

**PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, JULY 8, 2015
6:00 P.M.**

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

**Approved
September 9, 2015**

Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

Chair McGuire called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m. Those present:

Planning Commission: Marta McGuire, Eric Postma, Al Levit, Peter Hurley, Phyllis Millan, Jerry Greenfield, and City Councilor Charlotte Lehan. Simon Springall was absent.

City Staff: Chris Neamtzu, Barbara Jacobson, Nancy Kraushaar

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.

Debi Laue, 12340 SW Wilsonville Rd, Wilsonville, OR, said she had not yet seen Option F, but had been told allowed for 11 acres of large lots, which involved three owners that wanted to come together and develop that way, and also 205 small Lots. She asked if the information about the number of lots was accurate.

Chair McGuire confirmed there were 42 gross acres with 124 large single-family lots, 28 medium-sized lots and 205 small lots for a total of 610 lots.

Ms. Laue said she was very happy with Option F, as were several people she had spoken to who were unable to attend the meeting. The only change they would like to see was to move at least half of the small lots to medium sized lots because this was the only opportunity Wilsonville might have for a Wilsonville Meadows or Morey's Landing-type neighborhood, which seemed very unlikely to happen after this project. Having 205 small lots would not accomplish that type of neighborhood. She added it would be lovely for the builders to build two, three, or four homes a year, instead of having a production builder, to provide more interest and character in the neighborhood, so having at least another 100 medium-sized lots was very desirable for that reason.

Chair McGuire announced that the Basalt Creek Concept Plan update would be moved to the August meeting.

IV. CITY COUNCIL LIAISON REPORT

Councilor Lehan reported that City Council recently held a productive work session with the Tualatin City Council about the Basalt Creek area. At the July 6, 2015 meeting, City Council:

- Primarily discussed Frog Pond, the pros and cons of Options D, E, and F, and the desire to have larger lots. The main concern was that the price increased substantially at the low end.

Council recognized the development was likely to be different than other parts of Frog Pond that would have more constraints.

- Discussed a potential ballot measure to get an advisory vote regarding the Coffee Creek Urban Renewal District in the November election. While no decision was made, one was expected soon.
- Decided to surplus the Tooze Rd property, which would go out for bid with the minimum price the City paid for the property in 2006.
- Discussed the Newberg Dundee Bypass issue because the City of Newberg objected to ODOT's redesign of the intersection where the Dundee Bypass intersected Wilsonville Rd. The City of Newberg seemed less concerned with traffic on Wilsonville Rd than Wilsonville. The City Engineer would be meeting with ODOT and City of Newberg Staff to express the City's concerns. The City had sent a letter of concern to ODOT as had Clackamas County, the school district, and Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue (TVF&R) because of the problems with Wilsonville Rd to Newberg.

Commissioner Levit asked what kind of changes could be done since the bypass intersection was already being built.

Councilor Lehan responded the changes would be where the Dundee Bypass intersected with Wilsonville Rd. Initially, the City of Wilsonville was not included as one of the stakeholders when the project was first discussed because the initial plan was to continue the bypass to 99W so all the modeling was based on that design.

- The recent change was to implement the project in phases and Phase 1 ended at Wilsonville Rd/Hwy 219. The City was very concerned about how Phase 1 would be configured. Initially, ODOT suggested signage would direct traffic to Portland or to I-5 and over to 99W; however, people's GPS systems would specify the shortest route, which was Wilsonville Rd by a couple of miles, and it would be difficult to put up a sign that argued with GPS directions. So, ODOT presented a reconfiguration of that intersection that would make it more difficult and circuitous to get to Wilsonville Rd from Hwy 219. ODOT had already agreed with the Ladd Hill Neighborhood Association that the plan was viable for the Phase 1 construction, but the City of Newberg had objected. ODOT wanted to proceed because they needed to get funding secured with the legislature, but said they would continue to look for solutions.
- She did not believe Newberg had said absolutely no to ODOT's solution, but everyone was flying blind because nothing had been modeled. Some people believed that hardly any traffic would be on Wilsonville Rd and, of course, the Ladd Hill neighbors were terrified. She believed this was a big issue for Wilsonville because Wilsonville Rd handled a lot of traffic through Wilsonville on the west side and because the more Wilsonville Rd became an arterial road, the more risk involved. The school district had noted that as traffic entered the city from the rural area, there were two school zones immediately which suddenly resulted in a much slower zone. She believed the City had a lot of valid concerns about the redesign and should at least insist that a full-scale modeling be done to determine any potential liability.

V. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES

A. Consideration of the June 10, 2015 Planning Commission minutes

The June 10, 2015 PC minutes will be submitted for approval at the August 12, 2015 meeting.

VI. WORK SESSIONS

A. Frog Pond Area Plan update (Neamtzu)

Chris Neamtzu, Planning Director, introduced the work session topic, noting the Planning Commission's meeting packet addressed the motion made at the Commission's June meeting about reallocating some of the Medium Lots to Large Lots and providing the financial model related to that reallocation. Additional statistics were also provided about the city's existing lot sizes, which were presented in a chart in the packet (Page 8 of 18 of Joe Dill's Memorandum). The project team was targeting September for the public hearing on the Frog Pond Area Plan and sought input on what the Commission would like to see prepared for public hearings.

- He reported that at the City Council work session, Council had serious concerns about the Required Home Price on the Small Lot product being so high. He recognized members of the project team who could address questions about the financial models, infrastructure analysis, or the coding of the land plans.
- He clarified that the Wilsonville Lot Size Distribution included everything that was platted in the entire city, which would include vacant or built lots, as well as the new Legend homes at Villebois. Only part of the former Living Enrichment Center (LEC) property, (now known as Grande Pointe at Villebois) was platted, so only the first 50 LEC lots were included. The second phase of the Grande Pointe at Villebois did not have final plat.

Joe Dills, Project Manager, Angelo Planning Group, began presenting his memorandum dated June 30, 2015, which was included in the meeting packet, noting that lot size was not the only issue on which the project team still sought direction. At the last meeting, the Commission had requested that some objective information be provided to help compare some of the demographics and income factors in Wilsonville with adjacent communities in the market area. Some Commissioners had discussed the desire to attract more CEOs and managing professionals to tie housing in Frog Pond to larger economic development and community strategies.

Brian Vanneman, Leland Consulting Group, presented the Demographic Analysis Update via PowerPoint which responded to the Commission's questions on June 10, 2015 about comparing the demographics of different cities in the area.

- He noted that the market area shown on Slide 7 was created following input from brokers and developers about where people in Frog Pond would cross shop. A larger market area was created this last week and demographics from that area would be provided to the Commission separately. This larger area was an eight-mile radius from Frog Pond and the demographics would provide a sense about attracting residents from a larger area with potentially higher incomes.
- Referring to Slide 8, Demographics, of the Demographic Analysis Update portion of the presentation, Mr. Vanneman stated that the demographics between the City of Wilsonville and the market area are similar in terms of household incomes.
- There is a growing number of 65+ households (Slide 9, of the Demographic Analysis Update portion of the presentation).

Mr. Dills continued reviewing his memorandum via PowerPoint, describing Options D, E, and F for the West Neighborhood and resulting impacts on net density, affordability, infrastructure costs, and Wilsonville's housing mix.

Discussion and feedback from the Planning Commission on Key Issue 1 - Residential lot sizes and housing, and paying for infrastructure, related to residential lot sizes in the West Neighborhood was as follows with responses to Commissioner questions as noted:

- Mr. Neamtzu clarified that mobile homes were included in the single-family (SF) category when calculating the housing mix percentages on Page 9 of the memorandum (Slide 21), adding that multi-family (MF) was comprised of duplexes, condominiums and apartments.

- Mr. Dills confirmed that the infrastructure costs already included the approximately \$2 million in savings for the concept refinement for parks, as the project team assumed the refinement would be done. Without the refinement costs would increase approximately \$3,000 per lot.
- Mr. Dills clarified that infrastructure costs for new development would not be shared with existing homeowners who decide to remain on their property or a portion of their property. A lot would be drawn around properties with existing homes that remain and the land development on the remainder of the property would carry the new infrastructure costs. The cost calculations were based only on new growth and then divided by the number of new lots.
 - For any costs applied to a reimbursement area type of revenue stream, an existing lot with an existing home could be part of that Local Improvement District (LID), reimbursement district, etc. depending on the tool selected. However, the existing property would not contribute systems fees because it was an existing dwelling.
- Mr. Dills explained that existing homeowners would have a privilege in the size of lot they retained for themselves, but the City's average lot size requirements would apply. Mr. Neamtzu added that the parent parcel remnant would be part of the project area and reviewed as part of the subdivision application.
- Mr. Neamtzu confirmed a property owner could choose an inordinately large-sized lot for themselves, which could result in the other properties not being as large as the Commission might expect because smaller and larger lots could be used to get to the average lot requirement. Those details would be addressed during Phase 2 of the project.
 - Mr. Dills added one concept that had been discussed was to try to provide flexibility in the Development Code to accommodate that. Lot size averaging was in the Code now, but other tools to consider would be accessory dwelling units (ADUs) or the possibility of shadow platting future development on a larger lot.
- Chair McGuire read comments from Simon Springall's email dated July 6, 2015, entered into the record as Exhibit 1, regarding the West Neighborhood, noting his preference was Option E, but if the Commission could not reach consensus about Option E, he would support Option F.
- Option E was good, but there seemed to be very few tradeoffs to get to Option F, which was preferred because it addressed community input in a significant way.
- The Commission discussed how the East and South Neighborhoods fit into with the decision regarding which the options presented for the land use framework in Frog Pond. Key comments included:
 - Looking at only the West Neighborhood would make it difficult to restore some balance and understand how many of each lot type would be in all three neighborhoods. Deciding on an option would depend on what would happen in the East and South Neighborhoods because the Commission was still providing a concept of what kind of lot sizes and density would occur in East and South. If lot sizes were drastically smaller in the East and South, then an option with even less density than presented in the current options was preferred for the West Neighborhood.
 - The Commission could consider the whole plan and still make a decision on the West Neighborhood. There was only a difference of 35 lots between Options E and F and the Commission had been very reactive to public input in terms of including the larger lots in the plan. The Commission should not feel backed into a corner or that a decision could not be made on the West Neighborhood. The Concept Plan would get refined many times before it hit the ground.
 - Mr. Neamtzu explained that the West Neighborhood, being in the UGB with no conditions, provided the City with a unique opportunity, which City Council discussed at length in the work session on Monday. Because a different set of rules would apply to

the East and South Neighborhoods, the Commission should consider and discuss how those neighborhoods fit within that set of rules.

- He confirmed the entire Concept Plan for all three neighborhoods would be presented at public hearing in September.
- He clarified that Staff was not suggesting that the East and South Neighborhoods should not be considered, but was suggesting a menu of choices. As Commissioner Springall suggested in Exhibit 1, one option might be chosen for one neighborhood and a different alternative for another neighborhood, or even a hybrid of Options D, E, and F, or some option yet to be discussed. The idea was to step through the process; although a lot of focus was on the West Neighborhood, obviously the other neighborhoods must be discussed as well.
- Chair McGuire suggested discussing where the Commissioners were as far as the range of options and then seeing about reaching a consensus on the option for the West Neighborhood. Then, the Commission could look at the big picture and discuss the East and South Neighborhoods and revisit the options if necessary.
- With such small differences between Options E and F, Option F was preferred to provide flexibility. The different housing types in the East and South Neighborhoods could easily make up for the 30 or so units lost in the West Neighborhood.
- The differences between Options E and F were not worth discussing.
- Multiplying the expected selling price of the homes by size in all three options come out to same number, which was a surprise in one sense, but not in another.
- The biggest concern was the increase in the cost of housing from Option D to Options E and F. Despite what realtors and builders said last time that the expensive homes would be purchased, if there was a recession, building would stop and construction on the expensive homes would stop first.
 - Homes under \$300,000 were selling in Villebois, but the more expensive homes were not selling as fast, though they were selling; so it was hard to tell what would happen with \$700,000 homes. Despite the best intentions of wanting to provide that potential, it was uncertain whether it would play out.
 - The Commission needed to be responsive to what the community envisioned for the area, but there were concerns about how marketable the large lots would be because it was uncertain who would be able to afford them, unless higher technology or some other job base was brought into the city to support those homes.
 - The value of the homes Option E or F was so high that to attract the right people, the entire development would have to be so terrific that everyone would want to move in; not just because it was Wilsonville but because of what was around it; it could not be like anything else in the area.
 - Market data from multiple realtors, including a realtor focused on the Villebois market, showed that large lots in Villebois were selling faster. Perhaps, that data could be provided at a later date since the number of sold signs in Villebois did not confirm that.
 - Large lots in Villebois were 6,000 to 8,000 sq ft and were not more than \$600,000. The lots were selling faster than other less expensive lots, and more often than not, before the homes were even built.
- It was disappointing that a lot of market data was still missing, for example, where the income and home buyers were coming from because they were still looking in this small area.
 - Most fascinating about the new economic data provided was the map showing where the high-income jobs (Slide 4, of the Demographic Analysis Update portion of the presentation,) were versus where high-income housing (Slide 3) was located. In comparing the two images, West Linn had virtually no high income jobs, but Wilsonville did, and those with very high incomes were living in West Linn, which meant that

Wilsonville had the jobs, but sending those people to live elsewhere, which was unfathomable.

- That was a pretty big assumption to make; Higher-Wage Jobs were identified as \$40,000+ per year which was not a \$775,000 house.
 - The point was some of that data was still missing.
- Whether potential homebuyers were being considered from the Portland metro area or a small ring around Wilsonville, a couple things were still missing:
 - Wilsonville was building more industrial space and targeting higher wage jobs, but no homes were being built for those people. Wilsonville did not have executive level homes, so essentially the city was telling them to go live in Lake Oswego or West Linn, where higher income homes were located. For some reason, Wilsonville was putting more cars on the road for people to travel farther distances to work in Wilsonville. They would not be able to attract those businesses to Wilsonville because there was no housing for the types of businesses.
 - Multiple real estate agents have shared that those buying higher end homes were coming from places like California where people were selling homes for \$725,000 and had the option to purchase the same size home they had in California when they move to Oregon for about two-thirds of the price. That sector was missing as well; those people were living in other places.
- Of the options presented, Option F was preferred, but it was still too dense. Too many Large Lots were missing in the East and South Neighborhoods as well.
 - There were some reservations, but economic and market data were missing that could inform whether more Large Lots would truly work. The fact that people in Wilsonville were not buying Large Lot houses was continually being justified by looking at Wilsonville, yet there was a clear acknowledgement that such homes did not exist in Wilsonville.
 - Though some data was missing, there was enough to support at least Option F with some tinkering on the East and South Neighborhoods to recover some of that as well.
- Renaissance's infill project had eight of thirteen lots sold for more than \$600,000 and no for sale or sold signs had been seen. Only one structure was partially erected on one lot.
 - About a year ago, the Commission received the economic data for the Wilsonville area and the median or average salary for one person in the high-tech sector was \$80,000 or \$94,000 per year.
 - As stated previously, you do not look at existing market to figure out the market you will or want to have.
 - If a Large Lot was not on the menu, no one could buy it.
- Option F was definitely the preferred option, considering the thinking with the East and South Neighborhoods, or another option that rolled into considerations that end up occurring because of the East and South Neighborhoods.
 - The placement of the extra Large Lots was interesting, but was understood given the current desires of the existing landowners; the rest of the colored squares could be moved around in the future if no deed restrictions were placed on a piece of property, which could occur where the Large Lots were added in Option F versus Option E.
 - It was still a free market society and Wilsonville now had more than enough work force housing. It was time for anyone who did not want to live in the Stafford area, but wanted to be in the general area to have an option to live in the Wilsonville community, as heard from so many people during public testimony who said they had to live out Stafford way because Wilsonville did not have large enough lots.
- Could the colored squares actually be moved around in Option F?
 - Mr. Dills responded the project team was proposing the array of colors presented in Option F.

- What was striking was that it would have to be nice around the Large Lots and homes, yet there was a little cluster of Large Lots on Advance Rd. If they were talking about making that area all the Large Lots, that did not make any sense. People wanting the Large Lots would want a similar configuration around them, so why were the Large Lots plunked down on Advance Rd.
- Mr. Dills explained the project team looked at two other configurations for Large Lots in Option F, and chose the current layout for Option F for the following reasons:
 - The area north of Frog Pond Lane was right next to the power lines, which did not seem to be a good fit for higher end homes.
 - The area more toward the middle was not chosen because the Task Force had discussed the neighborhood edge near Boeckman Creek and decided they liked the idea of having more people near that neighborhood edge for stewardship reasons and to have an open space amenity that was effectively connected into the neighborhood.
- Mr. Dills confirmed that the existing homeowners in that area possibly wanted deed restrictions. The project team had heard from at least one property owner, and a couple others said they were working together with a preference for larger lots as shown on Option F.

The Commission consented to support Option F for the West Neighborhood of Frog Pond.

Mr. Dills reviewed the metrics related to the adjustments made to Option E for the East and South Neighborhoods (Slide 20), noting that Option F was not included as that was not directed by the Commission in June. His key comments were as follows:

- The total number of dwellings changed from 1,325 to approximately 1,100 dwellings, decreasing the overall density in both neighborhoods. The net density decreased from 10 to 8.24 dwellings/net acre.
- The current practice with Metro in bringing urban reserve areas into the UGB was to attach conditions to direct local governments with respect to density targets, which was done in a couple different ways.
 - From Metro's past practices, all other concept plans were brought in with 10 units/acre or greater.
 - If the Commission chose to plan the future urban reserve areas with a density around 8 units/acre as shown, then there was the risk that Metro might look at it less desirably as a candidate UGB expansion area.
 - The City had been in direct conversation with Metro Staff and had a pretty good region wide track record to consider when trying to predict how Metro would make that call.
- The cost per lot was quite a different story than the West Neighborhood because there were more lots and less infrastructure required.
- He briefly reviewed the Land Use Framework map, which was displayed onscreen.
- The Illustrative Plan helped to illustrate the design standards that would be put in place and the next level of illustration from the zoning colors shown on the framework plan. He briefly described the Illustrative Plan being worked on for East Neighborhood, which included a neighborhood park, six streets, and direct walking routes to the neighborhood center. The Illustrative Plan provided a different level of richness that was very much part of the recommendation.
 - Option D included the attached and cottage style product, which was indicated by the most orange brown color. The variety of housing within the attached and cottage lot designation was anticipated to be everything from detached cottages around the green to townhomes in three, four, maybe six clusters, on up to senior housing.
 - The Small Lot designation would be adjacent to the attached and cottage lot designation, essentially performing a transect out to the rural areas.

- Option E essentially increased the lot sizes of each of the designations as done in the West Neighborhood.
- Mr. Neamtzu believed the Illustrative Plan being created for the attached and cottage lot designation would be very informative in providing a better understanding of that land use pattern. He had similar concerns about that designation being homogeneous or not containing enough diversity and wanted to draw it in a detailed manner to depict what that could be and flush out the concepts more.
- The Illustrative Plan for the East Neighborhood should be available at the public hearing.
- Mr. Dills stated the principle of the rectilinear street framework was connectivity, confirming that how that connectivity was delivered was somewhat flexible. Primarily it would be determined by 60th Ave and Frog Pond Lane because continuing that connection was a natural thing to do and was consistent with other concept plan principles. Though shown as linear, there was a lot of room to move within the street framework to have a more organic street framework.

Discussion and feedback regarding the East and South Neighborhoods continued as follows with responses to Commissioner questions as noted:

- To minimize the assumption of a grid, it might be good to emphasize more organic streets in the illustrations.
- Option D resulted from the work session with City Council after all the apartments were removed from the prior concept.
- Mr. Dills confirmed that having either mixed use or small scale retail in the commercial designation was very much the concept. Feedback from the online surveys indicated a lot of support for a mixed concept. Mandating that concept would be pretty assertive, so for purposes of calculating capacity, the project team had not assumed mixed use would be mandated, but it certainly would be allowed. He would characterize mixed use as a community preference at this point.
 - Adding the mixed use component would only impact the density discussion by the 30 to 40 housing units that could fit on the second story of the footprints.
 - He did not know how the mixed use was doing in Sherwood on Roy Rodgers Rd.
- Mr. Neamtzu explained that building height restrictions and other dimensional standards would be discussed as part of the code work during Phase 2.
- Land Use Framework Option D was presented to the Commission. Option E would not change other than having larger lots for each of the colors representing the product types.
- As discussed at Council and Task Force meetings, there were several things working against having commercial at the Boeckman/Stafford/Advance/ Wilsonville Rd intersection:
 - First, Town Center was a mile away. Commercial was already not succeeding in Town Center and the commercial use in Frog Pond could possibly draw more business away.
 - If mixed use, residential above commercial, was a consideration for the future redevelopment of Town Center, it would also be in direct competition with the mixed use in Frog Pond.
 - Commercial locations in the city for the exact same use had not worked over the last 30 years. Even with full build out at Morey's Landing, the commercial use there never happened.
 - Another consideration was the assumption that corner would remain empty until closer to full build out as homes were built deeper into the development area.
 - The new cell tower located in Frog Pond would keep a lot of people from wanting a house nearby.
 - Retail was collapsing nationwide due to online shopping. Again, why steal a diminishing piece of retail from Town Center where it was already faltering?

- If the East Neighborhood was anticipated to be built out in the next 15 to 20 years, there should be an Option B or C for the commercial space in Frog Pond.
- Chair McGuire read Commissioner Springall's comments from his email (Exhibit 1), regarding the East and South Neighborhoods, noting his preference was Option D.
- Anything less than Option E would be a no vote, in fact, other options should be considered because there a lot of Small to Medium Lots were still being built in Villebois, so that market was covered.
 - Density could be increased in the future, but not decreased, so setting the City's density mark where it could not be reduced was very concerning. Option F should be considered for East and South as well.
- Anything less than Option E was not acceptable. The Commission should consider where Wilsonville was only two years ago when they thought the City was pushing the boundaries for having ADUs. It was a bit disconcerting going from that to townhouses on 2,000 sq ft lots in two years.
- Option D was preferred due to the amount of work and compromises made through the various open houses and work sessions. Overall, it was a more efficient use of land and better sustainably for the environment because City's infrastructure was used more efficiently. Option D also better supported Wilsonville's aging population by having a range of housing options for seniors.
- The aging population wanted a single-level master on main which could not be done on smaller lot sizes. To actually serve an aging population, lot sizes needed to increase.
 - Mr. Neamtzu clarified that cottage housing was an 800 to 1,200 sq ft single-story home that could fit easily on a 3,000 to 4,000 sq ft lot.
 - Mr. Vanneman noted that in considering the market for this project, the most interesting and well done study he found on aging households and their preferences was conducted by Portland State University, which was cited in a number of documents and could be provided to the Commission. Aging households do talk about master on the main and single-floor living, but also had a propensity toward higher density living where more amenities were within close proximity.
 - It seemed most appropriate that a single, elderly person would live in a condo in Town Center than in a single-family home. There would be no services available in Frog Pond for those that might be retired, aged, or disabled. A niche market of services would be needed that would not be able to stand on their own on the corner of a commercial area.
 - Mr. Dills noted that considering the projected increase in the aging population (Slide 10 of the Demographic Analysis Update portion of the presentation), Wilsonville would likely be well served by senior living in both Town Center and Frog Pond.
- Entry level housing was needed for young professionals and small families, which were the upcoming backbone of Wilsonville's future economy. Housing should be providing for them as well, it was not all about seniors.
 - Villebois had that housing in spades. The issue was that Wilsonville had no housing options for people moving up after the Landover neighborhood. Although Renaissance and other areas had larger lots, no lots were larger than 7,000 sq ft.
 - Older areas like Fox Chase had what would be considered large lots; some were about 8,000 sq ft and even bigger lots due to the street configuration. The housing was old, but bigger lots did exist.
- Senior citizens were a complicated demographic. Many tend to be active and most who moved from California want to live in Portland because they like that kind of living. It was uncertain how many would come to Wilsonville, which had a large amount of assisted living. Many elderly come to Wilsonville because their children live here and they want to live in less expensive homes. Most would never be able to afford anything being discussed for Frog Pond.
 - Specify exactly what any demographic would want was difficult.

- Blue collar and lower white collar workers with double incomes lived in Commissioner Hurley's neighborhood and several people owned their own business. Homeowners tended to leave once they were successful.
- Option D was the preferred option and it was a good compromise.
- When the Commission had heard all the testimony about larger lots in Frog Pond, people were not just talking about the West Neighborhood, they were talking about the entire project, so Option D seemed to go against the feedback received from Wilsonville citizens. It was important to build a community that people said they wanted built.
- At the June meeting when the Commission discussed revisions and considered Option F for the West Neighborhood, it was understood there would be the opportunity to suggest revisions for East and South Neighborhoods and have Staff return to the Commission in July for further consideration.
- If the City did not achieve a certain density, it was less likely that the East and South Neighborhoods would be brought into the UGB.
 - Mr. Neamtzu stated the most recent UGB expansion was the only time he could remember that Wilsonville was the only city in line. The time prior, a number of communities received an expansion and Wilsonville and the cities in line behind them did not. Now, the City had to wait 3 to 5 years for the next UGB expansion process, and at that time, there was certain to be at least five cities with concept plan areas requesting UGB expansions, so essentially, it was a competitive process.
 - Metro Council had a limited amount of land to expand to meet the need. Metro would review their Regional 2040 policies and reward what they believed was good planning, which was important to keep in mind going forward.
- One question raised at one of the Frog Pond Task Force meetings was what benefits current Wilsonville citizens would get by bringing in the East and South Neighborhood areas into Frog Pond. What were the negative impacts to the citizens of Wilsonville, if the areas did not come into the UGB?
 - Mr. Neamtzu stated there were several considerations to consider. The school district bought land out there without really talking to the City about where they were going to buy it. The City then conducted its 20-Year Look to see where Wilsonville wanted to grow as a city, and did a lot of planning over the last 10 years because the area was identified as a priority for the future expansion of Wilsonville.
 - The property owners in that area would be forever changed with the school being constructed so getting the land into the UGB afforded those property owners some opportunities to have options as they moved forward in their decision making.
 - There was also a 10-acre community park associated with the school district's property in the area.
 - The City had a lot of eggs in the basket as far as going into that neighborhood and trying to build a community around those schools.
 - Bringing those areas into Frog Pond was about economies of scale, it was about community, and getting the park and school surrounded as a center piece of community rather than isolated on the edge of a rural area. The City was following through on all the work done historically in moving through these processes.
- There was also the danger of not allowing Wilsonville residents to decide what this neighborhood would look like. Making a decision about the East and South Neighborhoods based on what the Commission believed would be approved by Metro was essentially allowing other communities decide what Wilsonville was going to look like.
 - The Commission heard so much testimony about what Wilsonville citizens and those property owners wanted Frog Pond to look like, yet the Commission was just breezing past that to meet a standard of density. The City should build the community Wilsonville wanted, not what other cities in the Metro area wanted Wilsonville to build.

- The bottom line was if the City did not follow through with all the planning done and discussion thus far, the area would not come into the UGB and then it would all be a moot point. The city would not even have the few large lots that were there.
- The elementary and middle schools on Wilsonville Rd were built 30 years ago and the City decided to build a park on the south end of town instead of a subdivision to bring that school into a neighborhood. There would be very little difference if the area north of the school at Advance Road remained rural reserve. In another 20 years, the City could put in a park system so it would look like the other end of Wilsonville Rd. School districts put schools on the edge of town because it was a cheap place to put a school; Canby was one example.
 - Again, what was in it to make quality life better for the current citizens of Wilsonville.

The Commission conducted a straw poll on which land use option should be used for the East and South Neighborhoods.

Option D: Chair McGuire and Commissioners Springall (via his submitted email), Levit, and Greenfield

Option E: Commission Millan

Option F: Commissioners Postma and Hurley

Commissioner Hurley added he preferred Option F as a minimum.

Mr. Dills stated the Commission's discussion, all the points of view and the straw poll vote would be carried forward to the City Council work session.

Mr. Neamtzu explained that City Council would be briefed during a work session at Council's second meeting in August. Staff would provide details about this Planning Commission meeting and also provide any additional information requested at the July 13 work session, in addition to the Illustrative Plans and materials still being prepared. The public hearing was tentatively set, but he was hearing concerns about the process taking too long. Phase 2 also needed to be done and property owners were concerned that work would extend to the end of 2016.

- He confirmed the work was funded through a grant, and as alternatives were created, the City was in a position of not being able to use that grant money. He noted that all of the recent work this last month was out of scope, and that the number of out of scope items was significant.
- He clarified that the public hearing was scheduled for September, but the Commission could take as much time as was needed to work through that process. The Planning Commission's recommendation would then be presented to City Council for final adoption.

Chair McGuire added it would be good if City Council could help narrow the project choices and forward a final draft for the Planning Commission to discuss and deliberate.

Mr. Dills described the refinement to the Park and Open Space Framework (Key Issue 3) via PowerPoint and as presented in his memorandum.

- He noted that on the Park and Open Space Framework, a potential future park site had been indicated with an asterisk adjacent to the 10-acres currently in public ownership. The idea was that the community park could expand to that adjacent property, but the property owner asked that the asterisk be removed, and the project team was comfortable in doing so since there were no concrete plans to acquire the property. All planning was focused on making the public ownerships work first.
- He confirmed that by removing the asterisk, the property could potentially develop as housing once the area was brought into UGB.

Comments from the Commission and responses to Commissioner questions were as follows:

- The proposed refinement was a better concept and took advantage of the Boeckman Creek area.
- Mr. Dills confirmed that terrain was not an issue where the more linear park was proposed as both the park and trail would be more upland. He noted the upland trail was shown when the proposed trail alignments were presented.

The Planning Commission consented to the Park and Open Space refinement.

Mr. Dills concluded that the remaining items were purely informational, and briefly highlighted the key design standards that would apply to the Neighborhood Commercial Center and would be carried forward into the package presented at the public hearing. (Key Issue 4, Slide 26)

Chair McGuire repeated her announcement that the agenda was revised at the beginning of the meeting to postpone the Basalt Creek Concept Plan Update to the August Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Neamtzu noted Ms. Bateschell was out of the state due to a family matter, adding the update was essentially a recap of the Joint City Council meeting, so not a lot of new information was coming forward.

B. Coffee Creek Industrial Area Form-based Code (Neamtzu)

Chris Neamtzu, Planning Director, noted the Commission had received a complete and extensive Form-based Code package, adding he had just received the Form-based Pattern Book last week and was not quite up to speed on all the details. The project team from Urbsworks and Bainbridge Planning were in attendance and tonight's work session was to get the big issues on the table for discussion and to introduce the packet of materials to begin working through them in a methodical way. There was no timeline for adoption and no schedule to be concerned about. The project was exciting and interesting, and he was happy to have the complete package and not just parts and pieces.

Marcy McInnelly and Joseph Readdy of Urbsworks presented the Wilsonville Coffee Creek Light Industrial Form-based Code via PowerPoint, explaining the opportunity provided by the Coffee Creek Design Overlay by describing its four key parts, which included the two-track system, Addressing Streets, and creating a network for people and goods with an emphasis on site design and the quality of the public realm. Paper copies of the PowerPoint were distributed to the Planning Commission.

Discussion and feedback from the Planning Commission along with responses to Commissioner questions were as follows:

- Hopefully, the tree preservation requirements would be part of the Form-based Code. For example, if trees were located within the setback, those trees could also be preserved within islands of the parking lot, but this was one aspect of the Code that had not been completely worked out yet. A number of different paths could be pursued to resolve the concern. One would be to understand how many trees were on the somewhat limited master planned area; the types and groves of trees could be inventoried to determine which trees were desirable to preserve. The Form-based Code requirements could assist a developer to build around the preserved trees and still achieve the pre-approved Form-based Code streamlined path.
 - No new standards were created for parking lot trees, which were addressed in the standards of the existing City Code. The existing Code required a tree for every seven to ten parking spaces in a tree island.

- The image of the parking lot on Slide 18 showing deciduous trees met the City's current parking lot standard for parking lot landscaping. A grove of fir trees was also shown on the slide, and a Pattern Book guideline discussed how to preserve trees and lay out the site around existing trees or groves of trees.
 - On Page 14 (51 of 155 of the packet) of the Form-based Code, Attachment C, two existing Wilsonville Code sections were referred to under Planting for Addressing Streets. One section was the general landscape standard and the other was a low berm standard, which was a new standard introduced as a result of the Form-based Code. Both standards would actually provide landscaping that was a bit denser along the Addressing Street than what was shown in the illustration. (Slide 18)
 - Also on Page 14, the Code for Supporting Streets and Through Connections provided a bit more flexibility, having less intense standards than those for the Addressing Street, which carried more importance on higher design.
- As in the current Development Code, the Form-based Code would require pedestrian access to come to the corners of blocks, such as at intersections.
- On Page 53 of 155 of the packet (Table CC-4: Development Standards), the third paragraph regarding Front Façade should be reworded to clarify that the front of the building façade must face Day Road if Day Road was one of the streets or connections bounding a parcel.
- The 65 percent minimum transparency identified on Page 53 applied to the building façade facing an Addressing Street, Supporting Street or a Through Connection because the standard crossed all three columns in Table CC-4: Development Standards.
 - The 60 percent minimum transparency on Page 54 for Allowance for Primary Building Entrances was specifically about entrances allowed to encroach into the setback, which were required to meet a certain quality standard.
- The Front Setback standards in Table CC-4 on Page 54 were correct. There was a 30-ft minimum front setback on an Addressing Street, and a 30-ft maximum, but no minimum requirement, for front setbacks on Supporting Streets and Through Connections because having that much distance between the Supporting Street and Through Connections was not desirable. The building could be right on the edge of the easement if the requirements for the façade were met, although the standard was certainly open for discussion. An urban street was possible if that was what the developer wanted.
- With all the attention to the building architecture and landscaping in the Form-based Code, more clarity should be added to the sign guidelines on Page 127 of 155, to ensure that growth of landscaping did not interfere with signage and architectural features to the extent of making them irrelevant.
 - As opposed to a standard, guidelines were intended to be followed or judged by the Development Review Board (DRB) as part of the second track.
 - The intent of the subject guideline was to ensure that signage be placed elsewhere if there was native landscaping in that location so that signage did not compete with native vegetation. The City's existing Sign Code with monument signs would still be functional.
- Page 51 of 155 Section C.7 in Table CC-3 addressed Location and Screening of Utilities and Services and stated that no such services were allowed in the front yard setback on Addressing Streets. On Supporting Streets, no equipment or services were permitted within the setback, but there was no limitation on a Through Connection. The hierarchy of the connections moving from left to right in the table showed that the Addressing Streets were most important, Supporting Streets were only slightly less important, because Supporting Streets could sometimes be the Addressing Streets, and then Through Connections had very little limitations.

- Developers using the streamlined review process would have to meet these standards, but if they insisted their utilities had to be on the Addressing Street, the project would go through development review where the design guidelines would apply for their placement and screening.
- A good point of discussion was that a lot of emphasis was placed on the landscaping and **architecture of the building on the front façade, but not the side elevations, which could become eyesores.**
- Section 4.3 on Page 129 of 155 regarding flood lighting was a guideline, so an applicant would have to prove to the DRB how flood lighting met the intent of the design guidelines, the language should be more defined and less subjective.
 - There had been expansions of projects in town that had very good lighting originally, and then very bad lighting that was approved by the DRB anyway.
- The picture on Page 132 of 155 of Rockwell Collins did not look inviting and something a little more creative architecturally should be included. Additionally, the Form-based Code emphasized the three parts of a building, the base, middle, and top; however, the base could not be clearly seen in several pictures in the Pattern Book.
 - Images should support the intention of the design guidelines. The Commission was invited to tell the project team about photographs that would be better examples.
- The concept about roofs being a fifth elevation on Page 133 was appreciated; however, the use of solar should be encouraged, as well as more functional plans, such as using roof space for things like community gardens for employees.
- On Page 139, C was identified as a Priority Addressing Street; similar to the clarification requested **regarding the Front Façade on Page 53 in Table CC-4 of the Form-based Code**, the language on Page 139 should be clarified that when Day Road was one of the Addressing Streets for a property, Day Road would be the primary Addressing Street.
- The head-in parking shown on the Park-like drawing on Page 145 seemed dangerous for bike riders; the angled parking shown in the Maximum Parking drawing (Page 146) was preferred so bicyclists could more easily see the backup or reverse lights of the vehicles.
- The Kinsman Road profile on Page 148 with the multi-use path on only one side was unfortunately cropped via the desktop publishing. The east side of Kinsman Road ran along the Bonneville Power right-of-way and could potentially connect across to the existing Commerce Circle Industrial Area, so the project team would love to see the multi-use path on the east side of Kinsman Road become very intensive and well-developed. The bicycle connectivity had regional implications whereas the west side of Kinsman Road was more for local trips for pedestrian or bicycles.
- Concern was expressed about how Section 4.134(.03).B Exceptions listed on Page 39 of 155 effectively allowed development of less than 1,250 sq ft to get around the standards. This could be abused for all areas, not just on Addressing Streets and entry ways.
- Concern was expressed about the 30-ft building height minimum on Page 54 of 155 limiting the flexibility to incorporate different building types, such as warehousing and other functions away from Addressing Streets. Was it wise to be so restrictive?
 - The Day Road Overlay used to have a 48-ft minimum building height to accommodate four stories.
 - Support was expressed for being more restrictive because the vision for that part of the city was to not have more warehousing and distribution centers. Other industry and business needed to be brought in and a minimum height encouraged a different type of land use.
- The Commission was asked whether there should be a distinction between the Day Road frontage and the rest of Coffee Creek.
 - A minimum building height was wanted on Addressing Streets but property way off and in the remainder of project area should not preclude a tilt up building.

- The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) encouraged little more openness with regard to Section 4.176(.04)E on Page 77 of 155 and the screening of loading areas, docks, and truck parking in industrial uses in industrial zones.
 - The Form-based Code for Coffee Creek had a very limited amount of loading space that could be on an Addressing Street; so much more flexible was provided for Supporting Streets and Through Connections so applicants could place loading docks where they should be located.
 - One concern was that loading docks could essentially become a parked truck and then a new storage facility. People were less concerned about the loading dock, as long as it was functional, than a loading dock with trailer storage. The issue might seemed to fall within an ordinance, but the solution was to make sure the loading areas, docks, and truck parking could not be turned into something unwanted and become an eyesore.
- The redline comment on Page 89 of 155 was correct. The wrong person looking for a loophole might try to apply one and not the other, so referring to the zone over and over might seem duplicative, but it might be needed.
 - The issue became more pronounced on Page 94 and 95. Section 4.440 (.02) kept referring to the DRB, but should also indicate an application might not go to the DRB, but to Planning Staff. When discussing effective dates of decisions, a new trigger point could be a date of decision from Planning Staff, not the DRB. For example, the time limits on approvals might still apply, but the application might not go before the DRB. These issues showed up in Sections 4.441, 4.442, and 4.443, as well as Section 4.450(.03), so duplicate references were needed.
- The project team did a phenomenal job with the project. There were very few missing items or things that did not work in conjunction with the rest of the Development Code.
- The Executive Summary on Page 110 of 155 needed to provide a good explanation of the advantages of doing Track 1 to encourage applicants to use Track 1 and clarify that Track 2 was a long, difficult, and expensive process that would likely change their project in ways not anticipated.
 - The language needed to do more to sell the Form-based Code concept, which was very positive for builders.
- With the Form-based Code, the DRB would continue to have an opportunity to call up review decisions made by the Planning Director. Board members would still receive notice of all decisions along with a full packet. If a majority of the panel wanted a public hearing, they had the right to do so.
 - Currently, City Council could call up a DRB decision, but would not even be Noticed about Staff decisions. Notice could be provided to the entire Council to provide that same opportunity and was something Staff could address. The Council had not been informed about the Form-based Code yet, so they might have feedback.
- After the first Form-based Code project is approved, it was recommended that a report be given to the Planning Commission on how the process worked, whether there were problems that needed to be addressed, did the process work smoothly, was there a quality project, etc.
 - Having the developer or person actually dealing with the plans provide feedback to the Commission about what they liked or did not like was also suggested.
- The overall sense that the Pattern Book and Form-based Code was interested in informality and not a severe urban feel was appreciated. The same sensibility expressed with regard to Frog Pond as well. The community wanted that kind of more relaxed architecture.
- Concern was expressed that the language on Page 121 regarding informal, natural landscaping could potentially result in shabby, unkempt spaces. Though natural was informal, informal did not necessarily mean natural in the sense that the landscaping was just left to go. No one would want to see weed patches between buildings.

- On Page 122, concern was expressed about a specification that appeared in multiple places regarding the use of industrial materials, like unfinished steel, raw aluminum and plain concrete, as finish materials for the construction of site and building elements. The issue was that this would encourage developers to use cheap materials rather than aesthetically pleasing and suitable materials. Raw untreated concrete should at least have a board-like texture. Tilting the language more toward aesthetic sensibility was suggested.
 - Large expanses of raw metal were also a concern versus using it as a detailed treatment.
 - The image of the screening material on Page 127 of 155 featured a textured sample.
- The limited use of non-native plants referenced in the materials was not congruent with the Development Code, which was more prescriptive in the type of shrubs and plants approved for use. Excessive landscaping could lead to abusing water usage.
 - The Commission was invited to provide more direction because natural often meant less watering in the Northwest climate; however, natural could also mean unkempt or unmaintained.
 - A balance of pride of place and naturalness, as well as a high degree of maintenance equality needed to be achieved in the fundamental aspects of the Form-based Code, as well as the Pattern Book.

C. Basalt Creek Concept Plan update (Bateschell)

This agenda item was removed from the agenda as Long-Range Planning Manager Miranda Bateschell was absent due to a family emergency.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

A. 2015 Planning Commission Work Program

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Chair McGuire adjourned the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

By Paula Pinyerd of ABC Transcription Services, Inc. for
Linda Straessle, Administrative Assistant III