



PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

MARCH 8, 2023 at 6:00 PM

City Hall Council Chambers & Remote Video Conferencing

Draft PC Minutes were reviewed and approved at the April 12, 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, March 8, 2023. Vice Chair Willard called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m., followed by roll call. Those present:

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

City Staff: Miranda Bateschell, Amanda Guile-Hinman, 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. There was none.

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. Consideration of the February 8, 2023, Planning Commission minutes

The February 8, 2023, Planning Commission minutes were approved as presented.

PUBLIC HEARING

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

Vice Chair Willard read the legislative hearing procedure into the record and opened the public hearing at 6:07 pm.

Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager, noted the Commission spent substantial time over the last two years on the Frog Pond East and South Master Plan, and one of the implementation steps was to integrate the projects from the Master Plan into the citywide Transportation System Plan (TSP) as discussed at the work session last month.

- He announced that the criteria applicable to the application were outlined in the Findings Report, which was Attachment 3 to the Staff report.

Jenna Bogert, DKS Associates, presented the proposed TSP amendments related to the Frog Pond East and South Master Plan via PowerPoint, describing the TSP and its purpose and reviewing Chapters 3 and 5 of the TSP, where the bulk of the revisions were contained. Her comments were as follows:

- The TSP is a citywide document that contains transportation policy and planning information, as well as transportation improvement projects. Having those projects identified in the TSP was important for the City to compete for federal, state, and regional funding, was integral to setting up the system development charges (SDCs) for development to contribute to those projects as well.
 - This TSP amendment was a required part of the Frog Pond East and South Master Plan, just like the TSP amendments made for other prior area plans the City had adopted, such as the Town Center Plan and Basalt Creek Concept Plan.
 - One thing to note about the proposed TSP amendment was that all the changes in the TSP focused on getting Frog Pond East and South transportation projects into the TSP. No other changes or updates were being made for other plans or projects.
- Chapter 3 contained the City's transportation standards, and several figures were revised and updated. On Figures 3-1, 3-2, and 3-5, the city limit boundary was updated, and the UGB boundary line was extended as well. Some of the figures had not been updated in the last three years, so the line work needed updated to match current boundaries. (Slide 4)
 - Figure 3-2: Functional Classification, showing the street network of arterials, collectors, and local streets within the city, was updated to include the future collector streets within the East and South Neighborhoods shown as dashed lines on the slide.
 - Figure 3-5: Bicycle Routes, showed the existing and future planned bike routes and would now include the future bike lanes and multi-use paths planned for the master planning area in the East and South Neighborhoods.
 - New Figure 3-14 was added to Chapter 3 to show the cross sections designed for the arterials, collectors, and local streets within the East and South Neighborhoods. These cross sections were pulled straight from the Master Plan and specifically called out in the TSP because they were slightly different than the standard arterial/collector cross section design. (Slide 5)
 - Cross section designs were shown for the Stafford Rd Arterial; Advanced Rd Collector; 60th Ave Collector North and South of Advanced Rd; the local street on the south side of Meridian Creek Middle School; and the Brisband Main Street running through the future commercial area in the East Neighborhood. (Slides 5 and 6)
- Chapter 5 contained the transportation improvement projects, which were categorized into two categories: high-priority projects and additional planned projects. All of the projects from the East and South Master Plan were added to the high-priority project list. (Slides 7 and 8) She highlighted the projects with these comments:
 - Project RE-12C, identified where future collector roads are desired to be located in the East Neighborhood.

- RE-17 was the alignment for Brisband Main Street through the East Neighborhood.
- Projects SI-12, SI-13, and SI-14 were the single-lane roundabout projects: two on Stafford Rd at Kahle and at Brisband, and a third on Advanced Rd at 60th Ave; both indicated by green circles on the map. (Slide 7)
- BW-21 was the Mid-block Pedestrian Crossing on Advance Rd located near the future community park in the South Neighborhood.
- BW-22, the Advanced Rd Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon (RRFB) will be located somewhere in the vicinity of the park, perhaps near the school, but definitely in that area on Advanced Rd to facilitate safe pedestrian crossings between the two neighborhoods.
- BW-23 is another RRFB on Stafford Rd at Frog Pond Lane indicated by the yellow diagonal pedestrian sign on the map.
- SR-05, which stood for Safe Routes, was an improved pedestrian school crossing at the middle school that might have high visibility crosswalk striping and improved signage to bring more visibility to school-aged children in that area.

Mr. Pauly entered into the record Staff's memorandum dated March 7, 2023 which noted the changes to the draft Frog Pond East and South TSP updates. The Commission received electronically an updated TSP document that reflected the changes, which he reviewed as follows:

- On Page 7, a disclaimer was added to explain how a lot of the maps, besides the ones specifically updated as Ms. Bogert mentioned, reflect 2013 conditions and should not be relied on to be up to date and where to go to find current city limits and UGB boundaries. Updating those images was not in the scope and it was somewhat costly to do so due to technical reasons. Those images would be updated when a wholesale update of the TSP was done in the coming years.
- On Page 51, a clarification was added to the map to address a gap regarding how the bike lane coming north on 60th Ave connects to the mixed-use path in the BPA easement.
- Page 60 included a clarification that not all cross sections specific to a master plan area were actually in the TSP and how essentially a master plan adopted earlier, such as for Town Center, Villebois, or Frog Pond West or East and South, was equivalent to the TSP in terms of the Comprehensive Plan. So, even if the cross section was not in the TSP, it had equal standing.
 - The added text explained that in about 2020, information from these Master Plans was shifted to the TSP, so the TSP could be a one-stop for all the information about transportation projects. This change clarified why Frog Pond East and South were in the TSP and not Frog Pond West, essentially.
- Page 95, Project RE-12B, a mixed-use trail, was updated to show that the intent was for the trail to go across Meridian Creek to connect to Boeckman Creek Primary.
- On Pages 103 and 111, and related to Project RE-12B, were images in the existing TSP that were a remnant of sketches from the 2015 Frog Pond Area Plan about potential connectivity for trails in Frog Pond South. The map did not get updated due to technology issues, but a call out was added on the map, stating that the alignment of these specific trails and connections should match the trail alignments shown in the Master Plan, and again with referencing, ensuring there was that

creek crossing to meet future connectivity goals as called out in the Frog Pond East and South Master Plan.

Vice Chair Willard called for questions from the Commission about the TSP amendments.

Commissioner Hendrix:

- Asked if the eight projects or so were all high priority and what that would mean for other projects that might have been in that high priority area. She also asked how the team prioritized all the high-priority projects.
 - Scott Mansur, DKS Associates, explained the reason the majority of these projects were identified as high priority was that many would get built as development occurred. This was different than a project, in an area that already had development on both sides, for example, but needed to add bike lanes, additional urban improvements, a roundabout, or an intersection, which were projects the City had to identify the funding for and then put in the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and build those projects; whereas, the collectors and many of these streets would slowly get constructed as development occurred, similar to what was happening in the western portion of Frog Pond.
 - High-priority projects meant they would likely get constructed within the planning horizon of 20 years. For example, the frontage improvements on the north side of Advanced Rd would be built by the development as development occurred. It would not be likely a City project, but be slowly constructed, as well as the collectors and trails throughout the development.
- Stated she supported the efforts in the Master Plan and believed they all made sense as a next step, especially for funding and moving the project along.

Vice Chair Willard called for public testimony on the TSP amendment.

Dan Grimberg, West Hills Land Development ~~33~~, stated West Hills was working on a good-sized project within Frog Pond East and had a lot of good collaboration with Staff. West Hills has done a lot of residential development in Wilsonville, in Frog Pond West and Villebois off Wilsonville Rd, and had been in Wilsonville for at least 25 years. They really liked Wilsonville and wanted to be part of the Frog Pond East in the worst way. West Hills had a great plan and continually tried to be part of the process, and it was difficult. A lot was going on, City Staff was busy and had a lot of projects, and so it was hard to give input.

- West Hills met yesterday with Staff and reviewed the Infrastructure Funding Plan, which was not developed yet. They reviewed the items being added to the TSP, listed on Pages 29, 30, and 31 of the packet, which he would call the Frog Pond East and South specific projects with roundabouts, collector roads, etc. Yesterday, dollar amounts had been added to those projects, and while no total was provided, the project costs totaled \$55 million, which was a lot of money.

- West Hills was very concerned, and he knew Staff and the City's consultants were also concerned, about how the project would be paid for because that affects the viability of the project. Would it ever get off the ground? Who was paying for what?
 - Typically, developers with property fronting on the north side of Advance Rd pay for half-street frontage improvements. He heard development on the north side of Advanced Rd would pay for the cost of the very expensive Advanced Rd improvements, including a median. If that was the case, the developer needed to know.
- He understood the TSP needed to be amended, however, he asked that there be more collaboration, so everyone understood what West Hills was committing to. In talking with Mr. Pauly, he understood if the TSP was amended with these projects, they had to be implemented and had to be funded. Where would the funding come from?
- He stated there were options for some of the road improvements, which he would not get into now. One example, were three roundabouts needed, or one roundabout? There could be alternative traffic treatments on some of the intersections.
- He requested more time and more discussion so the TSP amendment did not lock everyone into something that may or may not be doable. He would appreciate the Commission's consideration.

Vice Chair Willard:

- Asked ~~the~~ Staff where the numbers came from; were they the expected range based on the quality of the improvement or a guideline for what Staff believed they would cost. What was the basis for the numbers?
 - Mr. Pauly replied the numbers were put together by the City's contract engineers. Mr. Mansur and Ms. Bogert developed the base, which was escalated by another engineering firm based on standard practice of the expected cost as could best be determined by cost estimating at different levels.
- Asked if the expectation was that whoever absorbed that project as part of their development would spend a minimum or maximum of that amount?
 - Mr. Pauly replied no, adding the cost could be more or less. The cost figures did not reflect what portion might be built or paid for by cities, the larger pool of SDCs, credits, or what could be paid through different mechanisms not paid by the developer, but a portion would be paid by the developer as well.
 - The cost estimates did not reflect what the actual developer would pay, but the total amount it would take the City to build the road, which would actually be more than if the developer built the road because of different rules cities had to follow over the private sector.
 - Mr. Mansur agreed with Mr. Pauly's comments.

Commissioner Gallagher:

- Confirmed there were three roundabouts within a very small area. In high traffic times, traffic would really be slowed down with those three roundabouts. She asked if three roundabouts were really necessary and whether there could be two instead.

- Mr. Pauly responded one of the three roundabouts was on a different road; the focus was on the two on Stafford Rd.
- Asked if there were other solutions to slow traffic, such as stop signs, noting this was not her area of expertise.
 - Mr. Pauly deferred to the City Engineer as to why roundabouts were the professional recommendation as the best solution.
 - Zach Weigel, City Engineer, noted Mr. Mansur and Ms. Bogert could provide all the technical details, but the City did look at what treatments were needed to support development and roundabouts were the best way to slow traffic coming into the city. Stop signs would not accommodate the level of service needed at those intersections. Two neighborhoods that both have schools were being connected and roundabouts also make it more pedestrian friendly to cross major streets. These were the reasons why the decisions and proposed recommendations were made during the master planning.
 - Mr. Mansur added the two roundabouts at Kahle and Brisband on Stanford Rd were needed for operational purposes to provide traffic to meet the City's level of service and operating standard at those two locations, as well as to slow traffic and make the neighborhoods better connected as Mr. Weigel had mentioned.
 - The roundabout at 60th Ave and Advance Rd was not needed operationally as the existing stop signs would be acceptable. However, with the high-speed traffic coming from the east on Advance Rd, he recommended a roundabout for safety purposes to slow traffic and give it an urban neighborhood feel, while creating important connectivity for pedestrians and motor vehicles between the East and South Neighborhoods.
 - Roundabouts are one of the safest traffic control devices, and when building new developments, traffic signals and roundabouts cost about the same amount.

Commissioner Karr asked if a project was put into the TSP without specifying who was going to pay for it, would that be done later in the infrastructure funding. Following Mr. Grimberg's comments, how could the City prevent the cost from becoming so onerous to the developer that a development wouldn't happen? He noted farther down on Advanced Rd were individual small lots that would have to potentially pay for the improvements.

- Mr. Pauly responded it did come down to the Infrastructure Plan. Generally, the City did not have the exact funding mechanisms in place for any TSP projects being adopted. He confirmed an Infrastructure Funding Plan would go into effect where the ability to pay was considered. This was not the first new growth area that was difficult to fund. Staff was interested in meeting the City's goals for Frog Pond East and South and were committed to finding the best way possible to pay for very expensive infrastructure through different mechanisms, even though it was limited.
- Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, added it was important to note the TSP documented the needs for the citywide transportation system to function and meet all the different performance standards, which addressed what was needed to serve the volume and capacity needed on the roadway, as well as safety measures, multimodal connections, etc.
 - When added to the TSP, the source of funding was not needed and often, not known. Funding was considered after projects were added to the TSP, which was why Staff was working on the

Frog Pond Infrastructure Funding Plan for East and South. As done for Frog Pond West, Staff looked at what the different share of those projects would be, in terms of city share, development share, and the different potential funding sources.

- From a policy level perspective, it was important to get the projects in the TSP first, so the City could integrate those projects into CIP lists. Until that was done, the projects could not be system development charge (SDC) eligible and SDCs were one major component of how the City funded these projects. Sequentially, adopting projects into the TSP provided the City with the direction needed for integrating them into the Infrastructure Funding Plan as well as establishing and adopting that funding plan.
- Adopting projects into the TSP also helped set the foundation for the Development Code. She reminded how the Commission set some important policies at the end of the Master Plan process regarding the design for both Stafford and Advance Rds. Having those upgraded urban roads in the TSP would help inform the type of development and design standards the City wanted to see on those frontages.
- In thinking about all the different implementation projects being carried out, Staff was considering this sequence of how to adopt them.

Commissioner Hendrix requested more insight from Mr. Grimberg about what would change or be gained by having more time. It seemed more beneficial to keep moving forward instead of adding more time, since documenting and outlining the needs could lead to more opportunities for other funding.

Vice Chair Willard recognized Mr. Grimberg so he could address Commissioner Hendrix's question.

Mr. Grimberg thanked the Vice Chair. He reiterated West Hills understood the TSP needed to be amended; however, everyone needed to understand what they were committed to, part of which was the funding. While it could be said that these were not the real numbers and they would be refined, adding the projects to the TSP was a commitment that the projects would be built, as he understood it. No one knew who would pay for the projects, or how much they would cost, but they would cost a lot. Whether \$55 million, \$52 million, or \$60 million, it was a lot of money.

- West Hills has been doing this a long time, and each time the sources of money normally came down to the City, the SDC, and the developer. He hoped he was wrong, but normally, the City did not have a different bag of money to pay for these kinds of projects, so the developer had to contribute the lion's share since they were doing the projects and causing the impact.
- At \$55 million, the approximately 1800 units in Frog Pond East and South would cost over \$30,000 per dwelling unit. Frog Pond West started out at \$18,000 and was now over \$20,000. As a developer, he always wanted things to go fast and move ahead. He just wanted everyone to understand what they were doing. He did not want to slow things down, but to come up with a plan that was workable for the City, West Hills, and the people that would buy these houses. West Hills really wanted to create a great community in Wilsonville. Tonight's package had 444 pages; a lot of work went into these projects, and it would be terrible to have a plan that was not financially feasible.

Commissioner Neil asked if the roundabouts were Mr. Grimberg's only concerns.

- Mr. Grimberg replied he was concerned about an understanding of the improvements. He estimated the three roundabouts totaled about \$16 million. He has never seen a traffic signal cost \$6 million. He assured he was not trying to dispute any of that, he just wanted further discussion, so everyone understood what was being done. West Hills wanted to be part of the solution. He wanted to start building houses and West Hills wanted to create affordable or moderate priced housing, but there was no way to do that when looking at the costs. He believed the City's goal was great, but everyone needed to know what they were doing.

Vice Chair Willard stated she appreciated having a context of the implications.

Commissioner Karr understood from the engineer and Ms. Bateschell that this was not a list of wants, but a list of needs in order for the project to be viable. The infrastructure needed to be in place to support 1800 units in a safe and connected fashion and how it would be financed was part of the Infrastructure Funding Plan, which would be discussed in another work session. He was not qualified to contradict an engineer's professional recommendation for a roundabout and suggested going with the professionals.

Vice Chair Willard understood the concern differently. Frog Pond East was lagging West, and Frog Pond South would probably lag East, so the City was unfairly burdening the small development that is East with the lion share of the improvements. Was the City/Commission aware it was doing that and was the City/Commission okay with that? She understood the roundabouts, roads, and crosswalks would perhaps be burdening West Hills' development, since West Hills would be first once the transportation plan was implemented.

Amanda Guile-Hinman, City Attorney, advised that the Commission get back on track to the testimony portion and focus on asking the testifier questions. The implications would be discussed at a later point.

Mr. Grimberg stated he had an answer to the question posed.

Vice Chair Willard clarified the question was for Staff. She asked if Staff was open to collaborating and negotiating with the developer, so their one development was not overly burdened with too many of the transportation improvements.

- Ms. Bateschell responded that Staff was amenable to that process and had started to engage the developer as Staff began to evaluate the different options for the Infrastructure Funding Plan. As noted, there were not a lot of funding options and it was a challenge in every case, but Staff was working with the developer and talking through the options available.
 - In terms of unfair burden, every development needed to pay what was needed to serve their project and it also needed to be proportional. Staff would definitely be taking into consideration how development occurred over time to ensure they were not overburdening development.

Vice Chair Willard confirmed there was no further public testimony.

Ms. Guile-Hinman noted this would be the time for the Commissioners to indicate whether they wanted to leave the public hearing open and continue it; otherwise the Vice Chair could close the hearing.

Vice Chair Willard confirmed there were no strong opinions about a continuance and closed the public hearing at 6:49 pm and called for discussion by the Commission.

Ms. Guile-Hinman suggested a general discussion be held and if someone wanted to make a motion, further discussion could continue after the motion was made.

Vice Chair Willard believed that based on the clarifications received from Staff and from West Hills Land Development, the intent of the testimony was to make sure the intent to collaborate and discuss the improvement projects, as well as to understand the costs were noted. There were no specific changes needed to the TSP; it was really an awareness and a discussion opportunity for the Commission.

Vice Chair Willard moved to adopt Resolution No. LP22-0004 with the corrections as outlined in the March 7, 2023, memorandum from Planning Manager Daniel Pauly (Attachment 5). Commissioner Gallagher seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

WORK SESSION

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

Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager, believed Staff's third package of amendments was fairly light compared to the others, but it contained some pretty detailed standards around design. Staff would continue to bring in Development Code amendments in bits and pieces until they had all been discussed. As previously discussed, the idea was to extend or integrate novel concepts or other things that have worked elsewhere in the city into other existing standards or processes to avoid reinventing the wheel and make Code work well when implementing and building things in East and South.

- Tonight's discussion regarded the design standards specific to the Brisband Main Street, as well as multi-family design standards, based on the guidance given by the Commission and Council, and how the multi-family review process works.

Kate Rogers, MIG, and Mr. Pauly presented the Frog Pond East and South Development Code Amendments via PowerPoint, reviewing the design criteria, permitted uses, and the design and development standards for Brisband Main Street; the multi-family design standards and review process; and the Discretionary Alternative Path, which was proposed the form of Development Review Board (DRB) waivers.

Commissioner comments and Staff's responses to Commissioner questions on the topics of discussion were as follows:

Brisband Main Street Design Criteria

- The standards and plan would provide the feel the Planning Commission was looking for: ground floor commercial, shopping, pedestrian friendly. Features like the façade articulation were going in a good direction.
- In comparison to the Villebois Plaza where retail space had not been leased, Mr. Pauly replied that as discussed during the Master Plan, one difference was the Plaza was built in the middle of a neighborhood off any main street and Main Street would have more drive-by traffic here. Additionally, Staff would return with details about the flexibility of use of this space over time.
 - Commercial would be encouraged upfront, especially where there was existing drive-by traffic but the Code would also be flexible for live/work and other situations as more demand might occur over time. More construction north of Frog Pond West was anticipated over the next decades and other things that would add more rooftops to the area.
- Mr. Pauly clarified the proposed standards were more streamlined than Villebois, which was quite detailed and allowed a lot of discretion during review of the addresses, desired architectural type, the European feel, etc.
 - The proposed standards allowed for a variety of architecture and tried to get to a clear and objective type of standard, and reflected what was worked through by the Planning Commission and community for Town Center for the same sort of mixed-use Main Street type of feel. None of those had been built in Town Center yet, so there was no experience of how it works, but a number of types of projects were reviewed, including Villebois, when the Town Center standards were adopted.
- Vice Chair Willard confirmed the design standards were consistent with what the Commission expected.

Multi-Family Design Standards and Review Process

- Simplifying the multi-family process was good as the City was encouraging affordable housing and HB 2001, so making that more appealing was a long-term goal, and obviously making the process easier would help.
- The process was good. It allowed for public input, but it did make it faster.
- Mr. Pauly noted the verbiage “design of landscaping not part of required open space” on Slide 18 was not clear. He explained there were two classes of landscaping. A subdivision had a 25 percent open space requirement, half of which needed to be usable. The design review process for the subdivision included review of pocket parks, tot lots, picnic shelters, etc. and Staff reviewed those landscape plans, but landscaping on private lots was not reviewed. Staff ensured the required street trees were installed but did not look at which part of a private lot was shrubs versus grass. The desire was to make that equivalent for multi-family structures. On a 10 acre apartment complex, for example, the required formal open space or park areas would go through design review, as well as any screening of a parking area as part of a Stage II review, but landscaping that fills the area between a parking space and the front of the building, like between the sidewalk and front of the house, would not be reviewed.
- Mr. Pauly explained the removal of any significant trees would be reviewed concurrently with the Stage II. It could be reviewed later if one was forgotten or changes were made due to design

adjustments, an ice storm or climate changes, but it would still trigger at least a Type II or Type B review, which included notice of a removal of that tree and the opportunity for public input.

- The proposed review process was going in the right direction and reflected the Commissions conversations in January.
- Most entrances on multi-family properties were usually oriented to the pedestrian of somebody visiting or coming to the multi-family, not necessarily somebody on the pedestrian walkway of the main roadway. Could the orientation instruction be made more friendly to the visitor or the person arriving at the multi-family versus just a passerby.
 - Mr. Pauly replied oftentimes on multi-story, the door was to the side of the porch if units were on both sides or if four units shared a porch or a platform. The doors could still be oriented differently around that porch as long as there was that porch, and that porch was oriented towards the front.
 - Ms. Rogers added part of the intent of the standards was to make sure entries could be easily identified and found, so to orient visitors, the entries would be either visible from the street or a common space obviously leading to the entryway.
- Entries should be identifiable from the parking lot as well. People would be coming from the parking lot as well as the street, so did that matter/need to be included in the multi-family standards?
 - Mr. Pauly believed some of that occurred naturally, but the project team could think it through. The idea was for the entry to face the street and de-emphasize the parking lot. Naturally, one could see where things are and get in because generally, parking would be behind or to the side of the building, and not part of an enhanced elevation.
 - He agreed a walkway that was visible and lit would bring people safely to the entrance.
 - Ms. Bateschell noted the standards did not limit additional entrances, so additional entry points were quite possible for residents in that unit, as well as the primary front door entrance for visitors that would face the courtyard or the street and making sure there were eyes on those facilities as well.
 - Mr. Pauly added in the Villebois Village Center, where entries face the street, breezeways provided access to the units from the street and parking lot, which were on opposite sides.
- Vice Chair Willard believed the design standards were consistent with what the Commission had discussed as well.

Discretionary Alternative Path.

- Mr. Pauly clarified the specific factors referenced on Slide 20 were in the Frog Pond Code and had to be considered if a waiver was being requested in the RN zone. This was a similar structure that exists for the Sign Code. For example, if a sign waiver was being considered, a number of factors needed to be considered in addition to the general waiver criteria.
 - While the City was generally headed down the urban form and housing variety path in the future for other developments, whether those developments would be RN classified and the proposed variance rules applied was uncertain.

- Since this alternative path would apply more broadly to the city and to the design standards that apply throughout all the PDR zones and in Frog Pond West, should more general standards be added to the residential design standards when considering waivers for design standards?
 - If the rules/standards were made around variances specific to one development, then the Code starts growing. But if the Development Code was made more general, more citywide, then the standards only needed to be written once.
- Mr. Pauly replied some specific objectives called out in the Frog Pond East and South Master Plan, for instance, would probably still want to be added, but there was an opportunity to consider adding some general considerations for resident waivers specifically from these types of design standards that really did not exist in the Code when all the other waiver criteria were written.
 - He confirmed the Commission was interested in exploring some of those standards, generally.

Vice Chair Willard called for public testimony.

Mimi Doukas, AKS Engineering, speaking on behalf of West Hills Development, said she did not have a lot to say but wanted to keep up her perfect record of participating in all the Frog Pond East and South hearings. Generally, the design guidelines matched what the developer expected for the West Hills property and the design shown to the Commission several times. She believed the developer could work within these parameters.

- As Commissioner Neil pointed out, she believed everybody needed to be continually reminded that the commercial component was going to be a challenge at the beginning. West Hills had discussions with Staff and were talking through what an interim transition design process might be. Live/work units were probably a very big component of that, but also to make sure the design allowed for the transition to become commercial someday in the future, and that in the short term, it still had a welcoming, inviting street facade for the streetscape the Commission aspired to. West Hills understood that and just wanted to manage expectations. Commercial was very hard before all the rooftops were in.
- West Hills did do early collaboration with Staff regarding the details of the proposal, providing some feedback on some numerical things that had been acknowledged within the draft which was really appreciated.
 - One technical detail regarded window area. The standards of wanting articulation and variation in the facades were understood, but the language in the draft stated the window area was essentially the area of glass, which included the mullions, grids, etc., but it was just the glass. West Hills requested the window area also include the frame and trim around it as these were aesthetic parts of the window and part of that articulation.
 - From a percentage standpoint, measuring only the glass made it really hard to meet the standards, and she believed articulation was the goal. West Hills asked that the definition be revisited.

Mr. Pauly asked if Ms. Rogers had any feedback regarding the window area including the frames.

Ms. Rogers stated she had no problems with modifying the definition as suggested. She agreed with Ms. Doukas' point that the City was not just wanting to regulate actual transparency into the building, it was really about the design feature that a window provided and that articulation and additional definition to a façade, so she was not opposed to the request.

Mr. Pauly understood parts of the door that were not glass also counted, which followed the same principle.

Vice Chair Willard confirmed the Planning Commission agreed that the definition as proposed by Ms. Rogers and Ms. Doukas was appropriate.

INFORMATIONAL

4. City Council Action Minutes (March 7 & 21, 2023) (No Staff presentation)

Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager, suggested that the Commission preview its future work program, noting Staff did a Council presentation on March 6, 2023 about the Climate-Friendly and Equitable Communities (CEFC) and how that impacts the City and future work programs.

5. 2023 PC Work Program (No Staff presentation)

Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager, noted the Annual Housing Report scheduled for April was not set in stone. The report was still in process, and he was not confident it would be completely done, but Staff wanted to get it in front of the Commission soon.

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Gallagher moved to adjourn the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 7:42 p.m. Commissioner Hendrix seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

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