



PLANNING COMMISSION

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 8, 2023

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. Consideration of the February 8, 2023 PC Meeting Minutes



PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

February 8, 2023, at 6:00 PM

City Hall Council Chambers & Remote Video Conferencing

Draft PC Minutes are to be reviewed and approved at the March 8, 2023 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, February 8, 2023. Chair Heberlein called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m., followed by roll call. Those present:

Planning Commission: Ron Heberlein, Jennifer Willard, Andrew Karr, Kamran Mesbah, Kathryn Neil, Olive Gallagher, and Nicole Hendrix

City Staff: Miranda Bateschell, Daniel Pauly, Zach Weigel, 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.

Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager, suggested asking for citizen input again, later in the meeting.

There was no citizen input at this time.

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

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

Commissioner Mesbah amended the minutes, noting Planning Director Miranda Bateschell was not present at the January 11, 2023, meeting.

Commissioner Hendrix moved to approve the January 11, 2023, Planning Commission Minutes as amended. Commissioner Gallagher seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

WORK SESSION

2. Frog Pond East and South Implementation-Transportation System Plan Master Plan (Pauly)

Dan Pauly, Planning Manager, stated the Transportation System Plan (TSP) Amendment was one of several implementation steps for the Frog Pond East and South Master Plan adopted at the end of 2022. The TSP was fairly straightforward and took the projects from the Master Plan into the TSP. He

introduced Jenna Bogert and Scott Mansur from DKS and Associates who would do most of the presenting.

Jenna Bogert, DKS, presented the TSP Amendment via PowerPoint, reviewing the definition of a TSP, why the amendments were needed, and highlighting the proposed revisions to the TSP Standards as well as the transportation projects to be added, noting all eight Frog Pond East and South projects in the Master Plan were identified as high priority projects in the TSP in order to be prioritized for funding and improvements. (Slides 7 & 8) She clarified the proposed amendment only related to the Frog Pond East and South Master Plan; no other changes or updates were being made to the TSP.

Scott Mansur, DKS, confirmed a pedestrian symbol should be shown with Urban Upgrade Project 6 (UU-06) on Stafford Road because there would be a protected pedestrian crossing at Frog Pond Lane and Stafford Rd. (Slides 7 & 8)

Feedback from the Commission was as follows with responses to Commissioner questions as noted:

- The maps seem inconsistent on whether the Advance Rd cross section extends east of 60th Ave. The road transition could act as an additional traffic calming feature so people would start slowing down as they reached that neighborhood area.
 - Zach Weigel, City Engineer, explained one discussion the Commission/Staff had about the Advance Rd cross section was to see how development occurred and whether those bike lanes needed to be extended east of 60th Ave because the urban reserve ends there, so there would be no future expansion to the east.
 - Mr. Pauly added bikes would go up onto the shared path from there to connect to the regional trail system because there was no bike destination to the east.
- Mr. Mansur clarified Boeckman and Wilsonville Roads were shown as minor arterials due to the amount of residential along the streets, which should be slower and narrower with medians. Typically, the classification of streets as major arterial versus minor arterial or collector had a lot to do with the road design and what the City was trying to provide in terms of services and function to the traveling public. Major arterials were typically wider and faster streets.
- Was the street layout on Boeckman Rd significantly different than Advance Rd? The layouts cross sections looked similar, but the roads were classified differently.
 - Mr. Mansur replied, similar to Advance Road, the cross section provided access to the street and was not a major east/west through street from a volume standpoint, which was why there was a collector option on Advance Rd east of Stafford Road.
- Regarding considerations made for how the street standards would support public transit, Mr. Mansur noted the routing for Frog Pond Lane in Frog Pond West showed a loop for transit as the neighborhood developed, and he believed there would be a loop buses could circulate the north and south portions of Frog Pond.
 - Ms. Bogert added a transit figure in the Master Plan showed the planned transit loop through the East neighborhood that went down the Main Street into the South neighborhood with a stop near the school. The cross sections were sized to accommodate transit and school buses, and the pedestrian multi-modal facilities were comfortable for pedestrians to get to those bus stops.
 - Mr. Pauly noted the transit routing had been coordinated with SMART, especially the facilities in South by the middle school which would be used by city buses and school buses.

- Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, added that during the Town Center planning, Staff had spent a lot of time working with SMART on the designs and cross sections for different streets, including the Main Street, to accommodate bus traffic and bus stops where needed. The Main Street design in Frog Pond East and South borrows the cross section and modifies it slightly to provide some on street parking which also provides the spacing needs if a pull-out bus stop is located in that area.
- Mr. Mansur confirmed traffic would increase once Boeckman Road was redesigned and the dip was removed, especially as the new houses in Frog Pond were occupied.
 - Ms. Bogert added the projects identified in the TSP would be able to manage the level of traffic and buses and transit routes would be able to use that area of Boeckman, which was not possible today.
 - Mr. Mansur noted the Frog Pond Plan used the City’s travel demand model which evaluated the 20-year expected growth within the city. The future-year model assumed the improvements on Boeckman and the future traffic volumes. Some of the recommendations for transportation improvements in the Frog Pond Plan came from those future projections within the City’s travel demand model.

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

Dan Pauly, Planning Manager presented, via PowerPoint, the second package of draft Development Code Amendments for Frog Pond East and South, reviewing Housing Variety requirements on both a development-wide and block-wide scale and how to ensure compliance of those requirements over the lifetime of the project. Also highlighted were the Code amendments to integrate and encourage ADUs, as well as the integration of “mobility-friendly units.” He noted a specific memorandum was included in the Appendix about encouraging ADUs, and that Kate Rogers from MIG was available to answer questions.

Comments and feedback from the Commissioners were as follows with questions addressed by Staff as noted:

Housing Variety (Development Level)

- Mr. Pauly clarified households below 80 percent median family income would qualify for affordable housing, which would be required to maintain affordability status for 10 years.
 - In talking to Council and as indicated in the Master Plan, the goal when setting the Zoning standards was to avoid creating any barriers to affordable housing. While the City did not have funding for affordable housing yet, it did not want to have zoning barriers should funding be obtained.
- Did maintaining affordability status for 10 years apply to the entire complex or individual leases?
 - Mr. Pauly replied that was a good question. For mixed-income projects, there was no threshold for affordable housing, though one could be added. The draft as written anticipated affordability would apply to 100 percent of the project, to the building or series of buildings.
- Mr. Pauly clarified a cottage cluster would be a collection of ADU-sized buildings, but typically an ADU was a single cottage that was accessory next to a larger home on a lot.
- Commissioners Karr and Hendrix liked that 4.5-acre gross development areas were treated slightly differently than smaller development areas to allow for more variety and housing types.

- Mr. Pauly clarified the 5 percent minimum use for a housing category to count would ensure more than one token unit was built while still being low enough to not conflict with other standards.
 - He estimated the 5 percent would equate to 8 or 9 units in a two-acre area. Of those units, five or six could be detached homes along with a duplex/triplex building.
 - Smaller development areas with a 5 percent threshold would see only one or two units, which was why there were two-unit categories. A three-unit category would conflict with the different standards.

The Commission agreed with the draft Housing Variety amendments as presented for the Development Level.

Housing Variety (Block Level)

- Mr. Pauly clarified that without knowing what would be developed across the street in the future, a developer could not count units across the street to determine the housing variety/category minimum. It would either all be on one side of the street, or if it was internal to a subdivision where the developer would also be doing something across the street, then they could take advantage of counting the units toward the minimum number of categories.
- Questions were raised about whether variety on one side of the street would facilitate that the owner on the other side of the street would have a similar variety if the street separated the properties, or would that allow the person that develops last to not have the variety, because the variety was already met on one side of the street? Perhaps, they would not be able to have as many of one unit in order to maintain that same variety, or would that be required?
 - Ms. Bateschell noted the standard had not been written yet. At this point, the discussion regarded the opportunity to count in-line and across the street. Staff would like feedback on whether future development could count towards variety type. The question was if it mattered whether the overall variety or block level variety came first. Later development would still have to meet all the development-level variety standards, so larger developments would still be required to do at least three different housing unit categories. Developers would still have to hit minimum and maximum percentages at the development level. At the block level, the policy question was whether the Commission would still want to require a later developer to have additional variety along their in-line frontage, or essentially allow the variety presented in the previous development to count toward block variety. It was a question about timing of development as well as the end goal. If the end goal was getting variety, it could still be achieved at the block level; it was a matter of whether there was additional variety or not.
 - Mr. Pauly confirmed there would be a fair number of situations with multiple owners on opposite sides of the street, and more in Frog Pond South than in East.
 - Ms. Bateschell noted the situation may arise along 60th Ave in Frog Pond South, however it would only be a portion of 60th because of the school and park. The situation might also arise on a portion of the east/west street south of the school.

Commissioner Karr suggested adding something that if two different owners were on opposite sides of the street, housing variety must be maintained across both developments. Neither developer could count the other side of the street towards the variety requirement, the variety would have to be within each development.

- Mr. Pauly clarified there were two different varieties. Developers still had to meet the variety percentages shown in the table. (Slide 7) However, would people know or care who built what from a functional standpoint when the development was all built out?
- Ms. Bateschell believed something could be added and invited input from the other Commissioners.
- Mr. Pauly clarified the City would not want or expect to see 25-unit apartment complexes in a row or even five buildings in a row on one street, so variety would not be an issue.
 - Ms. Bateschell added the sub-bullets referred to the number of lots that were in-line, not necessarily the number of units. (Slide 10) The draft standards specified that once lots were separated by streets, they were no longer in line with one another, so there would not be more than x number of multi-family lots or Type I because a street, park or some other entity would separate the lots into another block and start another set of in-line lots to consider.
 - Mr. Pauly noted the required number of categories based on the number of lots in-line would come into play with detached homes on individual lots rather than block-length apartment buildings.

Commissioner Willard believed block level variety would only come into play along 60th Ave in South on the east side of the school and the park, where there is currently a long row of smaller parcels that would be gobbled up at different rates and different times. On that long road, the size of the lots did not seem amenable to having block-level variety. Variety would have to be along the entire road, not just along one parcel.

- Mr. Pauly responded 60th Ave would be broken up by streets; existing Code standards for maximum block lengths would interact with block level variety as well. He had done studies and tested the numbers out on Villebois and found there were rarely more than 12 lots in-line along a block; most blocks had five or fewer, or five to 12 lots. As Ms. Bateschell indicated, when lots were broken up by streets or open spaces, of which there were many, then the in-line number count reset.

Chair Heberlein stated the question was whether the Commission agreed with block level variety and if so, was it looking for variety requirements more towards one side of the street on both sides of the street, regardless of where the developer line was.

Mr. Pauly also asked the Commission's thoughts on backyard variety. From the Staff's perspective, residents would talk and interact with their in-line neighbors or neighbors across the street rather than their backyard neighbors due to fences.

- He confirmed developers would also be required to meet design requirements through architectural standards.

Commissioner Mesbah said variety would not be an issue along most of 60th Ave because the park and school were across the road. He believed allowing across-the-street flexibility was unnecessary and was causing difficulty and questions about different owners potentially being across the street. Variety should be required, period, with no flexibility across the street; simple.

Mr. Pauly noted one example was a West Hills development that had townhouses across from detached homes. Was that enough variety on a block or would each side of the street need to have some variety?

Commissioner Willard believed variety came with architectural standards and the actual category standards. She was not sure about specifying that much variability in the categories.

Commissioner Hendrix added it seemed unnecessary and restrictive to think about the variety was across the street. The proposed block standards seemed to be on the right track. Perhaps Staff could discuss the language with Staff from different cities to get a sense of whether the language conveyed the intended meaning.

- Mr. Pauly added Staff would continue to test some of the scenarios and continue to refine some of the standards.

Commissioner Gallagher noted the Commission had spoken last year about not wanting large buildings along one side of Stafford Street and it seemed that was now part of the discussion.

Chair Heberlein said he leaned towards the street-level variety and not one-side variety, adding it would be helpful to see the difference between having variety on one side versus both sides of the street. If five or less were in line, then both sides of the street would have two category types while five to 12 in-line units would require three, where there would still be some flexibility while getting the variety, and the entire block would not be one single product.

Mr. Pauly explained he had applied the proposed standards to a single-family subdivision in Villebois to show what variety could look like, noting he believed some portions would obviously be more townhouses or detached homes; however, with the block level and overall variety requirements, there was variety on other blocks. The yellow indicated the townhouse category, salmon indicated ADUs. (Slide 11)

Discussion continued as follows with questions addressed by Mr. Pauly as noted:

- Mr. Pauly clarified that without the block-level variety, clustering housing types made sense for site planning and other reasons as certain parts of the site would lend themselves better to one product or another. The question was how much of that should be broken up using block level variety.
- It appeared that the category types were clustered together in different sections, so all the similar looking buildings were in one spot, as opposed to alternating housing categories in each section.
- The Commission discussed having variety at the block level, so affordable housing was more integrated and not separated from other housing.
- The in-line lots in the diagram were in the 5-to-12-unit range, so the City would need to require more variety than what was proposed in the current draft Code to achieve what was in the diagram. (Slide 11)
- Commissioners commented that more variety was needed on the block.
 - Mr. Pauly clarified the diagram was based on block level, but in order to get less than 50 percent of Category D, he had to introduce additional townhouse units that would not otherwise be required by the block level variety.
 - For block level variety, the Commission was looking for three categories all in one block, like the block shown on the left side of the diagram, whereas other blocks were all one category.
 - Being placed around a park, it was difficult to see what it would look like on both sides. Having one category on each side would be okay.

- Mr. Pauly noted along Cherbourg Lane, more variety could be achieved by replacing the Category B (yellow) with other categories if both sides of the street counted for classification purposes. (Slide 11)
 - The lower right-hand side showed all Category B (yellow) on a lot of little lots; assuming they were townhouse buildings, only every three or four units counted as one lot because they were three- or four-plexes. He confirmed they were not across the street from each other but shared an alley, which was slightly different.
 - Villebois had some good examples of single-homes and townhouses in a row of which he would provide pictures. Staff had received some good guidance and this conversation would continue.
- Ms. Bateschell asked if Mr. Pauly could quickly cover the size of the project in terms of acreage and how far apart the areas were. depicted in the slide and noted the blocks were not very far apart.
 - He clarified the diagram covered about 10-acre area and one portion along the park was about 200 feet long.
- Ms. Bateschell encouraged the Commission to keep in mind that the space depicted in Slide 11 was not that large.
 - Mr. Pauly noted one portion along the park was about 200 feet long and suggested the Commissioners drive through Claremont to get an understanding of the space.
- Staff was encouraged to make the diagram colors darker, but the visual helped paint a clearer picture about how housing variety would be applied.

Variety and Review Process

- Was any data available that related to affordability when variety was enforced? If the City forced developers to intermix variety, would their costs skyrocket and the houses no longer affordable? Some economies of scale were involved with similar sized units that were more repeatable.
 - Mr. Pauly agreed, adding the City was trying to strike a balance between acknowledging costs and not letting costs run the show. The City wanted the balance for variety to be functional and developable.

ADU Integration

- Mr. Pauly noted a specific memorandum was prepared as part of the Master Plan to encourage ADUs, which was a goal of the UGB expansion. The memo, now part of the appendix, made a number of recommendations Staff wanted to bring into the Code, which he reviewed.

The Commission agreed with the direction Staff was taking with ADU integration.

Mobility-Friendly Unit Integration

- Mr. Pauly clarified the standards for mobile-friendly units were not applied on a sliding scale, but Staff could look at scenarios where it might make sense to do so. For example, it might make sense to remove requirements for those developers building less than a certain number of units. There would still be a number of units available in the overall master plan, so requiring a developer to build one of six homes as a mobility-friendly unit would not move the needle overall for the neighborhood. Staff would explore that more.

- Requiring mobility-friendly units did not mean those who needed the units could buy them. Instead of definitions of full-mobility or partial-mobility friendly, perhaps require that units be easily converted to mobility friendly units. For example, constructing the front entrance so a ramp could easily be installed post-development for home owners who needed it. Criteria could enable units to qualify as mobility friendly without being fully mobility friendly at development, which would reduce development costs while still providing the concept of having mobility-friendly units available, and then perhaps more units close to mobility friendly would be available to actually be able to impact those who need the units.
- Commissioner Gallagher clarified no space was needed for ramp installation, noting her experience as a disabled person and of friends who had been mobile but were suddenly disabled. The challenge was to make sure mobility friendly units were available to those who need it and could afford it, and no one knows when they might become disabled and need a mobility-friendly living space because accessibility to everyday things suddenly becomes a challenge.
- Just because the units would be available did not mean the people who needed them would get them.
 - Mr. Pauly noted it was often the timing of who was ready to sell when that unit was complete.
- Developers with seven units would sell to the first seven people who wanted to buy, not looking for someone who had mobility challenges to sell one mobility-friendly unit, though they may tell a mobility-challenged buyer they had a unit they preferred to sell to them.
- Commissioner Gallagher noted having a bedroom on the first floor of a two-story unit was a step in the right direction. A first-floor bedroom was a selling point to seniors and allowed younger buyers to think about the future because it could be converted to a master in the future if needed.

Chair Heberlein called for public comment.

Mimi Doukas, AKS Engineering, representing West Hills Development, stated West Hills had tied up the Azar Property located in Frog Pond East at Advance and Stafford Road. She distributed a preliminary layout for the Azar property to the Commission. The developer had missed the January meeting; however, they wanted to be sure to participate in the process. They had met with Staff and appreciated that some of those comments were reflected in what the Commission heard tonight. Her comments were as follows:

- She understood the list of minimum densities by subdistrict would be applied across an entire Stage 1 Master Plan, so the developer would be able to meet the densities across whichever bundle of subdistricts West Hills had. The preliminary layout showed the subdistricts in the table at the bottom. West Hills would not meet the subdistrict densities outlined for each individual subdistrict; there was more density in Subdistrict E4 and less than the minimum density shown for Subdistricts E5 and E6. The layout reflected what the Commission had seen before, and the developer believed it was a good plan. The density for the project was located around the Main Street, the active place with the highest walkability, so West Hills believed that was the right way to distribute density and wanted to make sure that was where the final code was headed. The developer understood the original idea behind the Frog Pond structure was to go on urban form rather than densities. Density was kind of a funny thing in today's world with Middle Housing; density was not unlimited but was an entirely different conversation than before Middle Housing.

- Development standards were also impacted by Middle Housing. Some development standards were listed for lot dimensions, minimum lot areas, setbacks, etc. and she encouraged the Commission to be flexible in some of the minimum dimensions for lot size and lot area.
- The Commission was focused on housing variety and affordability, which would be a huge challenge, especially with new development. While she understood the design expectations being put into the plan, those expectations came with a price. Whenever those layers were added, the City needed to balance out some of the affordability components and be less restrictive on lot sizes to achieve desired density. The densities shown in the sub districts could not be achieved with some of the lot dimensional standards presented in the table, which was part of the reason the developer wanted to share a sketch with the Commission.
- She encouraged Staff to do case studies to make sure the Code standards work. A standard might be a good idea in its own category but might not work when layered with others; not everything could be achieved.
- The developer also talked with Staff about some of the open space ratios shown in the drafts and had included the required open space park within Subdistrict E5 as shown in the sketch. The Master Plan also called for three-quarters of an acre of open space plaza in E4, a mixed-use district. Three-quarters of an acre was a lot of plaza, almost 35,000 square feet. West Hills was not opposed to plaza but needed to make sure it was right-sized and did not result in strange hardscape throughout the mixed-use district. Subdistrict E6 also called for three-quarters of an acre of open space, which was fine. However, the language as currently written said the open space could not be within the BPA corridor, which she did not understand. It sounded like Staff believed that language might change, and the company encouraged that change. Putting open space within the BPA corridor was an excellent and efficient way to get open space, though it was important to ensure the land was improved and not just left-over space.
- Housing variety was one of the bigger topics and a big reason why a sketch was provided. The sketch included a variety of housing types mixed across the plan: multi-family, mixed use, single-family detached, both front and rear loaded, as well as single-family attached, alley loaded. Multi-family was placed adjacent to the mixed-use center to activate it and for the best walkability and mobility standards. There was also variety throughout Subdistricts 5 and 6 but many of the blocks had single types of uses. The block faces had a good amount of variety, and block faces were how most people experienced a community. Part of what the Commission looked for in variety was architectural variety which was achieved through a set of standards and was not necessarily the same as housing variety.
- Part of what the Commission was trying to achieve through housing variety was cost differentials, attempting to get different social strata to interact with each other. She was not sure the Commission would see much differentiation between a townhouse social-financial structure versus an alley-loaded small lot detached home. They were probably similar. The Commission should consider what it was looking for from housing variety. A fair amount of the variety would be realized in a small format through the required densities, but it was uncertain whether the Commission would be achieving as much socio-economic variety as it desired. She encouraged the Commission to focus on the architectural variety standards.
- The mobility standards made sense and were a good goal. However, there was a big price tag attached to requiring full mobility in a single-story home. The City could require a kitchen, bath, and bedroom on the main floor, and still have bedrooms on the second floor, which improved the price per square foot, financing and saleability while achieving the ability to live on the main level

for visitors and residents, which was probably the primary objective as a total society. No one could control who would move into which house or who would become challenged at what stage in life. She encouraged having the main components on the main floor which would achieve a lot.

Chair Heberlein asked if ADUs were considered viable for single-family, front-loaded units given the lot sizes.

- Ms. Doukas replied it was more likely the ADUs could fit within townhouses, internal to the structure. Regardless of the type, with new construction ADUs were more likely to be designed integral to the single building instead of as garage conversion or a separate unit. The ADUs would likely be part of a multi-generational home with a lockable interior door and separate entry. The units allow a family to live together or could be converted into a rental unit. Integral ADUs were the most flexible way to design an ADU and were better for the buyer, the builder, and for resaleability. ADUs were still an unusual option involving expense, and only a segment of the market wanted them.

Commissioner Gallagher confirmed the buildings along Stafford Rd were all apartment buildings and recalled in previous discussions the Commission was more concerned about the look and feel of the building rather than the functionality. They did not want the same-looking apartment building up and down Stafford Rd.

- Ms. Doukas replied the discussion focused on height and ensuring the building was not generic or a standoff apartment but had a good interface with the street. The developer wanted to be sure a three-story structure could be done for the multi-family that would transition into the four-story mixed-use buildings. It was about the urban form and being able to transition the height. The apartment buildings were along Stafford Rd, so three-story building would not tower over the two-story structures in the main part of the neighborhood.

Mr. Pauly added the Commission would discuss the Stafford Road design standards in March.

Commissioner Mesbah noted part of the mix of housing type was to ensure affordable housing was not put in some corner out of sight where it became an undesirable part of the neighborhood. He agreed the Commission was trying to sprinkle different types of affordability and economic range within the neighborhood. The Commission had talked about architectural variety already and the design standards adequately addressed that, as well as the articulation of the apartment buildings along Stafford Road, which was a street looking for friendly frontage. Having said that, he believed stopping to struggle with the idea of the housing mix too early would be a challenge. The Commission was trying to get to what it initially talked about, and maybe in the end it would not come to much when it was actually on the ground. These things were always learning experiences; the Commission would learn from this subdivision and do the next one better. He welcomed any advice Ms. Doukas might have to offer.

Dan Grimberg, West Hills Land Development, stated he was very concerned about there being too much structure. It was difficult to do everything one wanted to do; no one had all the answers. In his years as a real estate developer, he had learned flexibility was needed. One issue discussed tonight was about variety. As a developer-builder, West Hills liked variety. Forty years ago, all the houses were the same lot size and with four designs, but developers no longer did that. Multiple designs were now

offered per lot size, architectural rules of adjacency, and developers did many things to make neighborhoods look good and live good that would not work if there was too much structure. Many things were going on the developers had to manage, and if the developer just juggled it, trying to make it fit the Code, it would not be a good neighborhood. West Hills wanted to be part of the process and had knowledge it could share. Perhaps during this process, West Hills could come in and talk about how the housing and the street would look, instead of yellow and green lots. West Hills developed lots and wanted to know what the neighborhood would look and feel like and how people were going to interact. But if there was too much structure, it would kill it.

- One Commissioner had asked how much this would add to the cost. None of these developments were easy to make work and they had razor thin margins. All the requirements add cost, and then it stated, “Affordability was key”. A building permit in Wilsonville was \$85,000 per house. The development costs in Wilsonville were the highest in the region, about 20 percent higher than anywhere else due to the high specifications. The permits were \$20,000 to \$30,000 higher than anywhere else, and now the City was adding affordability requirements and square footage requirements on top of permit fees and development costs. It cannot be done. If West Hills could do small homes and sell them at a reasonable price, the units would sell well. But it could not be done, so if the Code required it, West Hills could not get there; it was not possible.
- West Hills would love the opportunity to be part of the process. Perhaps in a work session, the developer could share ideas for three to four minutes and West Hills and the City could learn from one another. West Hills wanted a great neighborhood and was excited about Frog Pond East. They had completed three projects in Frog Pond West and had three more planned. West Hills wanted to be part of Wilsonville but needed to make it work and too much structure and requirements created problems.

Chair Heberlein stated West Hills’ comments were good feedback, adding he wanted to be sure the Commission considered whether what it was doing met its overall goals and would be feasible. He liked the idea of a sample development to show what the ideas could look like and whether it penciled out from a number’s perspective.

Commissioner Karr said he was astonished at the difference between large and small developments. The sketch from AKS looked good overall for the land use, and while it did not meet the block level variety, it looked acceptable and presentable and fit the Commission’s overall thoughts. He was not sure how to apply the same concepts to a small lot. There were three different subdistricts in one development, and he was not sure how to coordinate across subdistricts. He acknowledged Mr. Grimberg’s point, noting he did not want to place a burden on a developer to the point where the project could not be built and have it be somewhat affordable.

The rendering submitted via public comment by AKS Engineering was entered into the record as Attachment 7 to the Staff report.

INFORMATIONAL

1. City Council Action Minutes (January 5 & 19, 2023) (No staff presentation)
2. 2023 PC Work Program (No staff presentation)

Commissioner Willard stated she would like to see the City start incorporating primary bedroom instead of master bedroom throughout all its standards and suggested Frog Pond would be a great place to start.

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Gallagher moved to adjourn the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 7:50 p.m. Commissioner Willard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

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