

**PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 14, 2021
6:00 P.M.**

**Wilsonville City Hall
29799 SW Town Center Loop East
Wilsonville, Oregon**

*Minutes reviewed and
approved at the May 12,
2021 PC Meeting*

Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

Chair Kamran Mesbah called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m. Those present:

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

City Staff: Miranda Bateschell, Ryan Adams, and Daniel Pauly

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

A. Consideration of the March 10, 2021 Planning Commission minutes
The March 10, 2021 Planning Commission minutes were accepted as presented.

II. WORK SESSION

A. Middle Housing (Pauly)

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, noted the team would present an update on Wilsonville's Middle Housing project, the goal of which was to implement compliance with House Bill 2001 as well as some of the actions and policy objectives from the Equitable Housing Strategic Plan adopted by the City in 2019. She noted the material in the Staff report and presentation would cover the concepts, issues, and policy choices previously discussed with the Commission. The team had done additional work evolving policy choices and recommendations based on the preliminary input from the Commission and needed further input from the Commission on the direction to take on those items.

Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager, introduced the project team and the updates to Middle Housing in Wilsonville via PowerPoint, noting tonight's presentation would include further discussions on Frog Pond and Old Town, as well as the Category 3 items. (Slide 3) Categories 1, 2, and 4 would be discussed in future work sessions. He emphasized that the presentation would not get into the details of the numbers and the final resolution of the updates, but would outline how the team arrived at the recommended direction at this point. The project team sought confirmation about the direction so they could continue drafting and preparing for the Commission's further review as well as public consumption. He noted the team continued to receive feedback from the community via a survey on *Let's Talk, Wilsonville!* and those comments would be shared at the next Planning Commission work session.

Joe Dills, Angelo Planning Group, continued the presentation, reviewing the Buildable Land and Capacity Analysis used in Frog Pond to calculate how many additional units were needed to reach 8 du/ac, what land was available for the additional zoned capacity, and two methods to achieve 8 du/ac. (Slides 7-14)

- Mr. Pauly noted the 267 units in other sub districts in the presentation was different from the number in the Staff report and that discrepancy would be corrected as the updates became more refined. (Slide 10)

Key discussion points and input from the Planning Commission on the following policy questions related to Frog Pond were as follows with additional comments from the project team as noted (Slide 15):

1. Do you support reaching the 8 du/ac "Allowance" through changing requirements without changing the sub district map? This method was supported by the project team.
 2. Do you support requiring some level of middle housing through expanding the percentage approach?
- Mr. Dills clarified the two questions worked in tandem. The baseline was that something needed to be done to get to 8 du/ac and the project team was suggesting the "Allowance" of middle housing was ~~one~~ the method to get to 8 du/ac without requiring more than what the current Code required, although a developer could choose to build middle housing. The second question addressed whether a requirement should be adopted.
 - Mr. Pauly recalled that the developers active in Frog Pond West had not expressed a lot of interest in middle housing so not much middle housing would likely be built, regardless of the option chosen to reach 8 du/ac. Last time, the Commission generally supported some type of a requirement to actually support the goal of getting middle housing in Frog Pond West.
 - Question 2 would require a lot more discussion around what a requirement would look like and where the middle housing slider would be, especially given that developers would not likely build middle housing unless forced.
 - A requirement for middle housing would not address housing affordability, only the housing type. Housing affordability within diverse housing types was a larger problem for Wilsonville.
 - Mr. Pauly clarified that while there were developers in the market who were interested in creating middle housing in the region, the active developers in the community who were making offers on the land were focused on single-family homes as a product and had that expectation when purchasing the land.
 - Developers typically specialize in one kind of housing, so single-family developers would not jump into that market, as it was not their area of expertise. Middle housing developers would need to be attracted; interest in middle housing development in Frog Pond West was not yet on their radar.
 - Mr. Pauly explained the City could best be proactive in attracting middle housing developers to Frog Pond West through awareness, as there were already middle housing developers active in Wilsonville. Some property owners had also expressed interest in middle housing options outside of the meetings that had taken place.
 - How would developers already building single-family in Frog Pond West respond to such requirements?
 - Mr. Pauly explained some developers had built middle housing elsewhere but had not planned to do so in Frog Pond West, while other developers had not built a lot of middle housing. The developers might choose to build middle housing themselves or to build single-family units and then sell off some of the finished lots to a middle housing developer. Once a developer had subdivision approval, they could sell lots to another builder.
 - The State indicated duplexes could not be counted toward allowed density, which did not make sense.
 - Mr. Pauly confirmed the State looked at duplexes in the same way as ADUs. As the State crafted the regulations, the traditional definitions of various housing types had been turned on their heads. Under the new drafted regulations, a two-unit duplex was considered the same as a single-family unit.
 - He confirmed duplexes shared a lot and attached townhouses had two lots. Converting what would naturally be a duplex into a two townhouses would help satisfy the technicality of lot ownership. The City had requested clarification from the State on the difference between a duplex and a two-unit townhouse, but no response had been received.
 - That definition would make a difference in terms of how the City would achieve the density.
 - The State was trying to encourage middle housing, and density was an aspect of that approach. Middle housing was desired over an ocean of duplexes, so perhaps that was why duplexes were being discouraged. However, duplexes were included in the definition of middle housing

- Some very attractive duplexes had gone up in the Frog Pond West area, particularly in Morgan Farm.
- Mr. Pauly clarified the desired outcome of the Code update was twofold. The Zoning Code's compliance involved more paperwork than actual near- or mid-term results on the ground, while the initial buildout requirement would have near-term impacts on the ground. He emphasized that in places like Frog Pond West, for example, where more development would happen in the coming years, the initial buildout would be impacted, but the zoning component would also allow more middle housing that would require redevelopment to be implemented in 20 to 40 years. Question 2 addressed requiring middle housing as part of the initial buildout in the northern part of Frog Pond, while Question 1 allowed middle housing as part of the initial buildout. Some developers could be incentivized to build middle housing during initial buildout, but feedback from developers had shown the option was not likely to have a drastic impact on initial buildout.
 - Some buyers might see a zoned ability to add middle housing as an attractive, added property value. For example, an owner of a single-family dwelling would be allowed to build a structure on their land to house a parent because the land would already be zoned appropriately.
 - Ms. Bateschell added the zoning changes would be applicable throughout the city. The purpose of HB 2001 was to allow all middle housing types on any single-family property as the sites redeveloped over time. The types of middle housing allowed would be dependent on lot size and meeting other design standards. A duplex that fit on a lot and met the setback and other standards would be allowed anywhere within the city.
 - Mr. Dills clarified that the proposition was a Zoning Code update would be a change to the zoning regulations, which could affect what was built on the ground. If middle housing was required; it would be built.
 - The short-term tradeoff seemed to be whether or not the City was going to be more efficient in the use of its land resource today or wait 20 to 30 years to do so.
- Mr. Pauly clarified he had not directly asked the active developers who had already purchased land if they would be detracted from Wilsonville in the future if middle housing became a requirement. The regulations were being imposed across the state, creating a new reality for the industry. Developers who had issues with the changes might possibly come in with land use applications before the changes went into effect.
- Allowing the zoning change was supported, but how committed was the City to making changes on the ground?
- Changing the sub district mapping did not seem like a good approach. Reaching the 8 du/ac through changing the requirements without changing the sub district map was a better way to go.
 - Affordability would be impacted by the area in which middle housing was built. Morgan Farm was an expensive area, so any duplexes there would likely be costly.
- Affordability should not be confused with low-priced housing. Affordability in the context of a brand-new neighborhood development like Frog Pond West would be reflective of two-income professionals starting families or with young kids rather than subsidized affordable-type housing. The proposal would provide a good enough mix to have a mix of upper middle class and beyond in Frog Pond West.
- Overall, the Commission supported the "Allowance" option and agreed the requirement option needed further consideration given all of the dynamics involved.

Mr. Pauly and Ben Weber, SERA Architects, continued the presentation, reviewing the current Siting and Design Standards and discussing how to maximize flexibility of middle housing types in Frog Pond West while maintaining design standards that ensured a look and feel consistent with the Frog Pond West Master Plan. (Slides 16-27)

Key discussion points and input from the Commission on the following questions related to Siting and Design Standards in Frog Pond West were as follows with additional comments from the project team as noted (Slide 28):

1. Do you support maximizing the flexibility of middle housing types in each sub district with design standards to help ensure a look and feel consistent with the master plan?
2. Which additional standards stand out as the most important?
 - Duplexes and two-unit townhomes should be the primary focus in Frog Pond West. While a diversity of middle housing types was desired, adding more housing types would increase density and be more difficult to work with.
 - Mr. Pauly clarified the units would have one or two-car garages, depending on the unit type. Alley-loaded townhouses might tend to have more double garages, for example, whereas townhouses built elsewhere would have single garages. It would vary.
 - As most houses had at least two cars, parking availability was always a concern and would be an important piece to consider, particularly for middle housing types.
 - Triplexes or cottage clusters could be attractive if their design was consistent with the look and feel of the neighborhood. The duplexes in Morgan Farm looked nice and fit into the neighborhood; housing that did not should not be allowed.
 - As far as additional standards, more information was needed on how cottage clusters could be designed to fit into the neighborhood.
 - Developers and owners would need some leeway in order to achieve the flexibility desired. A triplex on a corner could be a good use of land, as long as the look and feel of the design was consistent. Very clear design standards that ensured a particular look and feel of the neighborhood was most important to protect quality and allow diversity.
 - Cottage clusters that were consistent in design with the structures on the single lots around them fit in well. The 900 sq ft footprint of cottage clusters seemed too limiting and should be more flexible.
 - When master planning Frog Pond West, a compromise was made to accommodate more dense housing types in Frog Pond East, which was not yet master planned. Staying as close as possible to the concept agreed upon for Frog Pond West was a matter of good faith for the community. Encouraging a consistent look and feel among all of the dwellings was easy to do successfully with duplexes, as evidenced in the examples already built. A well-designed triplex could also fit in well, especially if placed on a corner lot, but designing a quadplex to fit in would be more difficult.
 - Being sensitive and true to the compromise made during the Frog Pond master planning process was important.
 - Density had gotten a bad name, because in too many places, density had been implemented with bad design. The solution was good design. Design innovation and creativity should be encouraged, especially when honed and directed at maintaining the feel, texture, and quality of the neighborhood as well as the visual density. Tried and true solutions had been presented to address the issues, and good design standards were needed to ensure that whatever was developed was of high quality.
 - While a four-unit quad or larger set of row houses could fit into the neighborhood if designed properly, not allow those housing types and maintaining a smaller bulk than what was feasibly would likely result in more middle housing.
 - The Commission needed to be sensitive to the fact that Frog Pond West was halfway into the buildout process. Cottage clusters and triplexes could be done reasonably on a corner if the design standards were properly hashed out.
 - No additional standards stood out as most important, the standards just needed to work.

Mr. Pauly and Mr. Weber continued the presentation discussing Middle Housing in Old Town, which included a proposal for a new Old Town Residential Zone and a review of the general design standards that would remain and those that would change. (Slides 29-35)

Key discussion points and input from the Commission on the following policy questions regarding Old Town were as follows (Slide 36):

1. Do you support the development of a new Old Town Residential Zone for a legislative rezone of Old Town residential lots?
 2. Do you support the direction for Old Town design standards of minimizing changes to current standards?
- The Commissioners unanimously supported concepts proposed in both questions.
 - Limiting the cottage cluster to a maximum of one-story was unnecessarily restrictive with such a small square footage. A loft design with one and one-half stories would be a good solution.
 - The single-story, two-story, and one-and-one-half-story structures in the Canyon Creek Meadows neighborhood fit together very nicely without a distinct difference due to how they were designed.

Mr. Pauly confirmed the Commission had no objections to broadly allowing detached middle housing units the same as attached middle housing units? (Slide 37)

Mr. Pauly confirmed the Commission had no objections to keeping design standards similar to the existing standards regarding allowing ADUs for townhouses. (Slide 38)

- On a townhouse-sized lot, the garage could be converted to an ADU or the ADU could be internal to the structure.
 - Converting a garage would not violate the parking standards requirements, as long as one parking space was still available in the driveway or on the street for the house itself. ADUs did not require parking per state law.
 - ADUs would be only allowed for townhouses with an acceptable lot size to building ratio threshold.

III. INFORMATIONAL

- A. City Council Action Minutes (March 1 & 15, 2021) (No staff presentation)
- B. 2021 PC Work Program (No staff presentation)

Chair Mesbah noted Council had reviewed the bylaws for the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Committee and asked if there had been many applications.

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, replied that a couple community members and staff members, including herself, were reviewing the 44 applications that were received. She was honored and humbled to be able to review the applications. She appreciated the Commissioners volunteering to serve their community as well as the amazing people of Wilsonville whom she often did not get to meet. Reviewing the Committee applications had given her the opportunity to get to know more people in the community and be reminded of the special people who lived in the community. She was excited to see the DEI Committee take shape.

- Staff was excited to present the Annual Housing Report, which would be a bit later than usual particularly due to the winter storm event. The urban tree canopy had been significantly impacted, and Planning was one of the leads for responding to both the immediate response regarding the trees and residents, but also with regard to the long-term efforts for reforestation, particularly the street trees. More than 70 tree applications had come in since the winter storm event, and other neighborhoods had not yet submitted applications. The planner who normally produced the housing report had been processing ten times the usual number of tree permits in the last six weeks, but she would do an excellent job of pulling together a great summary for the past year on the Housing Report.

Commissioner Greenfield:

- Inquired about any updates appropriate for public consumption on the developments in the former Xerox property.
 - Ms. Bateschell replied a development application went to the Development Review Board for Twist Bioscience. More information about the company could be found in published news articles.
 - Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager, added there were active inquiries about the Xerox property, but nothing else was available to share yet.

- Said he walked the Parkway Woods property frequently and saw other neighborhood residents widely disregarding the posted no trespassing signs as people were playing Frisbee, flying kites, picnicking on the lawn, and so forth. The park was lovely and a fine resource, and he wished the City could officially make the area into a park. A lot of activity was occurring at the park, including what appeared to be basic infrastructure improvement on the rooftops of the large buildings, and he was eager to see what developed.
- He was disheartened to see approximately six large, heritage oak trees tipped over or were severely damaged from the recent winter storm, noting the large oak logs had gradually been informally harvested and carted away. The loss of trees had detracted from the charm of the property. Parkway Woods still had charm, but it needed to be cleaned up to maximize what was still there.

Chair Mesbah added that Charbonneau had a lot of tree damage as well.

Commissioner Heberlein asked if there had been any movement on the Fry's property.

- Ms. Bateschell responded a pre-application meeting was recently held regarding the property by people who had an option to do due diligence at this time.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Mesbah adjourned the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 7:39 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

By Paula Pinyerd of ABC Transcription Services, LLC. for
Tami Bergeron, Administrative Assistant-Planning