

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 11, 2017  
6:00 P.M.**

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

*Minutes reviewed and  
approved at the  
11/8/2017 PC Meeting*

---

**Minutes**

---

**I. CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL**

Chair Greenfield called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. Those present:

Planning Commission: Jerry Greenfield, Eric Postma, Peter Hurley, Al Levit, Kamran Mesbah, Phyllis Millan, and Simon Springall.

City Staff: Miranda Bateschell, Dan Pauly, Amanda Guile-Hinman

**II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

**III. CITIZEN'S INPUT** - This is an opportunity for visitors to address the Planning Commission on items not on the agenda. There was none.

**IV. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES**

A. Consideration of the September 13, 2017 Planning Commission minutes

The September 13, 2017 Planning Commission minutes were unanimously approved as presented.

**V. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

A. Old Town Single-Family Design Standards. (Pauly)

Chair Greenfield read the legislative hearing procedure into the record and called the public hearing for Old Town Single-Family Design Standards to order at 6:03 p.m.

Miranda Bateschell, Long-range Planning Manager, stated the Old Town neighborhood had wanted this project to proceed for a few years. Developing the Design Standards involved a collaborative process and included community input even before the project began, and continued throughout the process with Staff and the consultant team. She commended Staff and the consultant team for their work in developing these Design Standards for the neighborhood.

Dan Pauly, Senior Planner/Project Manager, announced that the criteria applicable to the application were stated on Page 1 of Attachment C, a document titled "Compliance Findings", which was on page 39 of 46 in the Commission packet. Copies of the report were made available to the side of the room.

Mr. Pauly noted his work, especially with the Old Town neighbors, as well as the consultant, staff and Steve Coyle from Town Green, who had advised the City on architectural matters over the years. The two components of project included the Development Code text changes, done in-house by Staff, and the Design Standards Book, done by Staff with the assistance of the Urban Collaborative consultant team and Town Green. He presented the Old Town Single-Family Design Standards via PowerPoint. His key comments were as follows:

- The properties impacted by the new Design Standards were displayed. He reviewed the early work done leading up to City Council's acceptance in 2011 of the Old Town Neighborhood Plan. This included the

identification of the Boones Ferry District as an area for design standards and an historic theme in the 1996 Westside Master Plan, the adoption of an overlay zone with design standards specific to the Boones Ferry District in the City's 2000 revision of the Development Code, and neighborhood input prompted from a development proposed in late 2006, which was never built. The neighborhood identified a number of issues during that process and took initiative in developing the Architectural Pattern Book. The Old Town Neighborhood Plan included an overall statement about wanting to maintain the Old Town character, which was human-scale, diverse, historic, eclectic, safe, walkable, friendly, and slower paced.

- Two of the 2011 resolution directives to Staff included incorporating the Architectural Pattern Book into the Old Town Overlay Zone and creating certain specific standards for accessory dwelling units (ADUs) in Old Town, and both defined the scope of the current project. Other key considerations included achieving better conformance with the State requirement for clear and objective standards for housing and with stipulations stated in recently passed legislative Senate Bill 1051 that allowed ADUs on all single-family lots.
- Many in the Old Town Neighborhood were heavily involved in the prior processes, including the Westside Plan and Old Town Neighborhood Plan. In scoping the project, Staff and the consultants met with Old Town representatives, Monica Keenan and Doug Muench, to get their input on the scope and direction of the project. Outreach to them and the entire neighborhood had continued throughout the project. The Urban Collaborative consultants held interviews with stakeholders to become oriented with the neighborhood, as well as the neighborhood's views and concerns. The work sessions were publicized in different ways to the neighborhood, and residents attended and participated.
- He noted underlying zoning changes, such as allowed uses, density, parking, and traffic, were outside the scope of the project, per the 2011 resolution's direction that any zoning changes related to the Old Town Plan should come at the request of the individual property owners rather than through a wholesale zoning change.
- He reviewed the key areas related to the recommended Development Code text changes as follows:
  - In the Purpose Statement, the current Code required all development to match the character/architecture of a specific period or be a modern interpretation thereof. However, the character of the single-family area was clearly not defined by that time period, but more by the feel of the neighborhood. (Slide 10)
    - The proposed language removed the reference to the time period for single-family homes and stated, "Single-family homes are to be consistent with and enhance the historic, small town residential character of a neighborhood." Other development, such as commercial and industrial, would still fall within that defined period as far as architectural precedent.
  - Currently, all development of single-family homes on an existing lot was reviewed by the Development Review Board (DRB).
    - The proposed language would bring the development review of Old Town single-family homes in line with the City's current Class 1 review process, so that Staff would conduct the review using clear and objective standards. The administrative process involved a significantly smaller fee and a shorter review time frame for single-family home applications.
    - All other development types would go through the DRB process, the same as in the rest of the city.
  - While the development standards established for single-family and related development in the Neighborhood Plan, particularly for setback, lot coverage, height, and ADUs, took precedence over potentially conflicting development standards elsewhere in the Code, the development standards of the underlying zone, such as density, still applied. The Code did establish what development was subject to the Old Town Single-Family Design Standards Book
    - A couple types of development that did not have to comply with design standards and could still be approved through a Class 1 Administrative Review process included remodels and additions that match the design of the existing house, which essentially became the design standard for any changes. Small accessory buildings, which were limited to 120 sq ft and 10 ft in height, did not have to meet the standard, which was consistent with other zones in the city.
  - The proposed ADU development standards suggested a limit of 600 sq ft, compared to 800 sq ft in the rest of the city, in accordance with the concept of having smaller scale homes reflect the existing neighborhood.

- Additional requirements were consistency with the design of the primary building, detached ADUs either as a single-story structure or over a detached garage, and onsite parking only.
- The resolution suggested limiting the number of ADUs to 10 percent of the lots in Old Town. However, in light of the State Senate bill recently passed, which allowed ADUs on all single-family lots, the proposed standards had no numerical limit on how many single-family lots could have ADUs.
- The Code was revised to make clear that the existing Old Town Overlay Zone standards still applied to commercial and industrial development. These were the same standards applied to the Fred Meyer and Subaru.
- Additional Code changes included organizational changes to better differentiate the review process from the review standards, and one unrelated change regarding access on Boones Ferry Rd.

Commissioner Postma:

- Questioned the formatting on Page 32 of 46 of the Staff report in Attachment B, which included the Code changes, and asked if the paragraph starting “An applicant may elect to go through site design review” under Section 4.138(.03)B.1 was an additional subpart under B, because it bled over to Subsection .04.
  - Mr. Pauly confirmed the numbering was in error in the final changes. That paragraph should be tabbed over as subsection a B.1.a., noting the reference in B above, stating “(except as noted in 1.a below)”.
  - Ms. Bateschell noted that in the last line of the same paragraph, which stated, “...“O” Overlay Zone. (.04)”, a hard return was needed to separate (.04), which was the start of a new line that went with the following A, B, and C.
- Referenced Section 4.138(.04)B.2 at the top of page 33, noting he was concerned about possible confusion caused by discussing accessory structures, which was not a defined term, right before talking about ADUs. He suggested adding a sentence stating, “Accessory structures not including accessory dwelling units (ADUs)
  - Mr. Pauly did not believe the Building Code allowed an ADU of 120 sq ft, but he would have to confirm the minimum. He noted 120 sq ft would be a very tiny space in which to live with bathroom, cooking, and sleeping facilities. If the Code allowed a 120 sq ft ADU, staff could include a clarifying ‘except as’ statement.
  - Ms. Bateschell clarified “Accessory structure” was defined in the definition section of the City’s Code.
- Suggested capitalizing the ‘s’, so it met the definition and people were referring to the definition.
- Clarified he was not concerned about someone building a 120 sq ft ADU; he wanted to make sure people were able to refer to the right section. If accessory structures were defined elsewhere, then changing the small ‘s’ to a capital ‘S’ was probably the solution.
- Corrected Section 4.138(.04)C.1, to state, “ADUs shall not exceed 600 sq ft of living space” under to “ADUs shall not exceed 600 sq ft of living space.”
- Was concerned also in Subsection C.1 that not defining “living space” would lead to confusion over what did and did not apply to living space.
  - Mr. Pauly explained it was the same language used in the existing ADU language of the Building Code. He was not aware of it ever being an issue.
- Did not know whether building an ADU above a garage with some next-door attic space would create some confusion about what was defined as living space in the ADU, adding he would defer to Staff on the issue.
- Confirmed these were not material changes, although the last change should be adjusted for the motion.

Amanda Guile-Hinman, Assistant City Attorney, assured she was keeping notes of the proposed changes, and advised that the motion be made subject to the changes that had been discussed.

Commissioner Levit:

- Noted ADUs were limited to a maximum of 600 sq ft in Old Town and 800 sq ft in the rest of the city. He asked what the square footage limit was on a shed in the rest of the city. His neighbor was building an enormous shed that was possibly 800 to 900 sq ft and quite high. The neighbor had worked with the City, so the shed was most likely within Code.

- Mr. Pauly clarified there was no limit on the square footage of a shed because that was driven by overall lot coverage. Typically, yards that were big enough to have a big shed had a low lot coverage ratio. Many of the older neighborhoods with the larger lots had 25 to 30 percent lot coverage. An oversize shed would have to meet more setbacks and Building Code requirements as well as the lot coverage requirements.
- Asked how duplexes fit in with the statement on Slide 10 that single-family homes had to be consistent with and enhance the historic small town character and that other developments would still have 1880-1930 architecture.
  - Mr. Pauly replied duplexes would be treated as single-family, which was consistent within the rest of the city.

Zoe Anton, Project Manager, Urban Collaborative, continued the PowerPoint presentation, reviewing the Design Standards Book with these key additional comments:

- The purpose of the proposed Design Standards was to create the clear and objective standards that helped the neighborhood and single-family homes in Old Town retain their unique historic character with a simple design and small scale.
- The Design Standards Book included an introduction and history of Old Town's historical significance and why the design standards were created. Old Town's historic residential types were introduced and a page described how to use the design standards. The style guidelines followed an introduction of the architectural styles: Western Farmhouse, Craftsman, and New Ranch. Accessory buildings, materials and lot coverage, edges and setbacks, were also discussed, and a glossary of terms was also included.
- The design standards included a step-by-step guide for residents and developers on how to use the book, as well as guidelines and a checklist for City Staff that Mr. Pauly was helping to develop.
- The three main architectural styles were indicative of the three main styles found in Old Town today and were intended to help the neighborhood keep its current character. The Colonial and Modern Mix styles had been discussed in work sessions, but did not appear in the design standards.
  - The Colonial style was not included because there was only one Colonial style home in the neighborhood and it was not actually built in the neighborhood but rather brought in; therefore, the team did not consider it indicative of the current character of the neighborhood.
  - The Modern Mix was not included because it was deemed 'unpredictable' and did not enhance the historical character of the neighborhood. This did not mean homeowners had to change their existing homes, only that a new home could not be built in a Modern style.
- She described the typical elements and characteristics of the three main architectural styles, referencing illustrations and renderings presented on Slides 23 through 35, with these key comments:
  - All three styles were specific to this region, and indicative of the house styles that currently exist in Old Town.
  - The Design Standards provided guidelines, specific details, and standards for each architectural style and included categories for massing and roofs, windows and doors, and porches and other elements. These details were refined through discussions with neighborhood residents, the Planning Commission, and City Staff.
- Typical elements in the stylized characteristics of the
  - The Western Farmhouse included a steeper pitched roof and a prominent porch and entry, which were typical of this architectural style.
  - The Craftsman style included one-and-a-half stories, a dormer, and a prominent porch integrated into the home. Craftsman homes often have expressive or exposed structural elements. The rendering was indicative of something that could be built according to the guidelines and design standards elements.
  - The Ranch style was the most prominent style in Old Town today, and the New Ranch Style was introduced with a lower pitched roof and the addition of a porch to help enhance the character of the neighborhood and help bring the Ranches back into the historical character. Porches would be encouraged on new homes but not on existing homes.

- Another change was moving the garage to the back or side of the house, instead of in line with the front façade of the typical Ranch style seen today.
- Large picture windows or prominent front windows were another style characteristic of the New Ranch.

Mr. Pauly reported that in response to neighbors' comments received last evening regarding concerns that porches or porticos would be required for remodels of existing Ranches, Staff was comfortable changing the existing language so that Porches would be encouraged, but not required, for remodels and additions of existing Ranch houses, but still required for new homes built in the New Ranch style.

- He confirmed that would be a change to the existing language under Porches to state porches were encouraged during remodels of existing homes and required for new homes.

Commissioner Springall:

- Asked if the existing Ranch homes could be remodeled using the generic ranch style.
  - Mr. Pauly replied that was correct. This language was duplicative of the concept and provided additional clarity whether one looked at the design standards or the remodel standards page, homeowners could keep the existing look of their Ranch.
- Asked whether an existing ranch style house adding a porch became a New Ranch, and who decided whether something qualified as a Ranch or New Ranch.
  - Mr. Pauly stated that ultimately, it was the homeowner's choice, as he did not see a scenario in which the City would force a porch or portico on anybody.
  - Ms. Anton added if a homeowner chose to build a porch to these design standards, they could call it a New Ranch.
  - Mr. Pauly clarified that Staff would make it clear in the record that adding a porch or portico to the front of a house did not mean the homeowner had to tear down and move the garage to the side of the house.

Commissioner Levit:

- Asked if the design standards affected remodeling the kitchen or if only remodeling on the exterior triggered the design standards.
  - Mr. Pauly stated there were no standards related to remodeling the interior of the homes.
- Commented that was a limitation on the definition of remodel.
  - Ms. Anton noted that 'remodel' was well-defined in the Code and including a list of how to tell whether or not a homeowner had to meet the Design standards, which required a significant change to the exterior structure.

Ms. Anton continued her review of the Design Standards Book via PowerPoint as follows:

- Accessory Buildings. Any accessory structure over the 120 sq ft minimum had to comply with the Design Standards. An accessory dwelling unit (ADU) had to match the primary dwelling on the lot in style and be built to the Design Standards.
  - A change to the requirements for accessory buildings and ADUs from the City Council work session was to allow an accessory building to be built up to a maximum of 15 feet high if the primary dwelling was less than 15 feet high.
  - Mr. Pauly added the change addressed a concern about some existing manufactured home that had very low slopes.
- Materials and Lot Coverage. The team did not want to restrict the materials that could be used and wanted to leave the materials flexible for developers and residents. The Design Standards followed the Frog Pond Code model in listing the five construction materials prohibited in the area, which were consistent with the Frog Pond Code.

- The restriction of built structures not to exceed 40 percent lot coverage was consistent with the current neighborhood lot coverage. The team's analysis found that 40 percent lot coverage meant a little over 90 percent of the parcels in the neighborhood would be conforming, which was consistent with the existing typology.
- Setbacks. All the setbacks were the same as in the current Code, although garage setbacks were changed a bit to be consistent with other existing codes in Wilsonville. The garage or secondary dwelling setback needed to be 4 feet from the front building line, not including the porch. Both the Frog Pond and Villebois Codes used that same language.
  - The Design Standards were highly encouraged but did not require a driveway at the front property line to be no greater than 12 feet. The diagram (Slide 38) illustrated that a garage accessed off the alley or not from the front building line could be wider. The intention was to enhance the pedestrian environment, which aligned with the Old Town Plan goals.

Mr. Pauly reviewed a couple of additional changes Staff recommended to the Design Standards Book, following further discussion with the neighborhood since the draft was published, to get the Commission's feedback.

- For remodels of and additions to existing homes, particularly those that did not comply with the proposed standards, Staff recommended adding a page of photos of existing homes and a cross-reference to the Development Code section that defined what remodels could happen through a Class 1 review, without needing to comply with the other design standards in the Design Standards Book. This addressed the concern that someone could look only at the Design Guidelines and never look at the standards in the Development Code.
  - The addition of a similar page was recommended for accessory buildings to cross-reference the ADU standards.
- In light of the neighborhood's concern about the impact duplex development could have on the neighborhood and the prevalent reference to duplexes in the Design Standards, Staff recommended removing the duplex example pages provided individually for each style, consolidating the three pages with the sketches and duplex language into a single page, and placing that page after the accessory building pages.
  - Staff did not anticipate many duplexes on existing single-family lots, as Staff found only three lots in Old Town of the right size and in the right zone on which duplexes would be permitted under the current zoning, lot size, and density requirements.
  - The predominant zone in Old Town was Residential Agricultural- Holding (RA-H), which explicitly only allowed single-family homes.
  - There was only a spattering of Residential (R) and Planned Development Residential (PDR-4) zoned lots in Old Town, which allowed the whole range of residential from single-family to multi-family, including duplexes. The few large lots zoned either R or PDR-4 and of sufficient size would be the ones that could have duplexes.
  - With Staff not anticipating duplexes, it made sense to put the duplex information in as a footnote so it could be a resource if needed, but was not as prevalent and less encouraging of duplexes.

Commissioner Postma asked for clarification on the proposed duplex changes and the pages to be removed.

- Mr. Pauly explained that currently there were three pages with drawings and language related to duplexes. Staff proposed removing those three pages from the middle of the document and reduce them to a single page that just gave an overview of duplexes towards the end of the document. In addition, Staff would remove the language in the steps Ms. Anton discussed that referred to duplexes.
  - From a policy standpoint and the initial direction, duplexes are allowed. Initially, Staff was not looking at changing any of the zoning or allowed uses through this project. The project encouraged duplexes to be on the same scale as single-family homes, only with two entrances.
  - An option was to keep duplexes with site design review, which was inconsistent with the rest of the city but there was some uncertainty of what would come from that process. Neighbors had mixed reactions regarding existing homes in the neighborhood that have gone through site design review.

- Having more certainty that duplexes would be on the smaller scale and meet the setbacks and other Design Standards was preferable with continuing to allow duplexes.
- Ms. Anton stated that Step 1.,1 on page 12 of 46 in the packet, which mentioned duplexes, would be taken out, as well as the one page in each of the three styles dedicated to a duplex drawing and duplex language. She confirmed those three pages would be consolidated.

Commissioner Springall asked where the text stating duplexes would be indistinguishable from single-family homes would end up.

- Mr. Pauly replied on the single page with the three images.

Commissioner Levit asked for clarification on where Lot 79, referenced in the last week's meeting minutes, was located.

- Mr. Pauly said Lot 79 was the property at 4<sup>th</sup> St and Fir Ave. It was now vacant since the larger home on it had been torn down. This lot was another location where duplexes could go, conceptually. The developer had been working with Staff, had done the pre-application meeting and held a neighborhood meeting this summer to discuss his plans with the neighborhood. The latest proposal, following the neighborhood meeting and staff discussion, was to have detached dwellings. Currently, the developer was not thinking of attached duplexes on that property, but conceptually, duplexes were allowed by Code.

Chair Greenfield called for public testimony on the Old Town Single-Family Design Standards.

Monica Keenan, 9460 SW 4<sup>th</sup> Street, thanked Mr. Pauly and Ms. Anton for their help in getting to this point with the plan. She supported all the comments, noting Mr. Pauly covered everything the neighborhood e-mailed and contacted him about the Design Standards Book. With respect to Code statements regarding pedestrian environment on Page 34 of 46, she asked for clarity regarding sidewalks and the street improvements on Boones Ferry north of 5<sup>th</sup> St. She acknowledged the direction that the neighborhood needed to work through Public Works and Engineering. However, in addressing the sidewalks in terms of the architectural standards and feel of the neighborhood, the residents wanted to make sure the rural feel was maintained and that no one misconstrued they were expecting sidewalks to be required. She did not see this specifically noted in what was expected to be the street improvements north of 5<sup>th</sup> St on Boones Ferry. She confirmed she was referencing Subsection .05 on page 33 of 46, specifically .05.E, which was on the following page.

Ms. Anton clarified Subsection .05 was the Development Standards for commercial, industrial, public facility, multi-family, and mixed-use buildings, and not single-family design standards.

Ms. Keenan commented she just wanted to make sure it was clearly stated and fell in alignment with the neighborhood's environment.

Ms. Keenan presented the neighborhood's request not to include duplexes at all in the residential area identified in the Old Town Plan. She acknowledged the City's desire to include duplexes because duplexes could be potentially developed on three lots. The neighborhood's concern was that a primary Old Town Neighborhood Plan goal was to maintain the single-family environment of the neighborhood; duplexes were never considered as part of the neighborhood's conversations about single-family.

Chair Greenfield:

- Confirmed there was language in the Plan for duplexes to be in a style similar to single-family homes. He recalled discussions about the possibility of duplexes with entrances on different sides of the building.
  - Mr. Pauly said the standards included that element as a requirement for the New Ranch style, but not for the other two styles, although the requirement could potentially be added.
  - Ms. Anton clarified the language for all duplex styles encouraged, but did not require, entrances on different sides of the building. The language required duplexes to appear indistinguishable from single-family homes, except for the two entries.

- Believed that should help assuage the concern.

Douglas Muench, 30950 SW Fir Ave, Wilsonville, stated the neighborhood's major concern was not the look, blending in or indistinguishability of duplexes from single-family homes. While that was preferable, the concern was duplexes doubled the number of families, which changed the density, as Commissioner Postma said at the last meeting. It would significantly change the neighborhood. His house was located next to two of the three lots that could redevelop with duplexes. The residents have put up with the sewage treatment plant, the cell phone tower, and all the construction. However, the dead end street gave the neighbors room to spread and allowed their kids to run around. He and his neighbors wanted to maintain that feel. It was not about excluding anyone; the neighbors did not want people packed in more. Duplexes involved more than only two doors. There were two driveways, garbage pickup, and all the extra stuff that came with two family households. Making a duplex look indistinguishable was only a small part of their concern. Their major concern was all the other stuff that came along with a family home. The neighbors would rather not have duplexes in Old Town if possible.

- He recalled the neighborhood originally had five styles in the Pattern Book because the neighbors wanted to encourage diversity of architectural style for new construction, which was important. There might be only one Colonial style house in the neighborhood now, but it was there. If someone wanted to build a Colonial or Modern Mix style house, he thought that would be great, as he believed most of the neighbors did too.

Rose Case, 9150 SW 4<sup>th</sup> St, Wilsonville, thanked the Commission for addressing this matter on which the neighborhood has worked so hard and so long. She lived on Lot 83 across from the duplexes on Lots 84 and 85. The duplexes messed up the street because of the way they were built and the failure to address traffic. She concurred with Mr. Muench regarding the wide variety of architectural styles in the neighborhood. The house on Lot 53 had originally been a Queen Anne style house, although it no longer looked like one with the second story having burned down, but the owners kept the downstairs exactly as it was built except to put in electrical outlets. Older pictures of Wilsonville included a picture of the Queen Anne house. Queen Anne was a style that would fit. Old Town was an historic area. As the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) officer said, Old Town was the history of Oregon. Limiting the variety of styles would be a disservice to the history of Wilsonville. She encouraged finding a way to address the ability to add other styles while noting duplexes were difficult to incorporate into Old Town.

Commissioner Levit asked when the duplexes Ms. Case mentioned were built.

Ms. Case replied the duplexes across from her were built two years ago.

Mr. Pauly clarified those buildings were technically not duplexes, but rather, attached ADUs.

Commissioner Postma:

- Asked if someone could build an additional style, such as the Colonial, by going through the DRB process according to these Design Standards, which did not prohibit additional styles, but rather required an additional process for those styles.
  - Mr. Pauly noted the additional process was a substantially more extensive process.
- Asked if the Design Guidelines could be amended in the future to add additional styles if the Commission felt it were warranted.
  - Mr. Pauly observed doing so involved a significant process.
- Wanted to make sure the Commission was not foreclosing the opportunity for other styles to be considered in Old Town. The Commission essentially was saying yes to these styles for now, with the opportunity for those other styles to be used either through the DRB process or through an amendment process.
  - Chair Greenfield observed an application to build one of the three styles received streamlined treatment.
  - Mr. Pauly said yes.

- Understood Staff to say there was a limited number of lots on which it was possible or feasible to build duplexes.
  - Mr. Pauly confirmed that was correct. Those same lots also appeared to be divisible to put a second unit on them.
- Asked if it was feasible under the Code or statutes to outright preclude duplexes in Old Town, or was there case law prohibiting the restriction of duplexes.
  - Mr. Pauly said no. The Department of Land Conversation and Development (DLCD) told him there was nothing in State statutes precluding a prohibition of duplexes. While he understood what the neighborhood was saying, he was trying to look at it from a broader City perspective. Old Town was different, yet the design standards addressed scale and massing, particularly on these lots where duplexes could be two separate units on two different lots. Old Town was its own neighborhood but any area in the city would have similar concerns about traffic, etc.
- Acknowledged Mr. Pauly's point, but noted there was still the character of the neighborhood of family atmosphere, more space, etc., to which he was sensitive.
  - Mr. Pauly observed Staff's standpoint was consistency with the rest of the city.

Commissioner Mesbah understood Staff's concern was that precluding duplexes could establish a precedent.

- Mr. Pauly concurred, although Staff has not discussed it. If the Commission used this rationale for this neighborhood, another neighborhood could make similar arguments.

Commissioner Postma:

- Asked what the maximum number of lots was that could have duplexes on them.
  - Mr. Pauly stated three lots could have duplexes under current zoning and lot size, two of which were Mr. Muench's neighbors. There was still the possibility of rezoning other larger lots, but that was a complicated process requiring a full public review. It was unlikely lot ownership would be consolidated to allow replatting of lots.
- Noted that even assuming a change to a prohibition of duplexes, someone could still do a technical, ADU type of structure and get multiple families on those lots.
  - Mr. Pauly concurred but noted one could not get a large family in 600 sq ft.

Chair Greenfield asked about the boundary between ADUs and duplexes. If someone proposed through the DRB process an ADU larger than 600 sq ft, it was not called an ADU. At what point did the City consider it a duplex?

- Mr. Pauly replied when it was beyond that. A key difference between ADUs and duplexes was that ADUs did not count in the density calculations and duplexes did. If someone came in with a 900 sq ft ADU, it would be a duplex, whether it was attached or detached.
- Ms. Anton noted a duplex would count in the density requirements, and thus, fall under the zoning rules.
- Mr. Pauly confirmed only three properties would permit duplexes because the primary Residential Agricultural - Holding (RA-H) zone of most of Old Town did not allow duplexes.

Commissioner Postma asked how long the zoning for those lots had been there.

- Mr. Pauly replied the RA-H zone had been on the Old Town lots since the current zoning types were adopted.

Commissioner Mesbah asked if the two lots that could potentially have a duplex on them could be subdivided into two single-family lots.

- Mr. Pauly said yes, based on the zoning and the zone's minimum lot size. The lots were 12,400 sq ft and the PD zone required more than 12,000 sq ft. At that size, there was room to meet the minimum lot size with a partition. However, a partition would trigger street improvements, but duplexes would not necessarily trigger any improvements.

Chair Greenfield asked if someone could remodel a single-family home as an attached duplex.

- Mr. Pauly said no. Unless the home was on one of the partitionable lots, remodeling a single-family home into a duplex could not happen because of the need to meet the density standards.

Chair Greenfield closed the public hearing for LP17-0004 at 7:10 pm and called for Council discussion.

Commissioner Levit appreciated all the work that went into this plan, as he could recall the Development Review Board days and the aborted multi-family development. He had mixed feelings about that development, as some of the reasons the neighbors did not want it seemed to be compromised by what was already happening, but he thought it was being imposed on the neighborhood. The proposed standards book would create a livable situation. Subdividing the lots or building duplexes on them would lead to the same result. He empathized with the neighborhood's concern about the duplexes based on the situation in his own neighborhood, but pointed out one could have the same situation with single-family homes. Depending on who lived in single-family homes, one could get a completely different nature to the street. The plan was a good piece of work.

Commissioner Hurley concurred that it was not so much the structure as it was the people living in the structure that dictated how a neighborhood ended up. The Design Standards Book was a good product, given the amount of work and divergent ideas, opinions, and thoughts that have gone into it.

Commissioner Mesbah concurred with the previous comments. Referencing the discussion about the Queen Anne style, he noted that in his experience, the farther back one went in architectural history in trying to build a new version of an architectural style, the phonier the style became. To him, a brand new Victorian screamed Disney. While someone could pay what was required to build a true Victorian with all the hand carving, no one did so. The Craftsman and Farmhouse styles in the plan had modern interpretations that looked respectable, a fusion vision that looked nice and not fake.

Commissioner Millan appreciated the neighborhood's work, time, and effort to stay involved in this long process. She acknowledged the neighborhood's desire to protect the look of the neighborhood, which this plan did in setting an architectural standard. Someone wanting to do something different could do that through the longer process of the DRB, while someone wanting to build a Craftsman could go through the streamlined process in the plan; this maintained the look of the neighborhood. It was a good product and a good process.

Commissioner Springall concurred with the prior comments, noting the excellent work from the City and the consultants. This plan achieved the needed balance between supporting the feel of a neighborhood and allowing flexibility for individual property owners to do what they wanted on their property. He liked the idea of remodels supporting the existing style while limiting new buildings to the three styles with encouragement to create something special. He was optimistic the City would have the sort of feeling they were all hoping for that would serve Old Town far into the future.

Commissioner Postma commended the residents on their work over the last decade and their perseverance in achieving their goal. This project testified to the fact that the process of input back and forth worked in developing a document that he hoped would serve the Old Town neighborhood well. He was sensitive to the duplex requirement and what it meant for the character of the neighborhood but the neighbors should not stop either. He was in the business of finding loopholes in codes. While hearing there were a limited number of opportunities for duplexes made him feel a bit better about duplexes, he was concerned that any prohibition or fix would probably not get the neighborhood anything different when it came to a density standard in terms of what it would do for the character of the neighborhood.

- He encouraged the neighbors not to stop their efforts to maintain the neighborhood character but to continue to be diligent in making sure any potential new neighbors abided by this Code. It was the same thing when it came to the other styles, too. He hoped the neighborhood heard there was still a possibility to have other styles; the issue was whether the style fit the character of the neighborhood. He hoped the neighbors would push that issue in front of the DRB if they wanted to see more styles. He thanked the neighbors for doing

what they did to get a good workable Code. He urged the neighbors not to stop because they still had work ahead of them to make sure the character of their neighborhood stayed the same.

Chair Greenfield said he had nothing to add that had not already been said very well. He commended Staff and the consultants for a patient and attentive process. This was a good conclusion, which included the important process for treating exceptions.

Commissioner Postma moved to adopt Resolution LP17-0004 Old Town Single-Family Design Standards as amended on October 11, 2017, which included the following recommendations:

- The Design Code changes as discussed with regard to formatting and numbering references;
- Design Standards page regarding porches for New Ranch Style being encouraged for existing structures and required for new structures;
- Design guidelines for an addition remodel and a ADU page that refers to the code provisions; and
- References to the duplexes in the Design Guidelines to combine information found on three (3) pages to consolidate onto one page of standards to remove the Item 1.1 page 12 of 46 reference to duplexes.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Mesbah and passed unanimously.

Chair Greenfield expressed his appreciation for the attendance from the community.

## VI. INFORMATIONAL

### A. City Council Action Minutes (09.07.2017 and 09.18.2017)

There were no comments.

### B. 2017 Planning Commission Work Program

Ms. Bateschell reviewed the Planning Commission's 2017 Work Program included in the meeting packet. She noted the extensive public outreach Staff did on the Town Center Plan over the summer and the work started with the consultant around the emerging concepts. Staff wanted the Commission's input to help Staff reach a preferred alternative and refine the initial concepts. The additional information needed to consider what elements would be preferred and the Task Force's feedback and comments from its October 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting would be discussed at the joint session with City Council on December 4<sup>th</sup>. She addressed questions from the Planning Commission as follows:

- In light of concerns about having both the Industrial Form-Based Code and Water Treatment Master Plan public hearings at the January meeting, she agreed to see if the Master Plan was still on schedule and how involved it would be.
- She would have the first few months of the 2018 Work Program worked out to present at the November meeting. Upcoming items included, the Town Center Plan, adoption of the Form-Based Code, the Old Town Code amendments, potentially, density fixes to the Development Code, and the citywide Wayfinding Program.
- She agreed to get an update from Project Manager Kerry Rappold regarding Phases 1 and 2 of the I-5 undercrossing trail improvement, and ask him to put the project on the City's website.
- The property owner of the hazelnut orchard across from Montebello on Wilsonville Rd told Staff he cut down trees that were past their production. The trees' removal was part of the farm operation. He had no interest in doing any development.
- She would research and provide information about the crosswalk light that was supposed to be installed from Graham Oaks across Wilsonville Rd.
- She would notify Code Enforcement about sandwich boards and other advertising proliferating on properties around the city, particularly in the 95<sup>th</sup> St area and along Wilsonville Rd to ensure the proper permitting and sign placement had been done. The City would remove any signs that were not properly permitted or displayed, which Staff did frequently.

- She would follow up on concerns about the Subaru dealership storing stock outside the fence, when the zoning required stock to be stored inside the fence, like at the Honda dealership.

Commissioner Levit:

- Noted today's *Spokesman* discussed the Hilton Hotel Project being reviewed favorably by the public, yet Wilsonville's Nextdoor website had a lot of negative comments about City Council approving the project. There was a lot of misinformation, especially since Council did not approve the project. People were upset about the trees being cut down, and that Council seemed to approve every development. He suggested someone at the City check out the Nextdoor comments and perhaps, add some commentary.
  - Ms Bateschell clarified DRB Panel A approved the Hilton project.
- Recalled receiving a copy of Mr. Britcliffe's letter expressing his anger that his property was not considered for the Brown Rd to Boones Ferry Rd connector.
  - Amanda Guile-Hinman, Assistant City Attorney, said Mr. Britcliffe filed a notice of appeal with the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) and then withdrew it. She did not believe the Commission needed to be concerned about it.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Greenfield adjourned the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 7:36 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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