminary work done during the 2015 Frog Pond Area Plan provided a foundation for the list of needed infrastructure projects as well as the cost estimates to develop a program for funding them.
- A sensitivity test for a hypothetical higher residential unit count was included in the water and sewer memorandum, and not in the current draft of the transportation memo. During the State administrative rule making for implementation of House Bill 2001, a variety of options was provided that jurisdictions could take, one of which was to plan for 20 units per net acre. How much more expensive would infrastructure be if 20 units per acre were planned versus what the City anticipated would be built during the initial buildout.

**Jenna Bogert, Transportation Engineer Consultant, DKS Associates**, continued the PowerPoint, highlighting the transportation analysis process and the housing unit and job counts used in the traffic model to identify failing intersections and needed improvements, including for bike and pedestrian facilities. She noted the traffic operations, identified deficiencies, and proposed improvements within the subject area, and described four main intersection improvements, which included roundabouts. (Slide 7) She reviewed the pros and cons of single lane roundabouts, as well as proposed pedestrian and bicycle treatments to address gaps and deficiencies, and the proposed street cross sections on Stafford and Advance Rds.

- **Mr. Pauly** noted the Stafford Rd/65th Avenue intersection was a high-priority project for the County to fix. The team's scenario assumed that those improvements were built within the 2040 baseline being considered. (Slide 6)
- **Ms. Bogert** added City Staff had been informing the County of the changes and plans for the Frog Pond Area throughout the master planning process.

Commissioner comments regarding the transportation infrastructure was as follows with responses to questions by the project team as noted:

- With the Advance Road and 60<sup>th</sup> roundabout so close to the school and park, what advanced safety precautions beyond the crosswalks would be taken because school children would be crossing there?
  - **Mr. Pauly** replied the project team talked directly with the School District this week on how to plan it. The District likes the roundabout for bus and traffic circulation, having buses go out that

way rather than being queued at a stop-controlled intersection. It could certainly be a place where extra flashers were installed, spaced out to increase visibility. He believed such improvements were on the designer's radar.

- The crosswalks on Roundabouts 1, 3, and 6 seemed pretty close to the turning portions of the roundabout and concern was expressed about the potential for an accident.
  - **Ms. Bogert** explained typically crosswalks were placed far enough back from the circulating traffic such that a vehicle could be completely out of the roundabout and on the road that they were traveling on without being in the crosswalk. The crosswalk was usually about a car's length or more away from the actual circulating lane of the roundabout, so that drivers feel comfortable stopping for a pedestrian without feeling they would get rear-ended by someone else in the circulating part of the roundabout. Design standards exist for the distances where the crosswalks are placed with safety in mind.
- As shown, the crosswalks looked very close to the roundabout. It was important to make sure cars coming out of the roundabout have enough time and space to stop for pedestrians and also for vehicles behind a car that has stopped for pedestrians to also come to a stop safely.
  - **Ms. Bogert** clarified the concept figures shown were not to scale but were very much concept icons and not great indications of what would necessarily be seen. (Slide 9)
    - She confirmed the roundabout design would be similar to the Boeckman/Kinsman roundabout from a crosswalk perspective with a 1 to 2 car gap after exiting the roundabout and before the crosswalk, which was a standard design.
- Roundabouts were a good traffic calming feature for the higher urban speeds when entering a neighborhood. The roundabout at the far west side of town on Wilsonville Rd could help slow people down who come flying in from that country road.
- What was the difference between Table 4 and Table 5? The volume through the Stafford/Kahle Rd roundabout increased after improvements were made. (Pages 15 and 17, Traffic Analysis)
  - **Ms. Bogert** clarified the volume differences between those two sets were because of the turn restrictions at Frog Pond Lane, which prevented traffic from turning left or going across. The volumes at Brisband and Kahle increased because that traffic had to be rerouted. It was assumed most of that traffic would go north to Kahle or with some down to Brisband.
    - She confirmed vehicles wanting to turn left on Frog Pond Lane were anticipated to go north on Kahle using the local streets and continue north from there.
    - Traffic was expected to come south as people came in from the country. A lot of the growth was in the south bound direction on Stafford Rd.
- The roundabouts were a great entry feature, however, the roundabout at Advance Rd and 60<sup>th</sup> Ave was not an interface between the rural and urban, because two to three intersections were east of that. What would be done from a traffic calming perspective to address the high speeds on those streets before people get to that roundabout?
  - **Mr. Pauly** replied there would be a median and lane markings, potentially on street parking, so some of those urban things would start to signal a more urban environment; however, there would not be any pedestrian/bicycle conflicts yet. He confirmed there were no crossings on Advanced Rd east of 60<sup>th</sup> Ave, noting a bicycle and pedestrian crossing would be a consideration at that safe intersection at 60<sup>th</sup> Ave in the future since there was no real traffic slowing elements before that.

- From a report perspective, it was confusing to have Figures 1 and 2 before Figures 4 and 5. Reordering the report to have Figures 4 and 5 first showing the analysis based on this situation, and then the figures afterward seemed to make more sense.
- **Ms. Bogert** explained she usually placed the figures at the front because she assumed most people would not read past the first few pages.

**Mike Carr, Principal Engineer, Murraysmith**, introduced his professional background and presented the proposed water and wastewater systems for East and South Frog Pond via PowerPoint, reviewing the scope of each system analysis, previous studies that provided context and set the criteria for the proposed infrastructure improvements, which he highlighted. The improvements included water distribution and storage projects and wastewater projects within the Master Plan area, as well as offsite wastewater Capital Improvement Program (CIP) projects for conveyance to the Wastewater Treatment Plant. Stormwater projects would be presented at a future date

Commissioner comments regarding the water and wastewater infrastructure was as follows with responses to Commissioner questions by the project team as noted:

- Of the four lift stations proposed, why was Station 4 the only one with an alternate lift station.
  - **Mr. Carr** explained in working through the plan with City Staff, discussion included about phasing and how the projects would get implemented. The entire Frog Pond South Area would drain south, and it all needed to be pumped. Station 4 and its associated force main and gravity sewers need to be built at the very beginning, before almost any development in Frog Pond South. The first choice for the primary station location would be at the very south end of 60<sup>th</sup> Ave, but it was not clear that development would occur down there to start with due to extensive costs to bring infrastructure there. Typically, these things happen incrementally. Elevation wise, another location was on the school property. This plan gives planners, designers, and developers opportunities to have other discussions, and those were not the only two locations.
  - **Mr. Pauly** added the entire drainage basin to the north was currently under one ownership, so there was no question that when that developer brings in that chunk of land, they could put in that lift station. In Frog Pond South, the parcels were much smaller for the most part, so if some smaller parcels to the north wanted to develop sooner, then some alternatives were needed if the property to the south was a long-term holdout because there was nowhere else for the sewer to go.
- **Mr. Pauly** confirmed the City was coordinating to combine as many infrastructure projects as possible from the Frog Pond improvements, Boeckman Dip project, Boeckman Rd sewer improvements and the school.
- **Mr. Carr** agreed 8-inch water lines could be installed to match the existing lines at Canyon Creek and the Wilsonville Rd neighborhoods, but the City engineer concluded 12-inch lines would provide robust continuity and the cost was almost the same as installing an 8-inch line.

**Mr. Pauly** continued the PowerPoint addressing questions related to Housing Variety from the last work session about the high income need and ADU costs, all of which was included in the Staff report. The high costs of ADUs reiterated the challenge of market rate affordable home ownership. He then highlighted next steps, noting the upcoming October 12th work session and November public hearing. Certain items, such as infrastructure financing and the details of the Development Code, would be addressed going into 2023. He reviewed what remained to be addressed in the Master Plan by the

Planning Commission in 2022, noting not a lot of discussion or controversy was anticipated because the items were based on prior work or prior precedent. (Slide 23)

- He asked how comfortable the Commission was with where the project was at and its ability to review the entire Master Plan given Metro's December deadline. Feedback was requested about holding a special work session probably in late October or in the next month or so to work through the details and get to a comfort level where the Commission was ready to have a public hearing.
- He explained that Metro's deadline was written as a condition of approval to the ordinance explaining the UGB; however, he was unclear about any enforcement actions. There was also the thought that Metro might be okay with it, but could other organizations sue Metro and the City for not following it. A public hearing to make a Council recommendation would be needed in November for Council to take action by the December deadline.

Following a brief discussion on the time needed to review the remaining Master Plan items and available dates, the Commission consented to hold an additional 3-hour, special work session on October 19<sup>th</sup>.

## **INFORMATIONAL**

5. City Council Action Minutes (August 1 & 15, 2022) (No staff presentation)
6. 2022 PC Work Program (No staff presentation)

**Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director**, highlighted upcoming items, including the agenda items for the October 12<sup>th</sup> meeting, which included a public hearing on the WWTP Master Plan.

The Commission returned to the consideration of the July 13, 2022, meeting minutes at this time.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

**Commissioner Willard moved to adjourn the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 9:09 p.m. Commissioner Gallagher seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.**

Respectfully submitted,

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



## PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

September 28, 2022 at 6:00 PM

City Hall Council Chambers & Remote Video Conferencing

---

*Draft PC Minutes are to be  
reviewed and approved at the  
November 16, 2022 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, September 28, 2022. Chair Heberlein called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m., followed by roll call. Those present:

Planning Commission: Ron Heberlein, Kamran Mesbah Andrew Karr, and Breanne Tusinski. Jennifer Willard, Aaron Woods, Olive Gallagher were absent.

City Staff: Miranda Bateschell, Daniel Pauly, Georgia McAlister.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

### CITIZEN'S INPUT

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

Chair Heberlein confirmed the Planning Commission would take public comment after the presentation.

### WORK SESSION

#### 1. Frog Pond East and South Master Plan (Pauly)

**Dan Pauly, Planning Manager**, introduced the work session, noting tonight's discussion would be focused on land use, particularly housing policy, and not going through detailed tables or the actual text of the Development Code, which would come in due time. He began presenting the continuing work on the Frog Pond East and South Master Plan via PowerPoint, noting the immediate goal for tonight's work session was to put implementation policies into the Master Plan document to guide Development Code work for both residential and commercial pieces. The project team sought clear guidance from the Commission on the language that should be in the Master Plan to direct what should happen with the Development Code. Tonight's discussion would eventually influence the clear and objective standards needed for the Development Code, as well as the guidelines, purpose statements, and intents that would be crucial if developers elected to go through the discretionary review alternative, which the City allowed.



- He highlighted the timeline of the Master Plan process, noting the public hearing would be held on November 16<sup>th</sup>. The Commission would focus on the Development Code the first half of 2023, and other implementation policies, such as the details of infrastructure funding mechanisms, as well as some public works standards around stormwater and other detailed standards.
- He noted the current colors shown on the map on Slide 5 did not represent different types of units or establish density, but represented the urban form, the look and feel of the area, the distance between buildings and from the streets, minimum lot size etc. In the end, the Zoning Map would show all these as one color, since it would be zoned the same.

**Joe Dills, MIG**, noted the clear and objective standards requirement in State law and being reinforced by the courts had a new emphasis, so tonight's policy discussion would focus on directing clear and objective standards by going from the policy intent to some of the potential details, but as stated, a discretionary review alternative would be in between and provide flexibility. Some of the specificity in tonight's presentation had that particular lens of thinking all the way through the clear and objective standards.

**Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director**, noted the project team had a number of questions to get input from the Commission, so tonight would involve much more dialogue and discussion than presentation. The Commission's feedback would help the project team get moving on what was needed in the Master Plan and also to bring something back to the Commission in the near future for the Development Code. She thanked the Commission for meeting a second time this month, knowing two meetings were also scheduled for next month.

**Mr. Dills** continued with the PowerPoint presentation, highlighting the Residential Policies the project team sought to confirm and receive further feedback on from the Commission. Key concepts reviewed included housing types, minimum density requirements, urban form standards, and how to achieve fine-grained variety standards.

The Commission provided feedback on the Residential Policies as follows with responses to questions by project team as noted:

- The full spectrum of housing being permitted for all the areas within Frog Pond East and South going forward should be shown as it would help realize the intent in planning the area.
- **Mr. Dills** understood manufactured housing was required to be allowed in all residential zones, but perhaps, only in single-family residential zones. The law passed in 1975.
  - **Mr. Pauly** added the City could still apply architectural standards, so it would blend in. He noted cottage cluster housing could be pre-fab homes.
- **Mr. Dills** explained a definition for cohousing was written in the Development Code as part of the Frog Pond Area Plan work. Cohousing was generally where there were shared facilities in a master planned unit of land. He was uncertain if not having individual lots was required, however, the cohousing projects built in the Portland area were one ownership, individual residential units, either attached or detached, with common facilities for cooking or communal rooms, etc.
- It was highly unlikely the full spectrum of housing types would be seen in the East and South, regardless of the City having them available, since it was still up to the builder to determine what they wanted. (Slide 9)
  - **Mr. Pauly** agreed, adding the project team would talk more about that.

- The financial or economic feasibility of some of the housing types was not going to pencil out, and the type of housing was being left to the developer; however, the project team had some analysis of what would be feasible.
- **Mr. Pauly** said that was right, noting cohousing had been explored for one property in Frog Pond West, but it did not get built. He expected all the other housing types could be built, though he was uncertain manufactured homes would be what the Commission had in mind. He could see a manufactured cottage or something like that easily coming into the mix, or alternative building methods. The line between townhouses, duplexes, triplexes, and quadplexes was kind of gray with some of the other laws at play, but for all intents and purposes, they would likely be built. Cluster housing cottages were a probability, and definitely multi-family and ADUs.
- He confirmed the City was allowing all of the housing types and that some had a higher probability of being built than others, so the housing types would not likely be evenly distributed. He noted the requirements would be categorized so there would be multiple ways to meet one requirement with different unit types.
- Minimum densities should be required and using the urban forms was supported, though the devil would be in the details as to how to make that happen.

**Mr. Dills** continued the PowerPoint presentation, reviewing housing variety policy, which was new, noting its purpose and the key intended outcomes of its implementation with additional comments from Mr. Pauly. The three-step approach for delivering housing variety was described. The project team had had a good discussion about whether to incentivize versus require the percentages of housing categories and, being doubtful that suggesting or incentivizing would result in housing variety, the project team received guidance to include some minimum category requirements.

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

- The allowable housing types (Slide 9) included manufactured and cohousing, but neither were included in the Venn diagram. (Slide 17)
  - **Mr. Pauly** noted there were many different ways to classify housing types. Manufactured housing could be an ADU, cottage cluster, detached, single-level home, etc. It was allowed, but that was not how it was categorized to get at the housing variety policies; same for cohousing homes.
  - **Mr. Dills** added they would have to have a home in some category. He agreed manufactured and cohousing would need to be added as the full spectrum of housing varieties was represented in the categories.
- As housing types, manufactured and cohousing should be categorized as well.
  - **Mr. Pauly** believed cohousing fits into that; however, manufactured homes could be several different unit types.
- Putting a note at the bottom was suggested if there were exclusions. If there was a reason why a type was not put into the categories, it should be noted, such as “Manufactured homes could be in any of the categories”.
- **Mr. Pauly** confirmed the specific definition of manufactured housing was based on State statute and rules.

- The components of a house could be manufactured in a specific design in a factory and assembled on site. It was not mobile homes like manufactured housing used to be, just stamping out the same thing. These days, manufactured housing was very high-quality.
  - **Mr. Pauly** added that technology could change and improve during the lifetime of the Master Plan.
- If including the definition of manufactured housing, the Master Plan would be saying that new technology was available to all categories, which would be a good asterisk or footnote. Cohousing needed to have a home.
  - Including a reference to the State definition or having a definition in the Master Plan for both a cohousing and manufactured home would be helpful as it was a more ambiguous housing type.
    - **Mr. Pauly** noted a lot of the definitions came from the Development Code and suggested adding a glossary in the Master Plan indicating where the definitions came from.
- **Mr. Dills** noted the point was very well-taken about modern-day practices and manufacturing components to homes, suggesting they look at the definitions through that current lens.
  - He offered another policy perspective given the market was strong at a couple of ends of the spectrum. The townhouse, multi-family, detached single-family, ends of the spectrum were strong, and if the project team knew those were likely to be delivered in Frog Pond East and South, perhaps the system should be set up so the requirements get at a little more than that, which was where the green and blue bubbles came in and the Commission's choices about how many categories get required in the Development Code. (Slide 17)
  - **Mr. Pauly** noted the requirements had to have a market feasibility reality to it as well, so that how much was required was reasonably absorbable by the market.
- If the City strongly believed a housing type was needed ~~there~~ in a particular area and there was no demand for it, it might be okay for the City to wait for that property to develop. The City did not have to build it now, if it was not the right product or the right time.
  - **Ms. Bateschell** agreed that was a policy choice the Commission should discuss. From what she had heard, it was not synonymous demand and market feasibility either, as there was a lot more to what the market was producing that was not just about demand. Part of that was ~~that~~ some of the green types had been less traditional or traditional at a certain point in history, but not currently. There were also market economies or scales of economies that developers took advantage of that could play into their market feasibility, but not necessarily equate to the fact that there was no demand for certain housing types; there likely was demand for these housing types.
- **Mr. Pauly** clarified the housing variety requirements for large properties could be by subdistrict, but properties smaller than a subdistrict would probably be by property. There was some feasibility when implementing the requirements as it was hard to do the math across property lines if the requirement applied to only a portion of what was being developed.
- If it was not economically feasible to build a needed housing type, and the City could wait, did that mean the property owner was going to wait? The concern was that the property owner would have to develop whatever required subcategory was left in that particular geographic area, and if they were not willing to build that type, the City would not allow them to develop their property.
  - **Mr. Pauly** said the project team had thought about how to avoid such situations and would discuss it more in the course of the work session.

- **Mr. Dills** added the team believed the solution was to set up the system so that individual properties have their required number of categories for that ownership, clearly and objectively stated in the Development Code.
  - The best example was the South neighborhood. The majority of homes on the east side of 60<sup>th</sup> Ave were 5 and 10 acre lots, so the system needed to be set up so that any individual property could go forward without having to rely on the adjacent property, and not be in the shell game of who has consumed how many categories elsewhere. The East neighborhood is different as it had larger ownerships, and the subdistrict mapping and good quality master planning by those owners and developers could deliver the system, too, and plan where to do the units they wanted to bring in first, which in some cases was a matter of the sewer's location. What product would come in to the market first and second, or maybe two markets would hit at the same time; all those things were in play for a master planned, larger developer situation, so the Master Plan needed to anticipate incremental development of that area where small, medium, and big projects would be happening.
- **Mr. Dills** agreed the South neighborhood could be exclusively categorized by property and East potentially by a mix of subdistricts because it was part of a large parcel, or by property if an individual area necessitated that.
- In a subdistrict with small properties, how would the City ensure the first property owner did not get all the good stuff and leave the rest for the property owners?
  - **Mr. Dills** replied the project team learned a lot by laying out the sewer system. At the south end of 60<sup>th</sup> Ave there was a lift station, which meant a line had to be brought south, which was where the gravity went, into lift station where it was then forced up to the gravity system of Advance and Boeckman Roads. Installing that line would open up all of those properties to the south, at least from a sewer perspective, so they could come in at the owner's timing once the infrastructure was in place.
- Though the City was not in the practice of having temporary lift stations as part of the development, it was technically possible. The City's main would be built as it went down/south, with a temporary lift station a quarter way down that pumped up and when the next quarter was ready, the City would basically move the lift station down and continue to build as that was more accessible to the main street and so forth. It was a more phased approach.
- The assignment of housing types to properties from the get-go was great because one of the alternatives was to allow property owners to start trading if they wanted something different, as long as in the end, everyone had the housing types that the City wanted.
  - **Mr. Pauly** replied it was a matter of getting it at the right geography so that smaller geographies, whether by subdistrict or property, could get variety at that granular level rather than having it more segregated, which the project team heard was clearly not wanted.
- Would it be possible to make sure that these housing categories and mixes were built all together as opposed to having all the single-family built first?
  - **Mr. Pauly** clarified each development would have to propose a mix, resulting in a mix occurring throughout.
  - **Mr. Dills** added the timing of the construction would be up to the developer.
  - **Mr. Pauly** noted the land use approvals would be done.
- **Commissioner Mesbah** noted the land use had also been approved in Villebois before the fires. He did not want the Planning Commission to have done all the work and not thought through all of that, allowing the first comers to burn the bridges, which would be an unfair way to

develop this area. If the City of Wilsonville was going into this development with a vision, it was important to make the vision stick, and not have it derailed by popular demand later on.

- **Ms. Bateschell** agreed that was an important point, and as the project team worked through the discussion tonight, the remaining choices, policy options, and feedback from the Commission, might influence some of the Commission's thoughts. Tonight's discussion was to help formulate what the housing variety policy would look like. Feedback on whether to require the housing mix; and if so, how and at what level; what were the maximum or minimum percentages, etc. would help better meet that objective, depending on what the Planning Commission decided.
- **Chair Heberlein** believed some of it would come down to the City communicating the intent better when those developments came forward to DRB, making sure that the community was aware of the process that was gone through to get to that point, as some of it was just a lack of knowledge. People needed to know DRB review was not the first step, but step thirty in the process.
- **Commissioner Mesbah** agreed with communicating the vision clearly, effectively, and continually, but also the values behind the vision. People complained about beautiful areas being developed but did not know the land use plans for the area. People need to know the values behind it. The City was trying to create these categories for variety because variety was what was going to strengthen the city and its supply of housing, residents, manpower, effective governance, etc. It becomes a moral imperative for the City to maintain that value through the vision and through realizing it and building it.

**Mr. Dills** continued the presentation, discussing the basic percentages and metrics to guide how the housing categories were applied to geographies. He described reasons for the proposed maximum net area for each housing category, minimum net area for any target category, and minimum middle housing mix as well as how and each could be accomplished.

**Mr. Dills** confirmed the Commission was comfortable with the notion of housing categories and that there would be categories per subarea with the preference of being on a tax lot basis, so properties did not get isolated.

Discussion and feedback about regulating questions with regard to Housing Variety Policy was as follows with responses to Commissioner questions as noted:

- Middle housing was part of the Variety and Affordability category and the Variety, Affordability, and Accessibility categories. Was the project team talking about specifying a minimum percentage of net area for those categories, but then adding a minimum requirement of middle housing within that category as well?
- **Mr. Pauly** clarified it would actually be an overlap; for example, a unit could be in two different categories and also meet the middle category requirement.
- **Ms. Bateschell** added the unit could meet multiple standards and objectives at the same time.
  - She confirmed it could be its own category, but it had not been because through the process, the City had heard that middle housing was not necessarily always the ultimate goal to having a housing variety policy, but to also have a variety of housing, so places did not have all the same housing type, and to provide for the various needs and wants in the community; not everyone wanted the same house type. There was also interest in having the housing variety policy address the affordability question. Moving forward, housing

would be getting more expensive and less affordable, and the project team's analysis revealed a huge pocket of that would have to be subsidized. The City had the ability to meet some demand within the 80% to 120% area medium income brackets, with housing types that were more affordable than the standard, single-family detached home. The category was more about that than what the form of the house was necessarily. It was about whether it was a more affordable housing type. Similarly, the City heard it was important moving forward to have homes that were accessible to people with limited mobility issues. Those had been the drivers behind a lot of the input heard from Planning Commission, City Council, and the community, which was why the project team chose to categorize the types as presented.

- Some middle housing as built, addressed those categories, values, and objectives behind the City's policies, but some did not. Middle housing in and of itself did not necessarily address that policy objective. The project team chose to place middle housing in multiple categories because it could sometimes meet those policy objectives and not at other times.
- The other question about middle housing regarded not only the City's compliance with House Bill 2001, but also the value at the State level that these housing types were clustered for a reason, and those middle housing types had been of interest to City Council in helping to achieve first-time home buyer opportunities and not necessarily in the form of a multi-family residential condo project. This led to the secondary question about whether that was also a policy objective, and if so, did the Commission want to have a minimum number of types. She noted the Commission caught on very quickly that middle housing was basically duplicated within the Venn diagram. The City could require a developer to build two housing types and to meet the percentages for Variety & Affordability and for Variety, Affordability, and Accessibility and they could pick two middle housing types to achieve that. Building townhomes and cottage clusters, or a single-level, accessible middle housing type, would meet both the standards for minimum percentages as well as the middle housing requirement.
- One subdistrict was going to have multiple property owners, potentially, so would individual property owners be able to adhere to the guidelines by multi-tiering it or would it hamstring them in what they could build?
  - **Mr. Pauly** responded the table concept Mr. Dills alluded to was important because the City was going to look at the Development Code at that property level, see what property was going to develop together.
  - He confirmed the districting would be at the property owner level, and then the City's guidelines would be either at the larger subdistrict on the East or the properties in South. That sub districting would not be done on smaller properties because each individual property did not need a green focal point, so other policies played into the subdistricts.
  - **Ms. Bateschell** noted the Commission could choose at what level those standards applied. Given the conversation around policy, the minimum number of middle housing types could be applied at a different scale than the minimums and maximums, which had been discussed as being per development, but the minimum middle housing could be applied differently.
  - **Mr. Pauly** added it could be applied at a higher level, for example, per subdistrict in the South, which would tend to happen anyway.
  - **Mr. Dills** added, or it could be only for properties over X acres that had the flexibility and would be doing more categories anyway. The project team did not have the specific answer to the

question, but it was a good critique. The team needed to figure out how 3C married up with 3A and 3B. It could be if 3A and 3B were satisfied, then 3C would also be achieved. He suggested that team work on that and return with ideas.

- It seemed the Commission agreed that minimums and maximums were wanted to control the variety, and now it had to come up with what could be put into a policy.
  - **Mr. Pauly** stated 3A and 3B were kind of the drivers, and if 3C fit into 3A and 3C that would probably go in the Code.
  - **Ms. Bateschell** suggested the Commission talk more about 3A and 3B to see if it became more clear whether 3C was met, as the Venn diagram had categories that did not have middle housing.
  - Apply 3A and 3B to the parcels in the development to see if it worked would very quickly reveal whether 3C was needed or not. Having 3A, 3B and 3C was fine, the question coming up was whether that would be practicable with all the available parcels or would they not end up being applied on smaller parcels. If it was applicable at the parcel level, 3A, 3B, and 3C were fine.
  - Policy could not be made that was not applicable to individual properties. It could inadvertently create conflict between the properties.
- The Planning Commission confirmed it was comfortable with the minimums and maximums platform.
  - A minimum might be needed for middle housing if it was going to be too tempting to work around it, resulting in no middle housing, which was needed.
  - It would be nice if 3A and 3B drove 3C.
  - In running the scenarios, if developers were able to skirt middle housing easily, then that would indicate a need for a middle housing minimum. If middle housing happened anyway, that was easy; but how could the City make sure the housing types that did not in the short term, did happen eventually and to ensure middle housing was not built because it was more difficult, too inconvenient, etc.
  - That also needed to be analyzed across individual properties to avoid making one development overpower another in the same subdistrict and prevent a "First builder in wins, the last builder is stuck with all the middle housing" type of scenario.
- **Mr. Pauly** gathered that the Commission was comfortable with the provided percentages. The project team had referenced the affordable housing analysis, which essentially said that market aside, 50% single-family and 50% middle housing would tend to be built. Even with some multi-family, it would still be around 50% detached single-family, which signaled to the project team that 50% not only met the variety, but it was also what the market would tend to do anyway.
- Visual examples showing how the percentages would look on a block were requested to give the Commission a feel for what a 50% mix might look like, for example.
  - **Mr. Pauly** noted he was uncertain the project team had the bandwidth, but that could possibly be explored when getting into the details of the Development Code. Going back to the urban form, he noted the team anticipated the middle housing design standards would continue to apply and would tend to make the townhouse or multi-family building look more like a large, single-family in terms of asymmetry or symmetry, door locations etc. Those were existing standards the City did not plan to change, but those architectural standards were still at play and would tend to help different unit types be more complimentary to each other. He believed design would help address the feel issue.

- Using Frog Pond West or an area of Villebois was suggested to get an example of what those areas would look like with certain categorizations and percentages. Finding a place with the same percentages would be helpful in looking and walking around it to see if it felt right.
  - **Mr. Pauly** added even taking a development like Morgan Farm, for instance, and indicating which units would be townhouses rather than single-family given certain percentages would be fairly simple to do or pulling some areas of Villebois that have a variety and show the percentage.
- **Commissioner Karr** noted the percentages he had given for housing types at a previous meeting had come from driving around Villebois and visualizing how to replicate something like that in Frog Pond. Pictures speak a thousand words.
- It could be fixed through architectural design as well, so the City had to make an allowance for that.

**Mr. Dills** continued the PowerPoint presentation, describing the Commercial Main Street streetscape components and noting the policy related questions for the Commission as follows:

*Should the City be flexible to allow commercial or vertical mixed use?*

*Should the City base the design standards on the Town Center main street code?*

The project team addressed questions from the Commission, which also provided additional comments as follows:

- Staff clarified a four-story building height was being considered for the Commercial Main Street and that Town Center had a range for building height. Each Town Center subdistrict had a different target, the higher end being five stories, which could go higher if certain waiver criteria were met.
- Three-story multi-family would be allowed in a residential area and four-stories in commercial, but a Type 1 could go up to four-story multi-family. Three-story building heights were pretty much allowed everywhere within the city.
- **Mr. Pauly** noted if there was interest in vertical mixed use resulting in four-plus stories, then maybe it makes sense to allow three story broadly. The team agreed that having kind of the Type 2 along Stafford Rd made sense for the most part, but the space in the image was across from a green space, so given the relationship, maybe having that little block as Type 1 could make it taller and mix better with a vertical mixed use product on Brisband St. At the street, there would be a transition to allow for a more subtle transition. The developer had expressed interest in doing that and having a more consistent look rather than going four-story all the way down the two sides of the street. Similarly, on the south side, the land use shown would be updated on the next version as constraints were revealed at that corner of Stafford and Advance Rds following wetland studies.
- The concern was having a four-story building next to a cottage cluster; an overpowering feeling of a big building with a small building next to it. However, being able to move or specify types would give it more of a smoother transition.
- A spot in Villebois had the mixed use with three-story, single-family homes next door, and it worked pretty well for that area. Mixed use with apartments or condos, etc. above was really trendy right now, and there was market demand for it.



- **Mr. Pauly** noted in terms of urban form, single-family houses, even though they were detached, were very much a bulky product, close to the street with limited setbacks that would fit more into that Type 1 category.
- The project team should make sure the image represented what it envisioned the Main Street area would look like. A three-story scale looked about right, but the idea of four-story buildings seemed a bit much.
  - **Mr. Dills** clarified he had not heard how many stories the team intended to represent in the Main Street diagram, whether it was a three- or four-story product.
    - **Mr. Pauly** noted there were some economies of scale to make construction feasible.
- **Commissioner Karr** liked the idea of the Main Street somewhat conforming or scaling down to the Town Center, giving the town a feel of continuity.
- **Chair Heberlein** stated he was supportive of both questions in terms of using the Town Center code.

Following a brief discussion, Staff confirmed the Commission wanted vertical mixed use for the Commercial Main Street area and that the project team should ensure there was no abrupt transact from any vertical mixed use on Brisband St.

**Ms. Bateschell** agreed understanding whether mixed use would be feasible from a developer's perspective was important, as that had been part of the challenge in Villebois.

The Planning Commission took a brief recess at 7:31 pm and reconvened the meeting at 7:37 pm.

**Chair Heberlein** called for public testimony.

**Sparkle Anderson** confirmed via phone with Staff that she could not hear the meeting via Zoom and that she had no public comment at this time.

**Mimi Doukas, AKS Engineering**, representing West Hills Development, which was working on the Azar property which comprised about half of the land within Frog Pond East, so West Hills had a very strong interest with how the development plan moved forward. Staff was aware of and had alluded to things the developer wanted to adjust in the land plan itself. West Hills did have a vision for what could happen in the Azar property, and had heard quite loudly from the City Council, Planning Commission, Staff that housing variety was a very important goal. West Hills shared that goal. Real estate worked better if there was a variety of housing as everything sold faster, looked better, and got more market share. The Azar property within the City's land plan had the most Type 1, the only Commercial Main Street zone, as well as Type 2 and Type 3, so West Hills had an urban design spectrum for that intensity would be. West Hills planned to build single-family detached and attached homes, multi-family, garden style apartments, and the vertical mixed use for the town center. Vertical mixed use was one of the trickier components and yes, West Hills was a bit concerned about how much commercial was viable in that location. West Hills knew vertical housing had a real opportunity, but the presented main street concepts were different from the garden style walk-ups West Hills was thinking of for Type 1 to help transition around the Town Center that would be a more affordable multi-family type.

- The vertical mixed use being discussed for the town center would need elevators and was a different type of development and price point. West Hills wanted and was striving for that type of variety but was concerned the level of calculus going into the regulations discussed tonight would

make development very challenging on implementation. The single-family detached and townhouses in Types 1, 2, and 3 would all be different housing types. A detached home in Type 3 was not the same as a detached home in Type 1, so there would be a variety of each of those housing types across the different urban design categories. Some of the City's concerns about housing variety would be addressed in the urban design overlay, which was why she cautioned against putting too many additional layers on top, which would break West Hills' implementation at some point.

- She was also concerned about how the percent requirements for housing variety were placed either by tax lot or by subdistricts. The subdistricts AKS and West Hills had to work through on Frog Pond West were challenging. Densities were assigned on subdistricts that did not match the number of units approved relative to the development standards; they did not quite line up. There were real problems on the implementation side. She advised being careful on how subdistricts were done and how that percentage was applied.
- Her main message was to be careful with how much calculus was put into the Development Code. The City was going to get variety with some basic controls. The 50% maximum of a single housing type was a good, straight forward regulation.
- She noted 3C middle housing was already covered in 3A and 3B for housing variety. Small lot, single-family detached and townhomes could be middle housing, or not middle housing. Again, too much calculus risked breaking the system.
- While the Commission did not want to be driven by market viability, it did want a plan that worked and market realities factored into what could get financing, what could attract a developer, and what could attract buyers, so market viability should not be ignored. She believed 3A and 3B made sense, but she would not add 3C on top.
- From West Hills' perspective, applying the housing variety percentages across the entire tax lot rather than the subcategories of colors across the tax lot was recommended. West Hills' site could end up with nine different categories, and maybe more if done by subcategory and by tax lot. That was a lot to deal with, particularly when townhomes or small lot, single-family detached houses could mean different things depending on size; small or big, the City would get variety regardless.

**Chair Heberlein** thanked Ms. Doukas for her comments, noting it was important for the Commission to hear some of the reality, so it did not get lost in the idealism of it all.

**Commissioner Mesbah** believed only a headcount was needed to make sure 3C was covered in 3A and 3B, it was not an added requirement but there to ensure 3C was covered. He asked if West Hills saw some other angle on that.

**Ms. Doukas** clarified her struggle was she was not 100% sure what middle housing was ~~versus~~ and was not. What was a small lot detached home versus a middle housing home, or an exploded duplex versus a middle housing duplex. There were traditional homes that would check the box on middle housing, and she did not know how to draw that bright line.

**Ms. Bateschell** clarified the City would do it based on the State law definitions.

**Ms. Doukas** replied she still did not think that was a bright line.

**Mr. Pauly** added, especially when it came to cluster housing.

**Ms. Doukas** noted cluster housing was a completely different housing type that West Hills did not build as that category did not match what West Hills builds. It built masters on the main and there was probably potential for ADUs, but mostly, it was a variety of sizes of detached homes, townhomes, garden apartments, and vertical apartments and middle housing was probably in that mix of things.

**Chair Heberlein** noted one challenge Ms. Doukas raised was some of the issues in terms of the Frog Pond West implementation. Were there were things the City could learn to make sure it did not repeat the same mistakes in East and South?

**Mr. Pauly** stated he agreed 100% about not doing subdistricts like Frog Pond West in the way it was addressed per property, and as experienced in Villebois, implementing regulations over two different developments added difficulty to the calculus. He believed in keeping it at the right scale and continuing to have that lens as the project team got into the details of the implementation.

**Dan Grimberg, West Hills Land Development**, stated West Hills had been involved in six different UGB expansion areas, including six projects in Frog Pond West with three that had been developed and three more that had been annexed into the city and had DRB and zoning approval. West Hills was very excited about its opportunity in Frog Pond East with the Azar property and was trying to get plugged in with the planning process, which was moving so fast that West Hills could not catch up and that was concerning. When the Master Plan was finally approved, West Hills would have to make it work with all the different percentages and definitions.

- West Hills had a great opportunity and wanted to develop all of the Azar property, then move on. The developer supported housing variety to a certain point, but it had to make sense in the market. West Hills did not create the market, it produced for a market. All those housing types could be done, though there could be a few it would choose not to do in Frog Pond East because there was no market. Adding 10% because someone would eventually want it did not work because West Hills could not develop part of a property. West Hills invested millions of dollars buying entire properties and could not afford to buy properties to develop parts of it 20 years later; streets, utilities, etc. all had to be put in for the entire property and it all needed to work. West Hills was good at blending different housing types, but each one had to be viable; banks did not lend on maybes.
- The City was doing a good job and West Hills would like to have more input. West Hills had a plan for the Planning Commission to understand what the developer was talking about and see how those percentages would look which could get the planning locked in. If West Hills could not make the planning work, development would not happen, nor would variety and no one got anything.
- West Hills pioneered the market and made Frog Pond West work with the large lot and eventually that became successful, but it was not easy earlier on. Frog Pond East was going to be more affordable, and West Hills wanted to provide more affordable housing as there was more of a market for it. West Hills was not trying to not do what the Commission wanted, but West Hills might just do it a little differently. The developer wanted to share its vision with the Commission which he believed was close to the Commission's. He was concerned about number being locked in because that may or may not work.

**Commissioner Karr** noted he liked that West Hills had a plan and was interested in seeing it. He also wanted to understand whether those plans could be applied to smaller parcels as he was concerned only one type of house would be built unless minimums and maximums existed. He did not want them

to be onerous or break somebody's plan, but the rest of Frog Pond needed to be protected, not just East, but also South where the property areas were much smaller.

**Mr. Grimberg** responded Frog Pond West was a good example as those were all small parcels. West Hills typically combined smaller parcels into 10- to 20-acre parcels, which was how Frog Pond West was primarily developing. The developments could have a variety of lot sizes, and now West Hills was excited about the new middle housing component. It was playing around with that on a lot of its opportunities as it provided another type of housing. With middle housing as a possibility, West Hills believed it could be made compatible and a lot of variety could be created through good architecture as done in Villebois. Frog Pond West was zoned for the overall area, not per property, and that was one way to get a variety of housing; one property got medium housing and the 5 to 10 acres next door got the small lot, and there was variety within that. A lot of variety could be created by combining different types of housing, but different design would also create great variety. Housing variety could be created on any size development, it just might not be as varied because it was smaller.

**Chair Heberlein** stated he was uncertain how the Commission could interact with the developer and asked Staff to decide what was feasible. It would be great to understand what Frog Pond East could look like conceptually to get a feel for how this type of development could look with West Hills' plan.

**Ms. Bateschell** noted the City has had several conversations with West Hills through the process in terms of keeping them engaged as a stakeholder along with other property owners in Frog Pond East and South to make sure they were aware and had opportunity to provide input along the way. It was a fast-moving master plan project compared to other master plans Staff has done, so she understood the feeling that the communication had not been as slow or extensive as on other projects. The City had seen proposals from West Hills and were working with them in thinking through that as Staff had these conversations with the Commission.

- Regarding the concern about a lot of percentages, she reiterated the project team was really trying to understand where it might go to make sure the intent was framed correctly in the Master Plan. What would move forward in October and November would be around the policies and the intent that would go in the Master Plan itself and adopted into the Comprehensive Plan. Work on some of the details around percentages and what would go into the Development Code would continue into the new year. Staff was also open to and planning on having more conversations with stakeholders and developers about what that Development Code would look like as the project team started bringing the Master Plan back to the Planning Commission and City Council.

**Mr. Pauly** added West Hills was welcome to submit any documents into the record for Staff to share with the Planning Commission.

**Chair Heberlein** understood variety was important to the Commission and the City needed to have all of those different types, the only question being how to ensure it happened.

**Commissioner Karr** added that both variety and affordability drove how to build or develop the Master Plan.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:06 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

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



**PLANNING COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES**

**October 12, 2022 at 6:00 PM**

**City Hall Council Chambers & Remote Video Conferencing**

---

*Draft PC Minutes are to be  
reviewed and approved at the  
November 16, 2022 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, October 12, 2022. Chair Heberlein called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m., followed by roll call. Those present:

Planning Commission: Ron Heberlein, Aaron Woods, Andrew Karr, Breanne Tusinski, and Kamran Mesbah. Jennifer Willard and Olive Gallagher were absent.

City Staff: Miranda Bateschell, Amanda Guile-Hinman, Kelsey Lewis, Dwight Brashear, Mike Nacrelli, 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 September 14, 2022 Planning Commission Minutes

Commissioner Mesbah:

- Noted the following corrections to the September 14, 2022, minutes:
  - On Page 5, second full sentence from the bottom of the page, "While development around and clogging the roadways, etc. would be one scenario, if that was the only focus, other stuff might be ~~missing~~ **missed**."
  - On Page 11, second line in the second bullet from the top, "discharging raw ~~sewer~~ **sewage** or polluted wastewater,"
- Asked what F1 meant on Page 9, first sub bullet under Mr. Price's last comments which stated, "He noted that when the membrane facility was in place, the filters and the two secondary clarifiers that are not demolished would effectively become redundant facilities because the MBR would produce F1."

**Mike Nacrelli, Senior Civil Engineer**, believed "F1" was misheard, and it should state "effluent".

Commissioner Mesbah asked if **Mr. Nacrelli** meant a certain quality of effluent since anything produces effluent; perhaps, “high quality effluent” should be used.

**Mr. Nacrelli** agreed something might be missing there, but without hearing the recording, the quality of effluent was the only thing that made sense.

**Amanda Guile-Hinman, City Attorney**, advised postponing the consideration of the minutes to allow time to check the audio recording.

Chair Heberlein stated consideration of the September 14, 2022 Planning Commission Minutes would be delayed to the next Planning Commission meeting to clarify the language on Page 9.

## LEGISLATIVE HEARING

### 2. Wastewater Treatment Plant Master Plan (Nacrelli) (No staff presentation) - CANCELLED

Chair Heberlein noted tonight’s public hearing had been cancelled and would be rescheduled to a later date.

**Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director**, asked that anyone present for the hearing add their contact information to the sign in sheet to receive notification about the new public hearing date. She also offered to provide the project manager’s business card.

## WORK SESSION

### 3. Transit Master Plan (Lewis)

**Kelsey Lewis, SMART Grants and Programs Manager**, introduced the City consultant who would present information about the public engagement conducted on the Master Plan over the summer.

**Brenda Martin, Consultant, EnviroIssues**, presented via PowerPoint a summary of the engagement conducted as part of the SMART Transit Master Plan Update. She highlighted the purpose of the Master Plan Update and described the outreach methods used to gather public input from various stakeholders and diverse groups of citizens, including underrepresented communities. She also reviewed the key findings from the data collected from surveys and the stakeholder’s workshop which identified ridership patterns and included requests for transit time and frequency changes, as well as additions to SMART’s service routes, which included connections to other destinations in the region.

Questions from the Commission were as follows with responses as noted:

- Why was there such a low turnout for the in-person stakeholder workshop where only 18 people attended after more than 100 invites were sent out?
  - **Ms. Martin** noted the project team made about 150 calls and sent emails, but she believed that ultimately, it was just the day and time, coupled with not being able to invite the right people to come from certain organizations due to changes in employment. The team did share the survey with most of those invitees, so the team did collect some feedback from those organizations. She believed having one time and place for attendance was difficult for some people.

- **Ms. Lewis** added that asking people to do a 3-hour in-person meeting was a lot and due to the game played on tables, a hybrid version was not possible. The beneficial side of having a smaller group was the team had an opportunity to pay more attention to each person's questions about the transit system they were developing together.
- The rank ordering of new locations had Salem in the middle. Had there been any input as far as why people were interested in Salem as a destination?
  - **Ms. Martin** replied Salem did not come up as a place of direct interest. The most answered was Canby, as well as Tualatin, downtown Portland, Woodburn, and Oregon City. Perhaps, people felt they had good connection with Salem, as Cherriots already helped SMART serve that area. It did not seem to be a place people felt was hard to get to or were dying to reach.
  - **Ms. Lewis** added most of the Capitol was still working virtually, so a huge number of those commuting previously were not riding or driving anymore to Salem or anywhere in the area. SMART had noticed a huge drop in state workers riding mass transit.
- Was there a way to break out how the survey results varied for current transit riders versus those who do not? If the goal was to increase ridership for people who were not currently riding, the answers on how to adjust service would potentially be different.
  - **Ms. Martin** clarified the team did do the analysis on non-riders versus riders, low-income respondents, and anyone who marked they were people of color on their response, and there was no notable difference in their answers, which surprised the team as well. Those results were mentioned in the report.
  - **Ms. Lewis** noted the team planned to separate those results in the report but did not find any significant differences.

**Ms. Martin** stated as far as next steps for the Transit Master Plan Update, the team would begin drafting a service enhancement plan with the Jarrett Walker team and return in the spring for the next round of community engagement to get feedback on the Draft Master Plan, which would include some potential operational needs from SMART Staff.

## INFORMATIONAL

4. Town Center Infrastructure Funding Plan (Rybold) (No staff presentation)
5. City Council Action Minutes (September 8 & 19, 2022) (No staff presentation)
6. 2022 PC Work Program (No staff presentation)

## ADJOURNMENT

The regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission adjourned at 6:28 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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





## PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

October 19, 2022 at 6:00 PM

City Hall & Remote Video Conferencing

---

*Draft PC Minutes are to be  
reviewed and approved at the  
November 16, 2022 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, October 19, 2022. Chair Heberlein called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m., followed by roll call. Those present:

Planning Commission: Ron Heberlein, Jennifer Willard, Breanne Tusinski, Andrew Karr, and Kamran Mesbah, and Olive Gallagher. Aaron Woods was absent.

City Staff: Miranda Bateschell, Amanda Guile-Hinman, Kerry Rappold, and Mandi Simmons.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

### CITIZEN'S INPUT

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

**Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director**, confirmed the Commission would entertain public comment following the work session presentation so those in attendance could hear the presentation first.

### WORK SESSION

#### 1. Frog Pond East and South Master Plan (Pauly)

**Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director**, started by congratulating Mr. Pauly on the addition of a baby girl in his household. She thanked the Planning Commissioners for their extra work and time commitment in developing the Master Plan, which would guide one of Wilsonville's next great neighborhoods. Tonight's main purpose was for the Commission to review and provide comment on some Master Plan items related to the transportation network and some of the cross sections, as well as stormwater and a few public realm items. The project team would return to the Planning Commission on the Housing Variety discussion from a previous work session to confirm the strategies settled on and make sure they were captured correctly. The strategies could be found in the Implementation Section of the Master Plan. She noted the following two items submitted for public comment:

- Letter dated October 14, 2022 from AKS Engineering & Forestry, LLC requesting changes to the draft Frog Pond East and South Master Plan with attached map.

- Letter dated October 19, 2022 from AKS Engineering & Forestry, LLC requesting additional changes to the draft Frog Pond East and South Master Plan with five attached maps.
- West Hills and AKS were requesting a potential update to the Master Plan to change a couple lots along Stafford Rd from Type 2 to Type 1, a higher density urban form, and a couple parcels by the park potentially. The Commission received that extra packet at tonight's meeting because she had requested some precedent images of what West Hills was thinking about, so the Commission and Staff could understand whether the requests fit within the Type 1, Type 2, Type 3 as outlined and discussed by Planning Commission and community. If not, that conversation could occur. The images were to help the Planning Commission better understand how the City had been visualizing it over the last six months and how that lined up with some of the housing products West Hills envisioned.

**Joe Dills, MIG**, introduced the project team members and presented the Frog Pond East and South Land Use and Housing Policy via PowerPoint, highlighting the focus of tonight's discussion, and providing an overview of the Master Plan and its key roles. After tonight's review of the Master Plan, a public hearing was scheduled on November 16, 2022. The Development Code and other implementation, including funding, would occur in 2023.

The Planning Commission had no feedback from on Chapters 1 through 4.

- **Mr. Dills** explained the best way to submit edits and comments related to the draft document was by a photograph or scan of the Commissioner's notes.
  - He clarified this Master Plan was not as prescriptive as the Villebois Village Master Plan for a development practicality reason. Villebois had a single master developer who had control over all 500 acres of the property and approached that Master Plan with a very fine grain of master plan layout. The streets and alleys shown were largely what was going to be proposed, though they evolved a bit through development review. The housing variety was likely the best example of how under a single developer, they went all the way down to the lot level on every block, which also played out over time with the market. Contrasting that with East and South, which had at least 20 different ownerships that would roll out incrementally over time; even the larger ownerships would undergo a phased type of development. So, because development would happen in more steps by more entities over time, the Frog Pond Master Plans had more flexibility in them.

**Mr. Dills** continued the PowerPoint presentation, briefly reviewing the highlights of the Master Plan addressed so far. (Slide 7)

**Mike Carr, Murray Smith**, presented the components of the Stormwater Plan specific to the Master Plan area, noting the citywide Stormwater Management Plan was being updated and describing the three major principles that would govern stormwater development as developers implement the urban design: utilize low impact development approaches (LIDA), limit the number of outfalls to enhance stream health, and the use a topographical, basin-by-basin approach to manage stormwater rather than according to each development. He highlighted applicable LIDA approaches, noting benefits and challenges of LIDA specific to Frog Pond East and South. (Slides 8-9)

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

- Was having multiple basins in the area helpful or did that make it more difficult ~~and more~~ or challenging to do the LIDA approach?
  - **Mr. Carr** replied multiple basins could be helpful in the sense of not having to collect a lot of stormwater to push it into a larger pipe, which then pushes it down to some larger facility. It forced developers to manage stormwater on a local level, and no large tract of land was needed to treat runoff downstream. Individual developers might need to have two different stormwater basins to deal with which could double the effort needed to manage the stormwater for their piece of property, making things a bit more challenging because the topography on a particular piece of land could dictate how the development was phased.
- How would the Stormwater Plan be designed so as not to be onerous to any one lot, subdivision, or ownership plot? [29:00]
  - **Mr. Carr** acknowledged was challenging for the City to manage, adding each basin could be a little different. As the framework streets go in, stormwater facilities would be developed, particularly to manage the streets themselves. The idea was to encourage development to utilize those streets to also provide stormwater treatment that can collect from the surrounding areas. Individual lots would likely need to manage their stormwater, but the idea was to come up with the basin-wide plan; a basin-by-basin approach to get an outfall and a conveyance to the outfall that would facilitate the individual owners to be able to develop and connect to that conveyance.
- Would the stormwater facilities be dedicated to public and managed publicly for maintenance? The NPDES permit issued to the City, correct?
  - **Mr. Carr** replied the City historically had HOAs manage their own facilities for developments or particular groups of properties. Where the facilities needed to be utilized by the public or treating stormwater in public spaces, like streets, those would be owned and managed by the City. A regional facility both taking stormwater from the public right-of-way as well as some private properties could also be managed by the City.
  - **Kerry Rappold, Natural Resources Manager**, clarified even if stormwater facilities were in the public right-of-way, they were still owned and maintained by that private development, and so the City allowed the right-of-way to be used for that purpose, but it was still the responsibility of the HOA or the individual property owner to ultimately maintain those facilities. City Staff provided reports on the stormwater facilities with regard to the City's NPDS permit. Wilsonville was unique in that 90% to 95% or more of the stormwater management facilities in the city were privately owned and maintained. The City takes responsibility for the conveyance system, the pipes and streets, or the outfalls where the stormwater runoff went. It was a lot of work to coordinate that, but the other alternative was to have a lot more Staff involved with managing the facilities.
  - Regarding the NPDES permit, the City was one of 13 co-permittees within Clackamas County, perhaps within the country, with a unique Phase 1 NPDES permit.
  - Collectively, Wilsonville's population rose above the 100,000-person threshold when looking at the permitted cities, such as Lake Oswego, Oregon City, Milwaukie, Gladstone, which were all part of the individual permit, but each city had its own responsibilities with regard to the permit.
- How did the City make sure the maintenance was done and the quality of the discharge was up to par?

- **Mr. Rappold** replied by really working with HOAs and individual property owners and having them submit reports every year about what they were doing as far as maintenance and then going out to inspect that. City Staff also did water quality monitoring, which was required ~~to be done~~ under the City's permit. While a bit difficult to relate those results back to any particular stormwater facility, it did provide trends allowing the City to analyze what was seen in terms of that water quality.
  - He believed the current system worked really well. There were deficiencies like any place one could go to in terms of looking at stormwater facilities, but the alternative would be for the City to have a much more substantial budget, as well as more staff and more resources to devote to if it was taking responsibility for all of that.
- Sometimes HOAs had a hard time figuring out what flowers to plant much less whether it was worthwhile maintaining the rain garden that was treating its stormwater. Was the City looking down the road, especially as it grew, to cumulatively start pushing against its standards and not be able to track it to any one HOA and not be able to really control it, as opposed to publicly owned facilities that have one responsible entity.
  - **Mr. Rappold** noted the City's current process was ahead of the curve as far as operation and maintenance, even when compared with publicly maintained facilities and had been using it since the mid-1990s. Currently, there were more than 100 agreements and it was challenging. Moving to publicly owned facility had to be a policy level decision that would have ramifications. He believed it still worked at the level the City was at now, but he was uncertain how it would be 5 or 10 years. He confirmed the City had an eye on it and would continue to track.
  - **Chair Heberlein** highlighted his HOA experience, noting the City regularly reviewed and gave notice when the HOA needed to update and maintain its stormwater facilities. One challenge on the HOA side was how to do that because they were not experts in stormwater maintenance. While it was working on the City side, it was a little more problematic on the homeowner side once there was a problem with the stormwater maintenance facility.
  - **Mr. Rappold** agreed, adding his employee, Sarah Sand, Stormwater Management Coordinator, tried to educate homeowners and HOAs as much as possible. His Staff worked a lot with the landscaping companies doing the maintenance work because a lot of it came back to the plants themselves, which tend to be one of the bigger issues in terms of maintaining what was there; that level of education was important on an ongoing basis.
- Did the City have access to resources, such as at the Metro, with stormwater design experts who could troubleshoot and problem solve with HOAs? Issues could snowball pretty quickly, and it was more than plants, soils and other things could go wrong with any of the facilities and it required expertise to solve them.
  - **Mr. Rappold** replied a number of training programs were available to landscapers to learn the appropriate ways of maintaining stormwater facilities, especially low-impact development. The City tried to push towards that as much as possible, so people get that level of expertise and training. It was an ongoing process because sometimes landscapers and employees change. The City faced the same thing with its own employees for the facilities it maintains.
  - This was very similar to the Urban Forest Management Plan discussion where arborists tell people how to cut trees. The HOAs were lost and needed similar support, not just coordinating but technical assistance from someone who could show up, inspect and identify the problem,

and advise them to work with the landscape contractors on certain things, for example, if the City was serious about water quality; otherwise, it would be forgotten. People were not sophisticated enough to know what these facilities are supposed to do. As long as the plants are growing and flowering, they think they are fine.

- **Mr. Rappold** clarified two projects were starting with the Urban Forest Management Plan. One was an action item in the Management Plan, a tree manual that would be available to the public and help Staff in terms of issues with trees.
- Many stormwater manuals have been developed by other municipalities, though they could not just be imported as they needed to be tied into local weather patterns, including rainfall, etc. A stormwater manual could be considered in the future as a first step for HOAs to use.
- **Mr. Rappold** added the City had developed a Low-Impact Development guide that included fact sheets. The guide was geared to the public in terms of information to share with them. Ms. Sand could use it when going out to speak with HOAs and developers, enabling the City to convey as much educational material as possible.
- Why were Basins K1 and K2 separated and what was the reason for the distinct size difference between the two? Why not combine K1 as part of K2?
  - **Mr. Carr** agreed it did all fall into the same designation of Kahle Creek. He was uncertain whether it was a phasing issue and offered to get back to the Commission with that information.
- More context was requested about the purpose of the proposed regional facilities versus others and how they differed from the local control.
  - **Mr. Carr** replied the idea was to have LIDA handle as much as possible, but with the amount of impervious areas going in, in some cases, it was not likely to be covered. To manage stormwater, developers need a place to put it to convey it downstream, but maybe they had not fully managed the flow control and hopefully the treatment, but at least the flow control, the runoff might have been too much relative to the pre-developed conditions. The stars on the map indicated a potential downstream location of some regional facility that may be needed to manage flow control particularly, and possibly incorporate any treatment prior to the outfall. It was a second priority, but it needed to be considered and so, for the upstream areas, it really had to be looked at on a basin-by-basin approach. Some of the basins would have the ability to manage stormwater better upstream and some would not, depending on the distance and the amount of area included. More studies were needed to be reviewed to identify how much space needed to be incorporated. Each of the 8 to 10 basins that needed to be managed may have to be approached differently.
- At what point in the process would the City know if regional facilities were needed and where they would be located?
  - **Mr. Carr** replied stormwater typically got addressed at a development standpoint and also in regard to the roadways. Roadways were typically the first things going in and they required the most intense management of stormwater. Developers try to understand how to manage stormwater for roadways as they come in, and the entire basin must be incorporated with an approach. They may be able to handle the stormwater runoff from the roadway and understand that each development that hooked into the stormwater line would have the ability to manage it on their site. The project team was trying to lay out approaches that the developers would come in and utilize. A number of different stormwater approaches exist, such as incorporating the facilities into a park area, which might require a certain method or level of intensity, and developers wanted that flexibility. The discussion with City Staff regarded being careful not to be

too prescriptive about identifying a particular location where a particular facility needed to be. As development came along, the plan needed to be flexible from that standpoint. The project team did not want to dictate that a particular facility be on a particular parcel.

- Given the number of parcels and the segment of development expected, how would the City know whether a regional facility would be needed?
- **Ms. Bateschell** explained a lot of that was determined at the development proposal stage because much of the calculation depended upon the added impervious surface and the resulting stormwater runoff that would occur, where it needed to go, and how it needed to be treated along the way, and the City primarily wanted to do that on site. During the development review process, Staff pushed applicant teams to not to provide regional facilities. Even on large industrial sites, the City would have multiple stormwater LIDA facilities to help deal with the flow control and treatment as close to the source as possible. The regional discussion occurred when Staff identified stormwater treatment might not all occur in those separate areas and remain localized. Staff believed regional facilities were possible here because of the small parcels and the densities called for in some areas with smaller properties. The roads would not necessarily be able to have LIDA facilities because a lot of things competed for that space along the road, like parking and street trees, not just stormwater facilities. The project team was starting to look at where those areas might be and call them out on the map to be thinking about it and planning for it where possible. That was why the team was making sure some facilities would be in the BPA easement, if possible, because that was an area the City could take advantage of to provide a larger space and not consume land elsewhere. Similar on 60<sup>th</sup> Ave to the south, likely all of that would not be in the roadway or along the street frontage based on the street cross sections, so the project team was looking at the opportunity to provide it at the corner of the school property or in the park if that regional facility was needed.
- LIDA was a great strategy and having sites for regional facilities for the long run was also an excellent strategy because the climate and water quality standards change, so there was uncertainty about the future.
- Once a developer finished working on a parcel, not much could be done by increasing the treatment capability of that facility on the margin, but not if the water quality improvement being required for healthy fisheries downstream, for example, were orders of magnitude of increased water quality. Having room for regional stormwater facilities downstream in the future was an excellent and necessary strategy in this day and age because the City was dealing with very unpredictable climate responses, which were becoming more extreme. A facility that could deal with six months of drizzle might have to suddenly deal with a downpour over two weeks, and it would not be able to handle it. The standards would follow whatever nature is doing and not necessarily where the City had painted itself in a corner. Regional facilities need to be Plan B for future stormwater planning.

**Mr. Dills** continued with the PowerPoint, reviewing the Active Transportation Plan, which included multiple bike route options as well as a new trail from the creek along the south edge of the Meridian Creek school property and extending across 60<sup>th</sup> Ave. The Plan anticipated providing every tool and safe strategy related to Safe Routes to School at the land use planning level. (Slides 11-12)

The Commission had no comments on the Active Transportation Plan.

**Mr. Dills** continued, describing the Street Plan, which regarded the street classifications, specific street designs, and street cross sections, noting the adjustments made in response to the Commission's comments, which included a more boulevard approach on 60<sup>th</sup> Ave North and a consistent streetscape along Brisband Main Street clear to the park. (Slides 14-21)

- **Ken Pirie, Walker Macy** added the Main Street site study (Slide 21) showed surface parking lots behind the buildings on the main street, and while it was subject to a developer's more detailed study, it could potentially be future development sites as well, so there could have been more capacity than what was shown. The plan was primarily trying to show how the Main Street was framed by buildings that could be up to four stories high and creating a lot of public space and a real sense of enclosure there.
- **Mr. Dills** added what was not shown was how the two-block area would connect to the properties to the south. Adjacent to Stafford was a long and skinny component of the Azar property that was a bit of a challenge to get streets to it. It did not include the cell tower property right next to it, though some day it would all be connected. There would have to be circulation down to the Stafford stem of the ownership.

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

- The south section of SW 60<sup>th</sup> Ave was so straight and flat that it looked like it would invite speed demons and there were no traffic calming features along that section which was a residential street along a school. Even arterial and collector streets had traffic calming measures.
  - **Jenna Bogert, DKS**, explained the buffer bike lanes would help slow traffic on SW 60<sup>th</sup> by visually providing that space that drivers should not be within.
  - **Mr. Dills** noted the team would take a second look and bring back some options to the Commission.
- **Mr. Dills** confirmed that at this time, the team had not planned for SMART to go into Frog Pond East and South but not West. There was a check in with SMART some months back, but the team would follow up on that. (Slide 14)
- **Mr. Dills** confirmed the powerlines would remain above ground on both Stafford and Advance Rds because they had high-voltage wires. The coordination for the Boeckman Rd version revealed they could be moved but could not be put underground for that reason.
  - **Ms. Bateschell** added all other utilities would be undergrounded, only the high voltage lines would not.
  - She understood that these lines were preexisting, unlike the lines in Villebois and other developments where everything was undergrounded but said she would find out and get back to the Commission.
- Looking at the cross section, Stafford Rd provided an opportunity to expand the road to two- or four-lanes in each direction if needed. Since Stafford would be the road that would need to expand, was being able to expand it to a wider road part of the plan? (Slide 16)
  - **Mr. Dills** replied theoretically, it was possible. The intent of the Master Plan was that Stafford would not be widened but was the three-lane gateway into the city. The volume of traffic was managed through the two roundabouts at Kahle and Brisband, the four-way signalized intersection, and the collection of other facilities. The project team did run the traffic analysis for a what-if scenario if Frog Pond East and South were to develop substantially more than what was expected. The team had planned for 1,600 units and analyzed that at 1,800 and 2,400

units, which was where the scales tipped to needing the larger, five-lane facility, which was not part of the vision.

- What was the driver of having the separated bike lane in lieu of a buffered bike lane adjacent to the travel lane? Wilsonville Rd did not have a buffered bike lane, but a bike lane, so why would the City not maintain a consistency or a closer consistency to what was on Wilsonville Rd rather than having a separated bike lane. (Slide 11)
  - **Mr. Dills** replied he could not remember the original rationale; however, the sidewalk on the east side would be where the Advanced Rd wider sidewalk came around and connected. It did not handle the bikes, but it was also separated.
  - **Ms. Bogert** added the team discussed that in their meeting on Friday. Public Works was fine with it being adjacent to the travel lane but separating it from the travel lane and on the opposite side of the planter as shown was more desirable. Bicyclists would have more comfort with more separation from the cars while still providing the same connectivity and access.
  - **Ms. Bateschell** added part of the bike lane conversation had to do with connections to schools. A primary school would be in Frog Pond West in addition to the middle school in South. The team was trying to create more separation and safety between the travel lane and kids who might be using the sidewalks or bike lanes to travel to and from school. Roundabouts and crosswalks were being added to increase safety, but buffered bike lanes further increased the safety by not having the lanes right adjacent to the roadway.
- Kids would not travel down Stafford Rd but would tend to use neighborhood streets until they got to Advance Rd if going to the middle school. Where one lived in the three neighborhoods would determine which collector or arterial would be used to cross Advance Rd to get to school.
  - **Mr. Dills** added in Frog Pond West, the blocks on the west side of the church were intentionally made to be porous north to south, so kids living in those areas could go directly to Boeckman Rd and then to Advance Rd. Pedestrian breaks in the wall and some elements anticipated getting kids to Boeckman rather than out to Stafford Rd.

**Mr. Pirie** continued the PowerPoint, describing the proposed Street Tree, Lighting, and Gateways Plans with additional comments from Mr. Dills, and noting the importance of complementing the trees and lighting in Frog Pond West. (Slides 23-25)

Planning Commissioner questions were as follows with responses as noted:

- Considering the ice storm a few years ago, how did durability and hardiness go into the City's updated Street Tree List, and how much consideration was given to that in these plans?
  - **Mr. Pirie** replied he would probably have to ask the arborist or in-house tree experts, but he believed durability and hardiness was a consideration when Street Tree Lists were provided. The ice storm was a special case, so he was uncertain such damage could be prevented completely.
  - **Ms. Bateschell** noted the City had done a Street Tree Inventory a couple years prior to the ice storm, just as an asset inventory. After the ice storm, Community Development partnered with Public Works, which hired two interns to go out and update the Street Tree Inventory and those results were provided to the Commission and City Council. From that, Staff learned a bit about which tree species were impacted most, and Public Works, Planning, and the Natural Resources Manager had been meeting regularly since the ice storm in partnership with the Urban Forestry



Management Plan and integrated that information to refine the Street Tree List that was provided, adding some species, and excluding that might be more susceptible moving forward in climate change. While those issues were constantly changing, City Staff was responding to them.

- She clarified she had not done a comparison to Frog Pond West to see if the trees in that plan had been removed when the trees list was put together; however, the provided Street Tree List was reviewed by Staff in terms of what it would want to call for on the City's street trees.
- If the City wanted to incorporate a drip system for flowering planters along Main Street, where would that be incorporated? Was that even incorporated in the Master Plan or was it too detailed?
  - **Ms. Bateschell** responded she would want to say it was detailed, but a drip system would typically be done at a streetscape planning level, but if it was a priority, it could be mentioned in the Master Plan.
  - **Mr. Dills** added there was no preclusion; the Master Plan was an ideas book as much as it was a directive outcome book or regulatory function. Thinking of other cities where those programs were done, it was very much programmatic at the city level as opposed to finding it in the Comprehensive Plan.
- Hanging banners to distinguish the area seemed comparable and a good option in the Main Street area.
- Did the Code ensure that lighting at the neighborhood street level was functional as far as the spacing and height of street trees not interfering or blocking the lighting? In years past, the Commission had talked about the challenges of developing a Street Tree Plan so that the lighting remained functional. Did the Code address that issue or was it all part of plan review?
  - **Ms. Bateschell** confirmed it was primarily part of plan review, and it was constantly evolving, especially as the City had a lot of facilities on the street. There was a constant balance between curb cuts, lights, trees, LIDA facilities, etc. as a lot of things had to be provided in that space. On the Main Street, for example, the City was trying to balance the type of trees being calling for in relationship to the type of lighting and spacing, so there were some spacing standards for both to balance at site plan review.

**Mr. Dills** continued the presentation via PowerPoint, reviewing the strategies to implement the Master Plan into the Comprehensive Plan, which would also require amendments to the Transportation System Plan, as well as applying the appropriate zoning to each property during annexation and development review. He reminded the process for adopting the infrastructure funding plan would begin in January. (Slide 27-30)

Comments and questions from the Planning Commission regarding Master Plan Chapters 5 through 8 were as follows with responses by the project team as noted:

- The BPA easement had recommendations of how it could be used with a network of trail systems or open space, but was there any teeth to make sure a developer did not use the BPA easement as RV storage for an HOA, for example? Did the City have anything that could prohibit certain functions so that the easement was prioritized for public space?
  - **Ms. Bateschell** clarified any uses within the BPA easement had to be arranged with them, so it had to be something the BPA agreed upon and RV storage was not a use they would agree to. The City had conversations with the BPA about what was being outlined in the Master Plan so far which were generally uses the BPA supported, and they supported some of the initial

conceptual, high-level drawings in the Master Plan. There would be some restrictions, particularly around height and the radius around each of the footings of each of the towers to ensure security and access for their facilities, such as any underground equipment for example. The City would have to do a much more detailed coordination with them with regard to path, trail, or LIDA facility locations to avoid conflicts with any underground equipment and to ensure the appropriate spacing from the towers' footings. All uses had to be organized with the BPA and part of an easement agreement since it was their easement.

- Would a community garden be something BPA would generally be open to and if not, should the City add community garden to the list of potential uses just to bring it more top of mind of the developer?
  - **Ms. Bateschell** replied the City could put it in that list and worst-case scenario, BPA would not allow it, but adding community garden to the Master Plan as a priority discussion item would be fine. City Staff would follow up with the BPA about the question.
- Was there anything Staff wanted to say about the public comments that were received?
  - **Ms. Bateschell** noted the comments were received on Friday, October 14<sup>th</sup>, and given the City Council meeting on Monday, there was not a lot of time to research and provide comment, but she did respond because she had gotten the information request, read it, and forwarded it to the Planning Commission.
    - One question she had was whether there needs to be a designated change from Type 2 to Type 1 along Stafford Rd, because from the description in the October 14<sup>th</sup> letter, it seemed like it meant the type and form of housing being discussed was housing that would be allowed in Type 2. She followed up asking for potentially, photographs or images of products the development team envisioned potentially putting along Stafford that was behind their request, so everyone could visually see and understand, if those fit what the Planning Commission and community had been discussing. The community had determined to put Type 2 along Stafford Rd, which was discussed when the project team went through the different options for the land use and the urban form and how the transect should play out. Various options were considered by the community and the Commission which included a lot of discussion about where to center the most dense buildings or housing, and how that should fan out within the community. There was also a lot of discussion about the central location of the park closer along Brisband because the Main Street would have the tallest buildings, but they would be distinct from housing along Stafford Rd. She remembered that being a part of the conversation at Planning Commission and knew the Commission would want to understand how that compared to what was being provided in the testimony and the request, so she essentially just responded by asking for images or pictures so that could be better understood to determine if they were talking about the same thing, and so the Planning Commission could have more information to consider the request when hearing the public comments. The requested information was received at 5:45 pm today, which was very responsive of AKS and West Hills considering she was not able to respond until Tuesday.

The Commission took a brief recess at 7:45 pm. The meeting was reconvened at 7:50 pm.

**Chair Heberlein** called for public comment.

**Mimi Doukas, AKS Engineering**, representing West Hills Development, said the developer appreciated the back and forth with City Staff and the Planning Commission, noting they were talking about the

same topics as a few weeks ago. Following Staff's advice, West Hills wanted to provide more documentation that gave an image of what was being requested and why, as well as some context. They were all very preliminary, and not necessarily the architectural styles, but they provided a sense of the urban form and scale of what West Hills was talking about and how it might transition.

- West Hills was still not 100% sure how it would all be implemented and what the rules were going to be, so they were still feeling it out on Type 1, Type 2, Type 3. Its main feedback was along Stafford Rd, West Hills desired to put garden style apartments, so three-story apartments, which was a good transition from the Main Street, which would be a four-story structure with retail mixed use on the main floor and three stories of residential above. Physically that still matched the transect that had been discussed. West Hills' concern with the Type 2 designation was that it said it was a two-story urban form with the option of a third story for certain state-mandated housing types, and it was not clear if garden style apartments fell under that category.
- So, there was a level of uncertainty, which developers did not like. If West Hills had the Level 1, it would have more assurance that the three-story structure was anticipated by everybody involved. That was why West Hills wanted to change that urban form designation along Stafford Rd to the Type 1. In looking through the descriptions in the Master Plan document about Type 1, Type 2, Type 3, it sounded like West Hills could live with the Type 1 designation around the park, so that was pulled that out of its request. West Hills was still guessing, but as far as it could tell, that was something it could live with.
- As Mr. Dills pointed out, particularly along Stafford Rd, as seen in the exhibits, the team had added the wetland in that next-to-the-cell tower property, there was a narrow strip of land that was not conducive to traditional block patterns. Access was going to be extremely challenging through there which was part of why West Hills thought garden apartments was a good urban form, a good design option, for that piece. If that was garden apartments, it was going to be a little strange to have garden apartments south of the main street on Stafford Rd and not have them north of Main Street along Stafford Rd, and that consistent streetscape was a good thing.
- The Frog Pond West side of Stafford Rd was not a consistent streetscape with the church and some out parcels. It. Moving farther north was new development, Frog Pond Ridge and Frog Pond Crossing that had the Frog Pond elements such as the brick wall and homes designed with a proper orientation to Stafford Rd; that was a little bit different. To the south, it was a little more piecemeal, so it gave the community more flexibility for how West Hills [we] treated that area.
- West Hills was also concerned about language in the Master Plan about variety of housing types within each block which was still a really hard design component to implement due to the single dimension of lot depth. Many were on 100 ft lot depths, so it was hard to change from a town home at an 85-ft lot depth to a single-family home with a 100-ft lot depth. The depth does not move across a rectangular block. There were a lot of opinions about whether variety should be at a block, community level, or lot by lot; it was really subjective. West Hills had real concerns on how to implement that, particularly as it got into the Type 1 urban form, just based on the logistics of how a block works. They had a good design to do a garden apartment, a single family detached house, then a town house and then garden style apartment; it would be disjointed. So, West Hills would like to do consistent garden-style apartments along Stafford Rd.
- Regarding the Master Plan document, she noted Figure 15 was titled "Frog Pond East and South Master Plan" and should be changed to avoid confusion between the land use map and the title of the entire document.

- The legend also needed to be a bit more descriptive, noting a stranger would not have a clue what Type 1, Type 2, Type 3 were. A subheading within the legend could state that they were urban forms".
- The sub-districts were probably going to be a bit of a challenge the way they were currently designed. The Azar property had blocks that ran north-south, as seen in the provided sketch, but West Hills had a development type on the west side of the Azar property, a bit different housing type in the middle of the Azar property, and a little bit different type moving farther east. West Hills had variety from east to west if the City drew the sub-districts that way, but not as much variety north to south, so those sub-districts did not quite work the way the developer envisioned things.
- In viewing the Stafford Rd cross section, there were two, one-way drive aisles that were 11 ft of pavement with a median in the middle and 11 ft of pavement was narrower than an alley, so the Fire Department would probably not like that cross section. There was a logical reason they needed 20 ft of hard surface in most of their corridors. She encouraged the project team to check in with the Fire Department on that cross section.

**Chair Heberlein** noted it was a challenge getting it late, but it was good information. He asked if Staff saw a conflict in the Type 1 versus Type 2 designation and the need for changing it to a Type 1 to accommodate the submitted testimony.

- **Ms. Bateschell** stated first part of the answer was to look at some of the architectural examples, in particular the large one provided as the garden style walkup apartments that would be provided along Stafford Rd, and whether that somewhat aligned with the Planning Commission envisioned when talking about the Type 2 urban form. Some of the discussion had the Type 1 more central and the Type 2 closer to Stafford Rd adjacent to Frog Pond West. Some images of a three-story garden style apartments discussed and presented in the letter fit the description of Type 2, so would there actually need to be a map change to reflect that because, in her opinion, that was something the process envisioned as potentially being built in Type 2. There were a variety of things that could be built in Type 2, and in part that was because the process envisioned a four-story mixed-use building along the Main Street, so the proposal would be a step down. And, it would not be a four-story building facade all the way along Stafford Rd, but it would have that variety, that step down, and a better transition across the way to Frog Pond West. The Commission envisioned some three-story buildings within the Type 2 throughout the neighborhood, and four-story buildings could be in the Type 1, which created that transition down. A lot of the houses in Type 3, the lowest density, were probably going to be two-story homes, and so it kind of created that transect. She believed what was described in the letter seemed like it fit in Type 2, but she could not say that with certainty before seeing images and hearing from the Commission who had been balancing all the input received from the community. She wanted to make sure the images actually aligned with what the Commission had been picturing when having discussions about the Type 2 versus the Type 1, and it might not. So, the first piece was to have some discussion to see if it lined up.
- She understood the distinction and concern about what was written in the text for the Type 2 urban form, and that the Type 2 did say that buildings were intended to be two stories with three stories allowed under applicable State law for certain housing categories. The certain housing categories referenced there meant three stories had to be allowed for middle housing. If these were units beyond the unit types for middle housing, which they appeared to be based on the pictures, they would not meet the definition by State law of middle housing and the City would not have to allow three stories. That being said, she did not know if the Commission

definitively believed that strongly that three stories would only be allowed for middle housing; maybe it should also be allowed for multi-family housing, which could be discussed. There were options in terms of how to potentially address the question and issue on table which was, if West Hills' proposal aligned with what the Commission had been thinking for Type 2, then maybe it was relevant to keep it as Type 2, but make a wording or verbiage change, a decision around what to allow to three stories or not in Type 2, or if Type 2 should really be as presented in the document, and then there could be discussion about whether the Commission wanted to modify the map and whether a modification of the map was consistent with the conversation over the last six months.

**Commissioner Karr** recalled the Commission had originally said Type 2, because it was blending into Frog Pond West. However, the commercial section was going to be four-story, so it made sense that the surrounding area could have three-story. He liked the idea as it builds up on the multi-family functionality and affordability. He did not want to necessarily change the description of the type, but was more in favor of changing the map. Changing the type opened that type up almost across the board, and he was uncertain if that was the Commission's intent. If the intent was to focus more on that subject plot of land and say the presentation made sense, he would rather change the map.

**Ms. Bateschell** added the Commission did discuss how many stories to have around the neighborhood park as well, which could help inform the decision about whether to change the verbiage or the map. In those prior conversations, the Commission seemed to prefer three-story buildings around the neighborhood park, which might be a verbiage change versus a map change.

Whether the Commission wanted more height on the Main Street and ensure some step down along the rest of Stafford, because making it Type 1 could result in four stories all along Stafford because Type 1 said buildings two to four stories and close to the street. She believed that was how it was described. There were a few moving pieces in terms of whether the Commission wanted that distinction on the Main Street versus the rest of Stafford Rd, and what did the Commission want to see around the park, in addition to what was desired t along Stafford Rd as all those pieces weighed into it.

**Ms. Doukas** noted another question was did the Commission want four-stories in Type 1. Four story on Main Street had been consistently discussed; however, four-story outside of Main Street was probably a valid question.

**Commissioner Mesbah** noted when discussing the experience going north or south on Stafford Rd, the Commission wanted to make sure that as one went from rural to urban, it slowly went up, a three-story to then four-story and back down made sense, especially when tied to the boulevard design for Stafford Rd. However, the big example of the garden style apartment, or whatever was proposed there, should be oriented toward Stafford Rd, so it was not turning its back on Stafford, but looking upon the boulevard and across the Boulevard to the church and everything else in Frog Pond West. That made Stafford more of an urban street, which addressed the question of expanding the road because it would ruin the whole sense of that stretch, because apartments would be looking at a very busy street, which was not currently what was being proposed. The proposal was fine if it respected and faced the boulevard. Some of the smaller examples on the third page would make a lot more sense.

- What happened around the park was an interesting question. Did the Commission want to maximize that kind of view upon the park and open space and allow for a three-story there? He

was fine with that as well as a more dense, two-story looking on the park. Putting a big wall next to an open space was not always a good idea.

**Ms. Doukas** clarified that was what West Hills sketched. Looking at the site plan on the southern portion of the garden style apartments, the buildings were to the Stafford side with parking on the backside, and that could certainly be done north of Main Street as well.

**Commissioner Mesbah** added north of Main Street had more room and could have both, as long as it did not have the back of the building on Stafford Rd.

**Ms. Bateschell** confirmed the garden style apartments did not meet the State's middle housing definition. Duplexes, triplex, fourplex, cottage housing were the State-mandated and definitions provided for middle housing. Units that appeared to have more than a fourplex, which seemed to be shown in the images, would not meet the definition of middle housing at the State level. She confirmed they could meet the definition of the 80% to 120% of the median income. When talking about the Housing Variety Policy garden style apartments would absolutely be in the bucket of housing types that would help the City achieve more market affordable housing opportunities or choices, which was probably why that and the form related to Type 2 felt like it fit.

**Commissioner Willard** stated for her, affordability took priority.

**Chair Heberlein** added that did not mean the City would get affordable, only that it was technically feasible. Compared to some of the costs for apartments or condos in the Lake Oswego developments, which were by no stretch of the imagination affordable, but could have been. That would be the challenge the Commission would face; everything would still depend on the developer.

**Commissioner Willard** agreed the Commission faced that challenge with every housing type.

**Ms. Doukas** added that was partly why West Hills provided that distinction between the Main Street multi-family and the garden style, which was designed to lower that price point. It did not have the elevators, the common shared space, the lobbies, etc., so it was functionally designed to keep the price point lower. Whereas the Main Street was an investment in retail space, it had to have fit and finish, elevators, etc. and at that point it had to go to the higher market place.

**Chair Heberlein** believed the three-story garden style form seemed appropriate. Changing it to Type 1 and then opening it up to four-stories threw him off a bit. He leaned toward a text change to allow the three-story, multi-family in Type 2, just so it maintained a bit more of that transition from Frog Pond West and then also going north and south down to the more reasonable form.

**Commissioner Karr** added that meant the Commission would open all types to that and there was considerable acreage in Type 2.

**Ms. Bateschell** noted three-stories between 25 ft and 35 ft was typically allowed throughout all Wilsonville residential neighborhoods and the City was required to allow three stories for all middle housing. Even in Type 1, while the City predominantly called for one- to two-story homes, some would likely end up single-family detached, and if one ended up being a townhouse or a duplex, it could absolutely be three stories. She agreed changing the language, whether for a certain housing type or any housing type, would open the possibility of up to three stories.

**Chair Heberlein** asked if that came down to identifying minimum and maximum types of products that had been discussed. Was that how the housing type was controlled?

**Ms. Bateschell** replied the variety standards would likely impact that as well as the height of the buildings, though no decisions had been made about the number of housing variety buckets. Though uncertain, if the developer was providing two-story town homes, two-story single-family detached, and two-story cottages, they likely all be the same height. However, three-story town homes, a two-story single-family detached and maybe single-story ADUs would present more fluctuation in building height within the same area.

**Mr. Dills** added if the Commission was headed toward the three-story, what he called the friendly face to Stafford approach that made sense for all the reasons stated, a couple of other things got implied about that. One was how the friendly face was actually executed with buildings. The brick wall treatment was on the west side of Stafford Rd and this approach would imply there was no brick wall approach on the east side. Another consideration was how the portals into the building were arranged. It was common for a garden style apartment to have a single, central breezeway portal up into the building. If that was the only way into the building, then what else would present the friendly face? Were there some porches, balconies, or something else that was semi-public space? The third consideration was the continuousness along Stafford Rd. It was about 600 ft from Advance Rd to the Brisband blocks. Three buildings had some space between them, with maybe some variation would go a long way towards breaking down the continuous wall impression. West Hills' pictures showed articulation, materials, peaked roofs—all nicely done architecture. How all three monopoly pieces fit together had to be considered to create a really nice total effect, and the landscaping did part of that, too. While beyond master planning, the considerations were part of a design package.

**Ms. Bateschell** confirmed the Commission did not have to make a decision tonight, but she asked that the Commissioners about any further input as the project team considered West Hills' requests.

**Chair Heberlein** noted the next time the Commission would see the Draft would be at the public hearing, so the Commission needed to figure out what it wanted to see in a final version, a motion was made to change it at the public hearing.

**Ms. Bateschell** said she preferred the Commissioners' strongest opinions on the matter, noting Staff had a few items to follow up with; some were responses to questions which could be done by email. If there were a few changes also made relative to that, the Staff could communicate that to you as a group, but any discussion about it really needed to occur in the meeting. Staff would put forth a recommendation based on the discussion and any recommendation made to Staff tonight.

**Commissioner Gallagher** stated she liked the illustration with the garden apartments which provided a wonderful, gracious front to the neighborhood, so she supported that if there was a way of making it work. She was not sure how to fix that within the Master Plan document, but believed the team was capable of doing that without impacting everything else because it was a complicated task.

**Ms. Bateschell** understood if Commissioner Gallagher had no strong opinion on the fix, adding it might be more helpful to understand whether the placement of the garden style apartments in other areas of Type 2 was appropriate.

**Commissioner Gallagher** agreed it was appropriate.

**Commissioner Tusinski** stated she would be most in favor of a verbiage change for Type 2 to allow three-story, multi-family but she did not want to open that area up to a four-story situation. She could see the garden style apartments in other areas, especially around the neighborhood park.

**Commissioner Karr** said he was still somewhat reluctant to open it as he was not sure about the ramifications throughout the Type 2, but he was okay with a verbiage change.

**Commissioner Willard** stated she was in favor of the garden style apartments along the corridor, noting she leaned towards allowing garden style apartments in Type 2.

**Chair Heberlein** stated he was still in favor of the verbiage change and shared Commissioner Karr's concern about the potential ramifications. He understood the concern was about a proliferation of multi-family throughout East and South and noted the public shared the same concern. Perhaps, that would be something for the team to think about moving forward, and if there was anything the Commission needed to think about or put in place to help ensure that did not happen.

**Commissioner Karr** noted that could be handled through the minimums and maximums.

**Ms. Bateschell** confirmed Staff could definitely have that conversation and think it through. The housing types for the Code had not been officially categorized. This was just the strategy that would be part of getting at the housing variety policies in the Code. Staff would weigh all of those things over and play out the scenarios with the project team to see what that could look and if it was handled through the variety standards to determine the best recommendations. The previous roundtable gave the team some clear direction on what to consider in order to return with a recommendation.

**Mr. Dills** added the team would couple that with the concept of the buildings providing a friendly face to Stafford Rd and would flesh out what that meant in the Master Plan language.

**Commissioner Karr** stated his concern was that early on the Commission discussed not wanting all single-family in West and all multi-family over in East and South. The idea was to have variety and spread it out. That was the only concern with opening Type 2. He liked what was presented and commended the project team on a good job.

**Ms. Bateschell** confirmed that was all the project team had and that the Commission had responded to the public input and provided Staff with some direction on that.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:29 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

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