

**PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, JULY 12, 2017
6:00 P.M.**

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

*Minutes approved
at 9.13.2017 PC
Meeting*

Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

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

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

City Staff: Chris Neamtzu, Amanda Guile-Hinman, Miranda Bateschell, Daniel Pauly, Jordan Vance, and Kim Rybold.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

CITIZEN'S INPUT

There was none.

CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES

A. Consideration of the May 10, 2017 Planning Commission minutes
The May 10, 2017 Planning Commission minutes were accepted as presented.

II. WORK SESSIONS

A. Old Town Development Code and Architectural Pattern Book (Pauly)

Dan Pauly, Senior Planner, explained that a lot of work went into the Old Town Neighborhood Plan and included an Architectural Pattern Book. The project team was tasked with developing and integrating objective standards into the Development Code in order to make the Neighborhood Plan operational and to review single-family homes in Old Town. He introduced the consultant team.

Zoe Anton, Project Manager, Urban Collaborative, and Steve Coyle, Architect and Planner of Town-Green, presented the Wilsonville Old Town Single-Family Architectural Standards. The PowerPoint presentation included a review of the six residential architectural styles proposed for Old Town, suggested guidelines for formatting clear, objective and useable standards, and the key issues for the Commission to consider when establishing appropriate architectural styles for Old Town in the Code.

- Some houses along the north side of Boones Ferry Rd were outside of the project's scope because they faced Boones Ferry Rd. Different standards would apply to those homes because Boones Ferry Rd would be turned into a mixed-use main street. The homes were included in the audit because they still contributed to the architectural style and especially because they included some beautiful historic styles.
- Most of the architectural examples were in Old Town, but some were in greater Wilsonville; however, all of the ranch-style homes shown were in Old Town.

Initial discussion and feedback from the Planning Commission was as follows:

- Farmhouse, bungalow, and ranch style homes only made up about a third of the homes in Old Town, yet these three styles seemed to be driving the architectural style of the neighborhood. Was the intention to drive the future development of those specific designs as opposed to the entire neighborhood? How many existing homes would not fit architectural proposals?
 - According to feedback received, the neighborhood wanted to maintain the specific historic character defined in the years 1880 to 1930, which would not include ranch or modern mix. The three styles represented a small part of the area, and the recommendation was to at least include ranch style homes dating from 1950 and forward and was currently the majority of the style in Old Town. The modern mix did include some ranch homes that had been altered, resulting in them no longer being identified as historic ranch. The question was whether to expand the time period beyond 1930 to show the real character of the neighborhood, so perhaps further input was needed from the community.
- Unlike Frog Pond, most of what was being discussed was concerning what the current ownership wanted their neighborhood to look like, so hearing from current residents was preferable as their input should be more of a driving force than what the Commission believed the neighborhood should look like.
- A key question was whether the massing and size, regardless of style, were more important or the actual architectural style versus the actual massing and setbacks.
- There were four undeveloped properties in Old Town, two were nearing completion and two had just started construction.
- The largest portion was at Fir Ave and 4th St, identified as Building 79, where the home had been demolished. The developers held a neighborhood meeting recently to discuss development of the property.

Chair Greenfield called for public comment.

Monica Keenan stated she had attended all the planning sessions for the development of the Old Town Plan and was on the Steering Committee for the Architectural Pattern Book to pull together some missing elements that needed to get into the Plan's text. She explained that the original Old Town Overlay called for the area to retain the historic feeling of the time period from 1880 to 1930. In the text of the Old Town Plan, the neighborhood wanted to move beyond that and include all of the ranch homes, which was why they were included in the Pattern Book to help support the continued growth of Old Town and acknowledge each step of growth in the neighborhood, depicting the very specific stages of growth there. She wanted to clarify that the 1880 to 1930 character was not expected to continue as that was the old overlay.

- In developing the subject standards, the goal was for the new standards to supersede what used to be the catch-all of the 1880s to 1930s character. If the owner of a ranch house wanted to do some renovations, for example, the owner was directed to make their ranch house look like something prior to 1930, which was the catalyst for developing the Pattern Book.

Commissioner Levit noted that even with the ranch homes included only about one third of the existing homes currently fit the historic category.

- Ms. Keenan adding noted that the Pattern Book included seven standards that allowed manufactured homes to be replaced with or new homes to be built as farmhouse, bungalow, colonial, or ranch style homes.
- The consultants discouraged the modern mix as a new housing style, but in developing the Plan 12 years ago, the intent was to protect existing homes so an existing modern mix owner could make some basic renovations without having to make it look like something it wasn't, which was why the Steering Committee tried to capture all of those elements. So, moving forward, developing ranch houses were fine. In total, 83 percent of the homes were covered by the standard styles recommended in the Pattern Book.

Commissioner Springall asked if she was suggesting a different treatment for remodeled versus new development; perhaps remodel standards would be slightly more flexible to keep with the current style of the house, particularly with regard to the modern mix, and not veer away from that style for new development, while allowing any existing buildings of that style to be remodeled consistent with their current style.

- Ms. Keenan agreed and cited the Butterfly House as an example, noting the idea was not to make it more difficult for that house to be remodeled into something it was not. Codifying that concept and making it specific was difficult. However, she did not believe it should be classified as a modern mix, which could then be submitted as a three-story, international style. The language needed to be careful with remodels, which was difficult given the broad mix of styles.

Commissioner Postma understood the mindset was that if renovations fell outside the recommended pattern styles, such as the ranch style, the modern mix should not be exacerbated when making renovations.

Ms. Anton summarized the understanding that remodels could stay within their current style and the scale and massing of the overall context of the neighborhood, but new homes must fit into the 1880s to 1930s styles.

Ms. Keenan responded no; the defined housing types were determined to go into the next stage of the Pattern Book. She clarified the architectural styles should include everything included in the Pattern Book, except for the modern mix. She confirmed that included western farmhouse, craftsmen, bungalow, colonial revival, ranch but not modern mix for new construction.

Doug Muench, citizen residing at Fir Ave, stated he had worked closely with Ms. Keenan and Marta on the Pattern Book. In their discussions, he did not recall talking about new construction being allowed to do modern mix at all. Remodels were discussed, but specifically, modern mix did not fit the neighborhood at all. While any existing remodel was okay within the styles discussed, including modern mix, any new construction needed to be the 1880s to 1930s plus the other two styles, but not modern mix.

Commissioner Postma understood new construction would be western farmhouse, craftsmen, bungalow, and ranch. The modern mix could be remodeled as long as the remodel did not significantly increase the massing or exacerbating the modern style.

Commissioner Millan noted the issue was to not preclude someone from being able to upgrade their modern mix.

Mr. Muench noted a section of Villebois included some modern mix, and many people were opposed to it because it did not fit. Old Town did not want to see that.

Commissioner Levit inquired about manufactured homes.

- Mr. Muench stated manufactured homes existed, and he did not believe any new ones would come in.
- Ms. Keenan noted the original Pattern Book includes a page for manufactured homes, but those styles had been pulled out and replaced with the styles set forth in the new Pattern Book.
- Ms. Anton stated manufactured homes could meet all style guidelines. If standards were set for materials, color, height, etc. and if the homes met those standards, whatever manufactured or not, it should be approved. She did not believe manufactured homes could be prohibited if all the standards were met.

Commissioner Hurley clarified a manufactured home did not simply mean double-wide trailer. Moving forward, 3,000 sq ft, factory-built manufactured homes would be built that looked like Renaissance homes.

Ms. Keenan stated it was a concern for residents who might want to replace their manufactured homes with another and not build a stick home.

- She noted a page in the Pattern Book needed clarification. The five contributing styles they wanted reflected in new homes were western farmhouse, bungalow, craftsman, colonial revival, and modern mix, which encapsulated everything from 1935 to 1990 and included ranch-style homes.

Commissioner Springall suggested that the definition of modern mix might be too broad as it included a variety of homes, and clearly, the international style that did not fit Old Town's character.

- Ms. Keenan stated the Old Town Neighborhood Plan was a neighborhood effort and that was the nomenclature at the time.
- Ms. Anton agreed the Plan was a great document. She recommended removing the ranch style from the modern mix, which she agreed was too broad. It was a recognized historic style and a large part of Old Town's current character. She clarified Craftsman was actually the style and bungalow was a subcategory, and actually a small craftsman.

Commissioner Mesbah:

- Asked if the style book was for those who wanted approval through Staff; if someone wanted to do a modern structure that harmonized with adjacent structures, the discretionary approval process was still available. Modern design could articulate different massing and elements very well, and be perfectly compatible with older, adjacent buildings.
 - Mr. Pauly added that as currently proposed, a project not meeting the Pattern Book or Design Guidelines would go back to the current process, which required an 1880 to 1930 style. The Code might need to be adjusted to better define the architectural styles or that era for single-family homes.
- Confirmed that as currently drafted, modern mix would be out if the standards in the design book were not met, though the planning appeals process was still available.

Commissioner Levit asked what the largest historical house was in Old Town, currently.

- Ms. Keenan replied the average was 1.5 stories, but there were a couple two-story homes. In the subject process, the neighborhood wanted to address the scale and massing on the lots to help minimize large ranches. The architectural standards were supposed to support the scale and massing of the existing Old Town neighborhood where the maximum was two stories.
- Mr. Pauly added the historical size was 1,200 to 1,300 sq ft, but nothing over 2,000 sq ft.

Mr. Coyle understood one fundamental issue was if a remodel, addition, or a new house did not fit the proposed standards for either a ranch or earlier, it would have to go through some kind of design review or discretionary process.

- Mr. Pauly responded presently, there was similar language in the Old Town Overlay stating the proposal much match the historical or the style of the existing house. Simple remodels were currently handled administratively. However, there was a need to define how far someone could go with the existing style before conformance was triggered.
- Ms. Anton stated getting further clarification through this planning session would help them provide further details for the next work session; for example, remodels over 400 sq ft must go through the process. More specific proposals would be presented at the next work session after the project team received direction on the key issues.

Ms. Keenan continued her testimony, stating that while the page with the small duplex example was appreciated, the text of the Plan stated no duplexes, which was why there was an issue with accessory dwelling units (ADUs). The Steering Committee had wanted to find a way to limit ADUs, which result in high-density in the neighborhood comprised of many dead-ends. ADUs had already been used as a mechanism for duplexes. Even the old Overlay stated no duplexes in the Old Town residential area.

- Although the current Overlay did allow duplexes, the whole point of the Old Town Plan was to change and clean up that old Overlay. She noted the single-family standards were being reviewed for the neighborhood.

Ms. Anton stated the Planning Commission needed to decide whether architectural standards should be included for duplexes, which would affect the Code.

Ms. Keenan responded it was the Code changes that had taken such a long time. She stated one of the five goals for the Old Town Plan was no ADUs. The Steering Committee focused on ADUs because the goal was to have no duplexes or multi-family in the single-family portion of the neighborhood, which was bordered by multi-family on the north and south.

Commissioner Postma noted a state statute required that ADUs be allowed.

- Ms. Keenan replied addressing that statute would come through defining ADUs in the neighborhood so they could not necessarily be used as a mechanism for duplexes or triplexes.

Commissioner Springall confirmed the existing multi-family was not included in the study area.

- Ms. Anton added there were a few duplexes along the park, which were included within the scope because they were in the Old Town Overlay Zone. The Commission needed to determine whether to continue to include duplexes.

Michelle Dempsey said she lived at the end of Boones Ferry Rd and wanted to talk about the four new homes built that she believed were considered condos. There used to be a trailer on that lot, and when the pictures came to the neighborhood, it looked like a house. The pictures showed it at the back of the lot with room in front of the building. However, the building was built directly on the street with no setback and a garage right in the front, so the massive house just dominated the tiny manufactured home next to it. There were actually two enormous homes being built on that one lot that used to have a trailer on it. She did not know what type of homes they were, but they did not look like Old Town.

Ms. Keenan believed she was talking about Lot 50. One reason scale and massing was such concern was because of the larger lots which currently had pretty nice homes on them that would be ripe for redevelopment if the Code was not changed since the scale and massing restrictions were not in place.

- She clarified with Staff that that lot in question was either Lot 50 or 51. A new home was proposed on the lot, but changes were made after Development Review Board (DRB) approval. It had virtually no setback and was not at all within the scale and massing of the neighborhood. There was hardly any setback on the roof line, either. There were just two large boxes with no parking and no setbacks, so it was very invasive. Those changes were a surprise.

Ms. Dempsey added nearby residents received a card in the mail describing the changes being proposed, and a few neighbors wrote in that they did not like it, but it did not matter. One could not tell the building had been brought up to the street; it still looked like the structure sat at the back of the lot.

Ms. Keenan added that was why the neighbors were anxious to get through this Code adoption process

Chris Neamtzu, Planning Director stated he did not know what happened with the changes, but he would find out.

Ms. Dempsey noted the two that were built across from Tim Knapp's property were set back, and she was told the new buildings would be the same.

Ms. Keenan noted those on Boones Ferry Rd looked like they were set back to allow for the widening of the road. She continued her testimony, stating she did not believe the Plan should be so prescriptive as to define absolute details on doors and windows or the intent of the style. The right scale and massing and architectural style were important, but things like a new door should not create issues.

- She did not believe there should be any fake facades on the homes and noted some commercial buildings had those; having an entire home look consistent was reasonable.
- As far as compatible ADUs, Senate Bill 1051 was a disappointment, and if possible, the neighborhood would still like to work around that. City Council had asked the Steering Committee to define some

language to help minimize ADUs in Old Town, and it appeared the only means to do that was through the architectural standards, and the scale and massing.

- The proposed standards were important because of the many developable lots that still have homes on them today. The proposed Plan was trying to take the future into account and minimize density in Old Town.

Chair Greenfield confirmed there was no further public input.

Ms. Anton noted the discussion had involved all of the questions the project team sought input on (Slide 60) and asked for further input from the Commission. She explained the goal was to create clear and objective architectural standards for single family homes in the Old Town neighborhood.

Chair Greenfield said he was unsure how that goal related to what existed; Old Town was a tremendously eclectic place architecturally, and he understood it would remain eclectic, perhaps with a little trimming on the modern end. But, how would Old Town look any different in 10 or 20 years?

- Mr. Pauly responded there was the property at Fir and 4th Ave, but there were also a number of manufactured homes; and as property values rose, their removal and redevelopment on those lots was expected. While homes have grown bigger over time, the idea was that Old Town would continue to look like it did now and would not have larger homes or different styles that would change the neighborhood.
- Mr. Coyle stated that in Wilsonville and other areas, property values were escalating, not declining. There might be speculation in Old Town where some of the smaller, 1,200 sq ft ranch homes were purchased and replaced with a 2,400 sq ft home. It was easier to scrape a home than remodel it, particularly because of new energy codes, and structurally, older homes were not designed for a seismic zone. Having a set of standards for this eventuality was important so that the replacement buildings had some consistency with what the neighborhood desired.
 - He noted the region was overdue for a subduction zone earthquake. If a large earthquake occurred that caused a lot of damage, a lot of homes would be replaced.
 - With regard to remodeling and additions, there might be a need to figure out how to provide some consistency for homes being expanded and remodeled, since many of the existing homes might be considered undersized by today's standards. Perhaps the simplest thing would be to have expansions towards the back and not the front, which might be a chance to create more consistency. Maybe a condition of an enlargement would be the addition of some feature that added some consistency to the neighborhood.
 - These were three ways to use the standards to begin to add design value, as well as property value, to the neighborhood.

Commissioner Levit said he was concerned that making the Pattern Book too constraining would hurt property values.

- Mr. Coyle replied he and Architect Marcy McInelly had seen the opposite in projects around the country. Setting high architectural standards tended to eliminate people who were not interested in that level of design quality. If someone was really serious about doing a modern structure or an international style and they wanted to go through the design process that might be acceptable to Old Town and to the City.

Chair Greenfield:

- Read the Purpose Statement of the Old Town Neighborhood Plan, emphasizing the unique character of Old Town, and said he could not easily put his finger on what made Old Town unique.
 - Ms. Keenan responded what was unique about Old Town was it was the only neighborhood in town that was not part of a planned development community. It had evolved over time from the very first days of Wilsonville. The neighborhood wanted to maintain the single-family home structure where people had yards. They did not want the infrastructure of curbs and sidewalks or stormwater planters. They wanted to maintain the rural feel in that six-block area, similar to what used to be seen in the old

town area of Lake Oswego and some areas in Lake Grove. The intent was to protect the neighborhood.

- This whole process started around the time of the Fred Meyer's development when a proposal came in for the lot that is being developed right now that had something like 25 units and 20 ADUs hidden in the development with no parking. The standards and the Old Town Plan first began because of that particular application, which shook up the neighborhood. A speculator wanted to put high density development on the lot without taking into account the neighborhood, parking, access, or anything else, and it would change the entire complexion of the entire neighborhood. That provided the opportunity for City Staff to start working with the neighborhood to define the neighborhood and develop standards to help protect it far into the future, so the DRB did not have to be burdened with it.
- She clarified the neighborhood did not want to create an historical replica or look like a theme park. They wanted to maintain the authenticity of the neighborhood, allow it to grow and gentrify, but not allow it to be speculated on and filled with high-density development that did not fit. There were some undervalued historic structures and it was important to everyone that lived there. It was the original, affordable neighborhood in Wilsonville with smaller homes that people could afford. The neighborhood wanted to remain eclectic and keep the small-town feel it had today with smaller places, nice yards, and no traffic. They did not want modern standards, like streetscapes in Old Town. The residents did not want to be like Frog Pond or Villebois.
- Did not believe this was an architectural or historic issue, but a lifestyle issue being overlaid on the community.
 - Ms. Keenan stated that was why they went through a public process and vetted the Plan for multiple years with the City. To support the lifestyle and feel in Old Town, the Code needed to be modified to support the architectural standards needed to maintain the scale and massing in the single-family area of the neighborhood. This structure was needed to help maintain the neighborhood so that every time a speculator came in, the neighborhood did not have to spend even more time at City Hall to protect the neighborhood. The neighborhood wanted some rules to back up Staff's rejection of an application for a five-story townhouse unit, for example, because Wilsonville was invested in protecting the only remaining original neighborhood.
- Noted there probably was broad concurrence within the Commission about what they did not want to happen in Old Town, though the reasons might not be the same as the neighborhoods. Generally, the Commission would not like to see a four- or five-story building in Old Town.
- Asked if any historic certification process applied to any structures in Old Town.
 - Ms. Keenan replied the neighborhood went through the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) process and tried to go through the historic inventory with the State of Oregon. Although there were several historic structures in Old Town, it was not a typical historic-type neighborhood due to the broad cross-section and eclectic mix of homes.
 - Mr. Coyle explained individual buildings could be certified, but understood the three objectives were simple homes of smaller scale and had a distinct character. Those could be coded, but serious decisions needed to be made. What could be seen from the street, not the actual size, might be the single most important issue in terms of scale. Hopefully, it could be made simpler for Staff to review and satisfy the neighborhood intentions, but he agreed veering into lifestyle issues would undermine the efforts of the project. What could legally be codified should be kept as clear and objective as possible, such as the issue with ADUs. Otherwise, he believed the project team had what it needed to move forward.
 - Ms. Anton confirmed the next work session would be September 13, 2017 and more detailed recommendations would be provided for the Commissioners to review by September 1.

Commissioner Springall noted with one major issue being what could be seen from the road and the testimony regarding concern about the lack of setbacks, he suggested including a large setback of 15 or 20 ft for new builds, if possible. This would keep the size of the house smaller while still preserving space.

Chair Greenfield believed the massing issue could be addressed by setbacks and lot coverage. It did not seem like the Commission was dealing with the appeal to historical styles very well. It was complicated and he did not see a way to do it very well.

- Ms. Keenan noted the reason the architectural standards were being discussed was because the previous 1880 to 1930 overlay created issues for the neighborhood. The proposed document would help alleviate those issues from the existing overlay for new development and remodeling existing homes. The proposed Code work was the last major hang up in the Plan and was important because of the existing overlay requirements.

Discussion regarding the questions on Slide 60 continued as follows.

Commissioner Levit did not believe style should be nitpicked since the neighborhood was already so eclectic. He preferred garages to be in the back. Regarding materials and colors, he did not believe uniformity of color, shutters, roofs, etc. was wanted. Some restored farmhouses had interesting colors, and he wondered if those were the original colors or a modern interpretation. Some colors looked very good, but no one would want a purple home. He was unsure how color would be addressed in the Code.

Mr. Coyle added context was important. If there were three ranch houses in a row, would it be acceptable to add a craftsman? A purple house might be acceptable sitting by itself and screened by trees. The Commission needed to discuss the contextual at the next work session, and it would be helpful to look at actual examples to understand how much context mattered in decision-making.

Commissioner Hurley asked if forming a homeowners association (HOA) was possible and if an HOA might address these issues. Some HOAs limit colors and many other things than the City could.

Ms. Keenan said she did not believe an HOA could be established retroactively and noted that governing color had never been a concern in any conversations.

Commissioner Postma believed many people would agree with not constraining things too much; however, he was wary of too much flexibility and wanted as much objectivity as possible. He liked what was done in Frog Pond where the owner/developer had to include seven or eight elements from a list of fifteen. That approach provided the objectivity of checking off boxes, but also the flexibility owners or architects wanted. He did not want any unclear language.

- He noted that he and Commissioners Levit and Hurley were on the DRB Panel that reviewed the project Ms. Keenan mentioned, and he was very sensitive to the issue. That high-density project was cloaked in the notion of using ADUs to achieve a desired number of units. He knew ADUs were required by statute, but he was wary of them because of the potential. He asked to see some options from other cities about limiting what could be done with ADUs to make sure they were not used in a way that conflicted with the neighborhood.
- He confirmed the requirement was simply one ADU per single family home, but the project did that with attached structures, which made it odd. There were a lot of homes with ADUs above garages which looked more like an apartment than what was intended by the ADU statute, which was a home with the opportunity to have an ADU. It was really a masqueraded multi-family development.

Ms. Keenan added when the Old Town Plan was brought to Council for approval, language was included, as requested by Council, to help minimize the amount of ADUs in the neighborhood, which was a challenge to define.

Commissioner Postma confirmed the state law could be challenged, but he assumed there were ways to get around it.

Mr. Pauly confirmed Lot 79, the subject of the multi-unit issue, was subdivided last year. One idea was to have 1.5-story craftsman bungalows that were condo-ized as separate, detached units. A subdivision could be built on the lot, but that would involve additional requirements, such as public streets, which made it difficult to achieve the required density given the shape of the lot. The lot could have ten, stand-alone units with a common space. The application had not been submitted to the City yet, but a neighborhood meeting had been held.

Ms. Keenan added the lot had been discussed when developing the Old Town Plan, and the neighborhood did not want the green space requirement so people could put in homes with larger yards to be able to maintain the feel of the neighborhood. However, that topic had not been discussed yet in the current process.

Mr. Pauly clarified that while a lot of the existing Code language regarded the Boones Ferry Road frontage and how buildings related to Boones Ferry Rd, none of that fell within the scope of the subject proposal because it related to the mixed-use, commercial component. The idea was to have a separate process for ministerial review of single family homes in Old Town, using the Pattern Book or design guidelines, and to address some specific things on ADUs, including making the allowed size smaller, and potentially requiring ADUs to be detached.

- He clarified the Commission's Work Program had been adjusted: another work session would be held in September, and the public hearing on the Old Town Development Code would be in October.

Chair Greenfield called for a brief recess and reconvened the meeting at 8:01 pm.

B. Coffee Creek Industrial Form-based Code (Rybold/Vance)

Chris Neamtzu, Planning Director, noted the Form-based Code project originally started in 2015, but had been delayed partly due to staffing shortages. Those issues had been resolved and the Code project had been budgeted and the finishing steps re-scoped in order to bring the project to fruition. He introduced the project team, who would reintroduce the project and discuss some specific high-level policy questions and ideas to help resolve earlier issues so the project could move forward.

Jordan Vance, Economic Development Manager, noted his role was to be part of the management team so he could articulate the Form-based Code to prospective developers, as he would be helping recruit developers and users in the Coffee Creek area.

Kim Rybold, Associate Planner, said she would be serving as a liaison between the consultant team and Staff, ensuring everyone was current on the Code and the best policy and procedural options available. It had been several years since this project was worked on and there had been no updates on any of the drafts due to outstanding policy questions. The goal of the presentation was to revisit those questions and get feedback from the Commission on updating the drafts and how to implement Form-based Code.

Marcy McInelly of Urbsworks, Inc. and Keith Liden of Bainbridge, presented the Coffee Creek Industrial Form-based Code and Pattern Book via PowerPoint, reviewing the purpose, background, paths to adoption and policy options, and questions to consider, as well as some of the existing Form-based code language and graphics, which were subject to change.

Discussion regarding the Form-based Code and responses to Commissioner questions by the project team were as follows:

- Streamlining the review process was initially proposed to minimize the number of steps involved in development review. The goal was for Coffee Creek to become a center for job growth in the city. Clear and objective standards would create greater certainty for developers and as an administrative review, the process should go more quickly, which would help the City attract tenants and industrial development to the

area. Wilsonville would be more competitive and could provide a better customer experience to achieve the City's goal of creating a robust employment district in Coffee Creek.

- Cost and timing were important considerations in the development process for commercial development. There had been concerns about Wilsonville's review process being slower than it should, which also added costs.
- The Pattern Book did not necessarily address zone map amendment, Comprehensive Plan, or annexation issues that might arise during a review, so why take the DRB out of the process for those changes?
 - The ability to be competitive was the main reason for removing the DRB from the process. For years, the notion was that Wilsonville's process took a long time and a lot of money to get through, which hurt Wilsonville's competitiveness for new commercial development.
 - There was not skimping on the design intention. The entire area had been somewhat predesigned, which was then reduced to a set of clear and objective standards that could be applied. Form-based code tried to do much of the design work upfront, distill the design into its essential pieces, and then put it into the Code. Although Form-based Code took longer to develop, the goal was to have a shorter approval process for the applicant.
 - Coffee Creek was somewhat unique in that it was master planned to be an industrial area, so the City knew the Comprehensive Plan designation would be industrial. The area was brought into the urban growth boundary (UGB) with the understanding it was a regionally significant industrial area, so the zoning would be the PDI-RSIA district.
 - In adopting the Form-based Code for Coffee Creek, the intent was that any development would be planned industrial and zoned PDI-RSIA, so the proposal would have to meet the performance standards of that district as part of the administrative review. If there was a question about whether a proposed development could meet the performance standards, the application could still be called-up if needed.
- In the administrative review process, a Staff member would be assigned to an application and work with the applicant to ensure all the appropriate findings were made, similar to the existing procedure used when a project came to DRB. A Staff report would still be provided showing that all the standards and performance criteria of the Form-based Code were being met.
 - What would be different would the use of clear and objective standards to see if the proposal met the Code, yes or no; it would be much more black-and-white as to whether something met the Form-based Code. Also, an administrative review had a 10-day public notice period and the same radius of property owners were notified, however, instead of testifying at a public hearing, people could submit comments which would be taking into account to determine the next steps.
- While an application might meet the Form-based code, enhancing certain details might not be considered, such as the best location for bicycle parking or the appropriate placement of the arches by Walgreens. Having the DRB review put more eyes on the details of an application and provided another chance to catch potential issues or offer better solutions. Developing a more substantial checklist for the applicant to meet might address concerns about missing any elements.
 - Staff confirmed Administrative II Reviews were subject to call up, or additional review, by the DRB, even though the application did not go through the DRB.
 - Some of the feedback on the Form-based Code in 2015 included questions of how that call up would work and which review body would be appropriate. If this approach was used, it would remove the responsibility of implementing the Form-based code from the DRB. However, there would definitely be a call-up provision whether the review body was the DRB or City Council.
 - The Form-based code was unique in that it was not completely separate from the existing Development Code. There were many inter-relationships between things like the City's bicycle parking standards. The Form-based Code was not a whole new set of standards for Coffee Creek.
 - While the Development Code included some robust and specific bicycle parking standards, for example, someone had to pay attention to those details, which could be overlooked if not in the checklist.
- Staff confirmed there would be a public notice period for all applications, except for annexations, zone map and Comprehensive Plan map amendments.

- A lot of work had been done to improve the obscurity of the public notices, including the use of common language in the description of legislative notices. Creating a templated map with a thorough description of the proposal in plain language would be pretty easy.
- The administrative public notification area was the same as for a public hearing. While ten days was the minimum time frame, rendering a decision usually took more than 10 days in most circumstances. The site would be posted consistent with the City's current posting practices. Although a map was a useful tool, it was expensive to put maps in the newspaper. Including a link to a map was suggested. Staff would return with some ideas for public notification.
- Currently, 120 days was the maximum timeframe allowed by State law for annexations, Comprehensive Plan Map amendments and zone changes to get through the process, but that did not include the 30 days after the Council decision. Staff tracked the timeframes and with just a DRB review, the process had been about 70 to 75 days, but when the Council was involved, an extra two weeks was required, so it took about 100 days.
 - Slide 13 illustrated the current and proposed review processes. Currently, the process was very linear and the proposal would include some parallel paths in the process.
 - An alternative would be to annex everything into the city, but there was no interest from current property owners in forcing annexation. The proposed review process was a compromise so as to not rock the boat too much with private property issues.
 - Specific timeframes attributed to DRB review had not been mapped because a lot of what affected timeframes was how much information the City received and how long it took to get an application to completeness. The timelines for applications under the Form-based code also depended on how many applications were received at any one time. Staff believed about 30 days could be cut from the process, although that could vary project-to-project.
 - Having more certainty about the trees and traffic took a lot of the applicant's time because the applicant had to have the traffic study done before the application process could even begin, which was before the land use clock started. Simplifying those processes was more valuable than shortening the process once the land-use clock started.
- What other things that took time, such as the creation of the Staff report, were not reflected in the process diagram? (Slide 13) Would there be more pressure on City Council to do a more in-depth analysis on annexations, Comprehensive Plan Map and zone map amendments since the DRB would not review those applications?
 - The full report would be provided to the DRB and if there were any issues, the Board would have the ability to call it to a public hearing for a full public review process where no time would be saved. The City was trying to preserve the ability to have public engagement; however, on straight-forward, industrial building applications, there was not a lot of citizen engagement. Property owners in the area might want an opportunity to have a hearing, and if a development was proposed right next to a resident, Staff might put it in a public hearing setting.
 - The intent was to build a beautiful and successful industrial zone and greenlight projects that met the performance standards developed for Coffee Creek, in which the City was heavily invested. Projects that fell outside the clear and objective standards of the pattern book, involved significant natural resources issues, or included items that the applicant pushed back on would go before the DRB.
 - The difference was putting the scrutiny at the front end rather than on a project-by-project basis. City Council and the Planning Commission were being asked to be very diligent in creating the pattern books and checklists. While good ideas were generated from the current process, the burden was being shifted from individual applications and doing it now.
 - Staff reports and all the documents took significant time for the planners and developers to prepare, and often the documents were overkill or needed to be reproduced due to changes discussed at DRB. Doing the scrutiny now would save time in not having to address projects piece by piece later.
- Being an isolated area of the community, Coffee Creek was chosen as a test case for Form-based Code so it should be thought about as an experiment. It could be reevaluated later if it did not work well, satisfy community expectations, or bring quality development to the community. Everyone amended zoning ordinances because cities were always trying to see if things could be done better.

- Thousands of hours were wasted at DRB considering everyone's time which resulted in little-to-zero benefit at the public hearings.
 - The community should look at the Form-based code and decide if they liked it; then builders could do what was required. Industrial development was not complicated. The City was developing industrial land that would look decent and accomplish commerce and the safety of the employees.
- The Form-based code provided a template for simple, light industrial development, allowing someone to check through a simplified list to meet the code. The pattern book went further in spelling out the requirements. Even if one small checkbox was missed, how negative would that be in this environment?
 - There would still be a building inspector to catch mistakes, and the process would be evaluated to see if changes needed to be made in the future.
 - The City should commit to tracking how much faster the review process was and show the Planning Commission and DRB members what was being built to see if it was what everyone intended and to know whether the Form-based code would work. This would help identify if something in the code needed to be modified.
 - The project team would present the same information to both panels of the DRB on July 24th in a joint work session. City Council would also see the presentation to help inform the process. Both meetings would provide direction about the five outstanding issues shown on Slide 23.
- Input was requested on having a district wide traffic study done in advance and then every applicant would only have to prove whether the trips generated by their project exceeded or stayed below threshold. If it was below the threshold, the project would be greenlighted.
 - How could a district wide traffic study be done with public approval? How would the public input be accommodated?
 - Scott Mansur at DKS advised that the levels of service (LOS) could be analyzed. In light of the recent Transportation Performance Report, a lot was known about the transportation system and criteria already existed in the Code about LOS requirements. Intersection capacity and trips available through any given intersection could be easily documented.
 - A threshold-type approach could be used where the LOS levels were analyzed and documented so true LOS challenges could be identified. All the analysis would be in a district wide report, which would become available to the public at that time. Any deficiencies would then be chipped away at project by project.
 - It was uncertain how a district wide traffic study that included public input could be approved, and there were similarities between approving the traffic study and tree plans.
 - First, the roadmap to formally adopting this entire process needed to be considered. Many had stated they wanted to see what public input would look like as part of the final approval package. Logistically, they needed to think about how to roll all this together as part of implementing the Form-based code or if it could be tacked on at a later time.
 - Transportation impact was best analyzed at a larger and not a small scale: however, a Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA) was quite technical and the public being able to make sense of it was questioned. Typically, the purpose behind the Form-based approach was to become more performance-oriented. The public approached transportation based on performance in their own minds, so that any level of congestion was no good. It would be difficult to have public input that was meaningful.
 - However, having district wide information was a much better approach for the City and would give an idea about the overall shape of transportation through the city. The same applied to the trees.
 - The focus had to be on performance. While meeting numbers and checking boxes felt good, it was important that it worked. In planning, post occupancy evaluations were not usually done until someone complained, which did not give the City the tools to correct the assumptions and models.
 - How would performance be allocated amongst various parcels and potential building? Projects early on could front end load all the trips and potentially constrain later development.
 - Rather than an overall threshold, a traffic engineer could make assumptions based on the known zoning on how many trips would be generated per acre. The trips generated per acre could be

used to review each project individually to see whether that project was above or below those assumptions. The burden of proof would be on a developer whose trips were above the threshold, and the last developers of projects would not be in trouble.

- If the design sent traffic in one particular direction, the approach seemed to have a hole in it.
 - A district wide transportation analysis specified design of the roads in the district, including all turn lanes, etc., all of which would be part of the assumptions going into the model and would dictate what each lot could do. The modeling would get quite close to what was needed.
 - Freight would also go into the assumptions based on the land use. Something like a large warehouse would clearly not be what the modeler had assumed and Staff would know what the assumptions were. Even more numerous, smaller warehouses would be all right as long as they were under the assumption line based on the street design by the transportation planners.
- The threshold approach was currently being used in Villebois. Ultimately, the trips were vested, which allowed Villebois developers to buy capacity in advance of actually needing it, which gave them certainty, even if they waited several years to develop.

Commissioner Hurley left the meeting at 9:02 pm.

- At the master plan level in Villebois, the City knew there would be 2700 dwelling units and what roads needed to be built. Everything in the SAPs and PDPs were linked together and checked against the master plan and resulted in smaller reports in shorter timeframes, so there was some precedent for a district wide approach for transportation.
- The traffic model would include all the development occurring in the cities and all of the pass through and regional traffic trips, so both the north and south sides of Day Rd would be included. As models were updated and new models were produced, it was all being plugged into the models used by the transportation consultants. Since regional traffic would be accounted for, Tualatin would be included. Metro puts assumptions into the regional transportation model. A normal traffic report included existing conditions, existing conditions plus previously approved Stage II projects and then, existing conditions plus Stage II plus proposed projects. These three conditions were all analyzed in a full traffic analysis. Because development in other cities was more difficult to capture, there could be a lag in getting the information.
- As congestion builds and people might try to maximize first-come, first-serve models, it was a no-win situation for everybody. Dealing with traffic as a free resource would result in it being taken advantage of.
 - Perhaps the City could be proactive with industry; for example, requiring traffic management plans that staggered work shifts and so on to preserve capacity and avoid the PM Peak Hour. While not presently in the Code, this idea came up during the discussions about Basalt Creek. It was important to ensure capacity was available long term in the new multimillion road network.
 - Avoiding massive impacts of future traffic needed to be addressed upfront and industry should have to come forward with creative approaches. Many businesses liked the idea of staggering work shifts, for example. They did not want to sit on Tualatin-Sherwood Rd at 5:00 pm so some sent freight out in the middle of the night.
- Input was requested on having a similar approach to trees, with a district wide tree inventory in which significant trees were identified. If all significant trees were preserved or no significant trees were on a developer's property, the project would automatically be green lighted. Any trees that had to be dealt with would go through an administrative process presumed by the district wide tree plan.
 - The Commission generally agreed looking at the trees on a larger scale made sense and would result in a better plan.
- Signage could also be addressed with a master sign plan. Signs would either fit within the plan or not. With clearly defined standards, there would not be problems with bad signage.
- All of the proposals unified the design and approach to the entire district. The only concern was around annexation, Comprehensive Plan Map and zone map amendments.

- The process of approval was a courtship between the community and its new industrial, commercial, or residential residents. Even if no one attended public meetings, community consent was meaningful. Informing the DRB so they had a way of consenting was positive, even if there was no formal public hearing.
- Lighting was another issue. The master plan should include a standard for lighting because each project could be modified to the detriment of the community.
 - The City currently had citywide lighting standards, but it had not been applied consistently. There prescriptive and performance paths for compliance, and big differences in technology and fixtures sometimes resulted in different outcomes, even though there were basic tenets for all applications.

Ms. Rybold stated the work session was very helpful and the Commission's feedback would further define the path going forward so when Form-based Code returned for public hearings, there would be clear consensus from the City's boards and commissions.

III. INFORMATIONAL

A. Town Center Update (Bateschell)

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Manager, updated the Commission on the design workshop for the Town Center Plan held on June 26th, which included a visual preference survey with instant polling results. Many different street designs and options for bike lanes were shared, along with various options for open spaces, parks and gathering spaces. Different types of uses, heights and scales of buildings were also reviewed. About 35 people attended the event, but they were very engaged and provided Staff with additional context. A report on the event would be provided at a future time.

- Due to the small attendance at this event, an online survey regarding these same issues would be available from July 26th until August 20th. It would be the visual preference survey that was condensed down to land use and buildings, as there was already a lot of consensus around open space, bike lanes, etc. Additional responses were desired from a broader base of the community. Staff would also be at Rotary concerts, Fun in the Park, the Fun Run and BrewFest seeking additional input on some visual preference based materials. Bookmarks advertising Staff's events and how people could take the online survey were created.
- Currently, an Instagram photo contest was happening. People were asked to take pictures of their favorite things about living, working, and playing in the Town Center and post them on Instagram #myWilsonville. The photos would be judged by the Task Force for some prizes. There would probably be some pictures that were not specifically of Town Center.
- Staff was also holding a number of trivia events at three different pubs/breweries over the next month to try to engage the younger population. The surveys at these events would be different than the one online.
- The culminating event would be the block party on August 16. She described the setup and activities that would be available at this event to engage the citizens of Wilsonville.

Comments from Commissioners who attended the event were as follows:

- There was considerable support for multi-use and particularly, multi-story buildings, which was surprising.
- It was surprising that people felt similar about things. There was not a huge divergence on what should happen. There seemed to be a sense of what Wilsonville was like or what people wanted it to be like.
 - Ms. Bateschell agreed, noting people definitely gravitated toward the open space images that had a lot of naturescaping and more greenery, rather than images with more hardscaping.
 - The instant polling system would be great to have at public outreach events, but it was very expensive to use.

B. City Council Action Minutes: (05.01.2017, 05.15.2017, 06.05.2017, and 06.19.2017)

There were no comments.

C. 2017 Planning Commission Work Program

The updated Work Program was distributed and reflected the new hearing date in October for the Old Town Development Code.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Greenfield adjourned the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 9:29 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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