



CITY COUNCIL MEETING STAFF REPORT

Meeting Date: July 18, 2022		Subject: Frog Pond East and South Master Plan	
		Staff Member: Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager	
		Department: Community Development	
Action Required		Advisory Board/Commission Recommendation	
<input type="checkbox"/> Motion <input type="checkbox"/> Public Hearing Date: <input type="checkbox"/> Ordinance 1 st Reading Date: <input type="checkbox"/> Ordinance 2 nd Reading Date: <input type="checkbox"/> Resolution <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information or Direction <input type="checkbox"/> Information Only <input type="checkbox"/> Council Direction <input type="checkbox"/> Consent Agenda		<input type="checkbox"/> Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Denial <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None Forwarded <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
		Comments: During a July 13 work session, Planning Commission provided input that will be provided to the Council at the work session.	
Staff Recommendation: Provide requested input regarding residential policies for Frog Pond East and South.			
Recommended Language for Motion: N/A			
Project / Issue Relates To:			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Council Goals/Priorities: Expand home ownership	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopted Master Plan(s): Frog Pond Area Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	

ISSUE BEFORE COUNCIL:

Provide feedback and input on residential policies for Frog Pond East and South. Specifically, provide guidance on variety of unit types to encourage and/or require. The policy discussion will also clarify what the different mapped colors (design types) mean on the draft preferred land use alternative (Attachment 1). The design types and policies, after further refinement in the coming months, will control the development of Frog Pond East and South.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Following designation of the subject land as an urban reserve in 2010, the City adopted the Frog Pond Area Plan in 2015 to set the stage for additional planning and eventual development to meet identified housing needs. Besides the urban reserve area, the Frog Pond Area Plan also established a vision for growth for undeveloped land already within the City's Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) now known as Frog Pond West. In 2017, a Master Plan and implementing zoning code was adopted for Frog Pond West. The Master Plan provided the necessary regulatory framework for the residential neighborhood currently under development north of Boeckman Road and west of Stafford Road.

In 2018, Metro expanded the UGB to include the urban reserve land known as Frog Pond East and South. As part of the Metro Ordinance adopting the UGB expansion, Metro required Wilsonville to complete master planning to make the area development ready, from a regulatory standpoint, by December 2022. Similar to past master planning efforts, such as Villebois and Frog Pond West, this master planning effort will identify the types and locations of the homes, other land uses, parks, open spaces, streets, trails and neighborhood amenities to be built over the next 10-20 years. To support implementation of the plan, the process will also identify water, sewer, stormwater, and transportation infrastructure needs and funding sources.

This will be the Council's sixth work session on the Frog Pond East and South Master Plan. The previous work sessions and their content were as follows:

Work Session 1-October 2021: Focus on overall project scope and the outreach plan.

Work Session 2-January 2022: Initial feedback on the needs and opportunities for affordable housing and housing variety.

Work Session 3-March 2022: Continuation of the topic of housing needs for more detailed feedback and direction, introduction of the neighborhood commercial evaluation.

Work Session 4-May 2022: Further discussion of the neighborhood commercial center and discussion of the recommended design concepts for development of land use and urban design alternatives.

Work Session 5-June 2022: Review and direction on draft land use alternatives. This included mapping the locations of different housing design types and forms, which were grouped into Type 1, Type 2, and Type 3.

This *Work Session 6* will present a draft preferred land use alternative for Council review and discussion. This work session will focus on developing specific land use policies to guide housing development in Frog Pond East and South. Discussion of these policies will clarify what is meant by the three housing design type categories (Type 1, Type 2, Type 3) represented in the draft preferred alternative map (Attachment 1). The policies and design types presented will be further refined over the coming months to be adopted in the Frog Pond East and South Master Plan and into land use regulations that will control the development of this area.

In Work Session 4, the Council discussed design concepts to guide development of the land use alternatives, many of which focused on housing. The housing-focused design concepts are reflected in the draft preferred alternative and include:

- Housing variety throughout the plan area.
- Affordable housing integration (both subsidized affordable housing and market-rate units that are more financially attainable).
- A transect of density in the urban form. “Transect” means a fanning out of look and feel of density from a focal point to an edge. A prime example in Wilsonville is Villebois. In Villebois, the tallest buildings with little setback from the street are located around and near the piazza at the center of the development. The edges, such as in the Grande Pointe subdivision, are shorter buildings with more separation from the street. These two examples are Villebois’ center and its edge, with various housing forms in between that create a seamless transition between these different building forms.

Type 1, Type 2, and Type 3 housing design types and housing variety

The draft preferred alternative shows Type 1, Type 2, and Type 3 housing design types in “transects”. This includes a “larger-scale transect” for the entire planning area radiating from larger focal points like the neighborhood park and neighborhood commercial center and “mini transects” operating within the larger transect that radiate from localized small greenspace focal points and minor intersections. The design types are defined by urban form, that is, the look and feel of each residential structure, how they relate to other buildings and to the public realm, such as streets, rather than what type of housing unit(s) is built within a given residential structure.

This approach intends to achieve variety in architectural style and neighborhood composition, providing a wider variety of housing options and a more mixed-income community. The approach further complies with House Bill 2001 and related housing variety policy adopted by the City Council this last fall.

Certain unit types do lend themselves towards building envelopes that would be typical in the different Type 1-3 design types. Attachment 2 includes photos of residential structures in both Villebois and Frog Pond West that help to illustrate the variety of unit types that could be built within each design type. Each photo is labeled with the design type it best represents, along with the type of unit or units within the structure.

To better define the different design types, it is also helpful to understand what they have in common and what is different.

Commonalities between design types:

- Variety of unit types allowed within each design type
- Residential structures with different unit types within an area have similar building bulk and appearance that integrate together well
- Limited separation or geographic isolation of different unit types

- Housing organized by blocks and around nearby greenspace or other focal points

Differences:

The following table highlights the main differences between housing design types. See Attachment 2 for photos that help illustrate the differences.

The dimensions below are preliminary and subject to change.

Urban Form Element	Type 1 Housing	Type 2 Housing	Type 3 Housing
Façade length facing street or public realm	75-200 feet (also can be 20–25-foot facades feet closely spaced that together have a similar appearance of a larger façade)	25-80 feet (front façade length is commonly 25-45 feet, however the range goes up to 80 feet to accommodate street-facing side facade length and longer front facade length on shallow lots)	45-100 feet
Typical building height	Primarily 2-3 stories, but some 1-story cottages/ADU's	Primarily 2 stories with some 3-story middle housing and 1-story cottages/ADU's	Primarily 1-2 stories, with 3-story allowed
Typical setbacks between buildings	10 or less feet between smaller buildings, more distance between large buildings	Approximately 10 feet	10-15 feet
Vehicle access and off-street parking	Access and parking almost all to the rear or side of building, alley access very common	Access and parking predominantly to the rear or side, alley access common. Some units may have front access and driveways/garages	Variety. Access and parking commonly from front with front access and driveways. Some rear and side access and parking, along with alleys, particularly for middle housing.
Typical front setbacks from street	Buildings typically close to the street	Further back than Type 1, but still fairly close to street unless front facing garage	20 feet with front vehicle access, similar to Type 2 with rear access

Typical lot size for individual residential structure	Less than 3,000 square feet for smaller structures containing single units. Larger for multi-unit structures	3,000-5,000 square feet	5,000-10,000 square feet
Example residential structures (see also Attachment 2)	Many in Villebois including: 5–6-unit townhouse buildings, detached homes closely spaced on approx. 2,500 square foot lots, condo buildings, apartment buildings	Alley-loaded single-family/townhomes in Villebois, Morgan Farm in Frog Pond West	Single-family detached lots in Frog Pond West and Grande Pointe in Villebois, two-story townhouse buildings in Villebois and Frog Pond West.

Housing variety policy options

With an understanding of what each housing design type means and how much variety is allowed within each, the team desires Council direction on regulating variety within each of the three design types and to what extent.

The following are key points the project team recommends the Council consider during their review and discussion:

- Variety requirements regulate types of units rather than specific price points
- This type of regulation can help ensure that middle housing is built, which is supportive of House Bill 2001 and Wilsonville’s implementation of it
- Without variety requirements each development is likely to produce one or two different unit types
- Reasonable flexibility is important: too granular or detailed of regulations make implementation difficult and can unintentionally prevent development of needed housing the market is otherwise willing and able to deliver.
- Unit variety is better regulated by unit type groupings or “buckets” rather than by individual stand-alone unit types.¹
- Regulations must be clear and objective, but a discretionary path may be made available as an option to developers.

The project team offers the following draft policy options for the Council to consider. Other policies can be explored per Council direction.

¹ For example, townhouses, plexes, and stacked-flat apartments/condos may be grouped in a bucket as they can be built in similar sized structures. A similar bucket approach was used in Villebois that helped implement urban design and architectural variety policies while still allowing reasonable flexibility to the development community.

1. Encourage But Not Require Variety: This policy option would encourage and allow variety, but not regulate. Developers would determine variety (or lack thereof) based on their preference and market conditions.
2. Minimum of Certain Housing Types: This policy option would require a certain amount of target unit types per subdistrict or block. Examples of potential targeted unit types to require:
 - a. Attached middle housing (townhouses, plexes)
 - b. Single-level units: in smaller homes (i.e., less than 1,200 sf livable floor area, this would include cottage clusters, ADUs [including those integrated into the ground floor of taller townhouse buildings], and in elevator-served multi-story buildings with single-level units.)
3. Maximum of Certain Housing Types: This policy option would require each subdistrict or block to have no more than a certain percent of one type of unit.
4. Maximum and Minimum of Certain Housing Types: This policy option would combine the requirement elements of policy option 2 and 3 to have no more than a certain percent of one type and ensure a certain amount of target unit types.

The project team recommends Option 4 as a feasible policy that will best help the City meet its goals around housing variety while still allowing a reasonable level of flexibility for developers. The size and scale of subdistricts is also an important implementing criterion, following this principle: the greater the number of potential units, the more variety that should be required.

Discussion Questions:

1. What additional questions, if any, does the City Council have about the three housing design types?
2. Which policy option would the City Council like the project team to pursue regarding housing variety in Frog Pond East and South? *Should the City require a certain mix of housing?*
3. What additional questions about housing variety policy would you like the project team to be prepared to answer for future work sessions?

EXPECTED RESULTS:

Feedback and direction from the Council on developing key residential policies for housing design types and unit variety in Frog Pond East and South.

TIMELINE:

This is the sixth in a series of work sessions for the City Council. The next work session is planned for September. The Master Plan is scheduled to be completed by December 2022, with some implementation elements extending into early 2023.

CURRENT YEAR BUDGET IMPACTS:

The project is funded by a combination of a \$350,000 Metro grant, an \$81,000 Oregon Department of Land and Conservation and Development grant, and matching City funds in the form of staff time. \$311,000 is budgeted in FY 22/23 to complete the project.

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT PROCESS:

The project has a community engagement plan which lays out a robust public engagement program that will include meaningful and impactful involvement of people who identify with historically marginalized communities.

POTENTIAL IMPACTS OR BENEFIT TO THE COMMUNITY:

Furthering of the City's Equitable Housing Strategic Plan and Council's goal of affordable home ownership, while creating Wilsonville next great neighborhoods.

ALTERNATIVES:

The City Council can continue to direct changes to the draft preferred land use alternative. In addition, the City Council continues to have a number of options for policy related to housing variety.

CITY MANAGER COMMENT:

N/A

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Draft Preferred Land Use Alternative for Frog Pond East and South (dated July 5, 2022)
2. Example Photos of the Three Housing Design Types proposed (dated July 5, 2022)