

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 2020  
6:00 P.M.**

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

*Meeting Minutes approved as  
amended at the January 13,  
2021 PC Meeting*

**Minutes**

---

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

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

Planning Commission: Kamran Mesbah, Ron Heberlein, Jerry Greenfield, Phyllis Millan, Aaron Woods, and Breanne Tusinski

City Staff: Miranda Bateschell, Ryan Adams, Daniel Pauly, Kim Rybold, Jordan Vance, Phillip Bradford, and Tami Bergeron.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

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

**ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

A. Consideration of the October 14, 2020 Planning Commission minutes  
The October 14, 2020 Planning Commission minutes were accepted as presented.

**II. WORK SESSION**

A. Town Center Streetscape Plan (Bradford)

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, reminded that the Town Center Plan was adopted in 2019 after numerous public engagement activities and a vision developed by the community. The Plan recommended amendments to the Transportation System Plan (TSP), which would put the infrastructure in place for multimodal transportation. The Streetscape Plan was built on those TSP amendments and the design was important to the function of the space. The project team would be sharing the initial Streetscape Plan concepts and take feedback from the Commission. Public engagement had already begun for this phase of the project.

Philip Bradford, Associate Planner, presented a brief update on Staff's work done to date. He noted that a public forum was held on Tuesday, November 10, and that Staff was seeking feedback on several questions related to the Plan.

Ben Weber, Project Manager at SERA Architects, gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Town Center Streetscape Plan, reviewing the role of the Commissioners, the community engagement plan, other plans that influenced this project, existing conditions, streetscape inspirations, preliminary design concepts, and next steps. He noted the concepts were presented to the public during Tuesday's forum, where there was broad support for the Plan's goals, the walkability of the street network, covered gathering areas, and public spaces that could be used year-round. There was also a lot of support for a modern and natural design aesthetic, as well as better lighting.

Discussion and feedback from the Planning Commission was as follows with responses to Commissioner questions by Staff and Mr. Weber as noted:

- Mr. Bradford explained those currently being considered for stakeholder interviews were landowners in the area. ROIC was the largest owner of property in Town Center. Staff had also considered reaching out to people who have been active in the planning process or have a history with Town Center, like Susan Myers, who was a property owner and developer. Staff did not have a list of specific people yet, but would be reaching out to anyone with a vested interest.
- Commissioners discussed the modern natural design and the use of wood, stone, glass, and brick, which received support from the public at Tuesday's public forum. The general consensus was that the proposed materials would be appropriate for Town Center because they would be sustainable and artistic. Commissioner Greenfield did note that brick was structurally vulnerable to seismic activity.
  - Mr. Weber clarified for Chair Mesbah that the weathered steel, as seen on City signage (Pages 20 and 21, Staff report), was not intentionally omitted from the list of proposed materials and Staff could add it. He reminded that he was presenting initial concepts and the four materials proposed were not the only four that could be used. Obviously, steel and metal would be necessary for structural purposes.
- Commissioners shared which existing designs and key features in the Town Center should be retained and built upon for the Streetscape Project. Commissioners wanted to expand on the covered shelters and walkways, particularly in the Murase Plaza area of Memorial Park. Other features that should be highlighted included the Apache, the fountains, and the war memorial. The development could also use a lot more art and sculptures, which could turn Town Center into an outdoor art gallery with an art walk guide.
  - The connection between areas should have a good flow, which was not currently the case. The area was currently disjointed, and the emerald chain idea was important for people to feel connected and want to hang out. A path could connect everything, like the yellow brick road.
  - Perhaps a reflection area with benches could be added to the war memorial so that people could see and appreciate it.
  - Covered walkways across such a large area would need to be effective, but not obtrusive to natural lighting. Additionally, the covering should not be monolithic.
    - Mr. Weber responded that weather protection was obviously appealing, and he surmised that fully arcaded streets and covered sidewalks might not be practical. However, the streetscape should accommodate awnings, which the Town Center Design Standards already encourage.
  - Each area should have a theme and be uniform. For example, the emerald chain had a distinct coloring theme for the benches that might be different from the Main Street area. Themes would give people a sense of where they were.
    - Mr. Weber clarified that he had been referring to the streetscape as a linear feature. Thinking about unique locations was another part of the scope of the project.
  - The City could require that art be incorporated into some of the buildings to encourage people to see what was there and enjoy the aesthetics.

Mr. Weber clarified he was seeking general feedback on the three preliminary streetscape concepts, but was not looking for a vote. He specifically wanted to know if the concepts captured the range of themes and ideas the Commission would like to see further developed. The three options would be carried out further to tease out design ideas, but he wanted to know which features were not appealing to the Commission. [these design concepts not included in the slides were in the staff report]

Commissioner Heberlein responded that the river/organic design palette was more timeless and went along with the materials being discussed. The technological/innovation design palette had the potential to become dated. The wooden light posts in the photographs caught his eye as a distinct feature that made things stand out. The photograph of the back side of a sign post looked unsightly, so the posts should look better.

Commissioner Tusinski agreed and added that the agricultural legacy and the river spoke more to the timelessness that the Commission was leaning towards and lent themselves better to the glass, wood, and stone that people have said they were looking for. The river lent itself to the town's history and the details that harken back to the history of the town still look timeless and were aesthetically pleasing.

Commissioner Millan also agreed. The agriculture and the river seemed to feel more like the other concepts the Commission had been looking at for the I-5 bridge and the park areas. However, the agriculture had a real connection through the city going across to Memorial Park and the Stein-Boozer Barn. She did not want to mix too many elements, but there was a way to blend the agriculture and river without changing the other things the Commission had already said they liked.

Commissioner Greenfield said he believed the public input received about the bike/pedestrian bridge and signage generally and consistently favored curvilinear over rectilinear designs. He advised against being overly thematic. He did not like West Linn's old town area where they tried to recreate 19<sup>th</sup> Century features. He encouraged the project team to be sensible, modern, and respectful of Wilsonville's traditions.

Commissioner Woods stated he believed all three concepts could provide a nice range of designs. Wilsonville was innovative, so it was important to incorporate technological innovations into the planning because the City was planning for the future. He was a big proponent of electric vehicles and he envisioned seeing charging stations around the city. The streetscape with wide streets was paramount to what the Commission wanted to consider from a landscape buffering perspective because it gave a modern look and a safe feel. Wider streets also offer restaurants the potential to have street seating and give an open feel to the area. It was important to be mindful of the senior population, so they could enjoy what was developed. He encouraged the design team to think about the specific needs of seniors because the senior population is growing.

Chair Mesbah responded that he did not like the hay bale planters, adding he would like to see the project team "keep it real."

Mr. Weber appreciated the Commission's input and opinions. In future phases of the project, he would return to the Commission with more details for deeper conversations about the designs.

Commissioner Millan stated seniors and high schoolers should be included on the list of stakeholders, especially if the City wants the development to be used by everyone.

Chair Mesbah added that existing business owners should also be consulted. Retaining those businesses during the redesign was discussed at a City Council meeting. Parts of Town Center lends itself to smaller, more affordable shops and those shops should not be priced out. The Commission had speculated that some businesses would have outside seating and some of the businesses might have ideas about how to make that effective and efficient.

Ms. Bateschell asked for input about the technological innovation concept, noting she had not heard much support or any opposition to that concept.

Chair Mesbah stated that new technologies needed to be supported, like charging stations. He liked the river pebble seating areas and believed it would attract younger crowds. Elements in all of the designs could be used and parts of Town Center would have different functions and needs. All of the ideas and concepts were potentially useful.

Commissioner Woods said it was extremely important to have Wi-Fi throughout the city because residents would be looking for it.

Commissioner Heberlein believed that having technological features did not have to force a theme. All themes could incorporate technology. However, because Town Center was so large, maybe a variety of themes in different areas could intersect without being out of place.

#### B. HB 2001 Compliance Middle Housing (Pauly)

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, said she spent most of the day in the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) hearing on HB 2001 and HB 2003. The DLCD was adopting administrative rules for both bills. The rules for HB 2003 was adopted today and the commission had requested one more meeting of the rulemaking advisory committee to work through issues with HB 2001. She hoped the administrative rules for HB 2001 would be adopted in December. The timeline of the middle housing project had been dictated by the bill. The City recently adopted the Equitable Housing Strategic Plan, which would influence Development Code and Comprehensive Plan revisions related to residential land uses.

Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager, stated Staff first briefed the Commission in December on the new State statutes and shared the scope of this project in February. There must be duplexes on every lot or every lot that allows single-family units must also allow duplexes. Tri-plexes, quad-plexes, cottage clusters, and town houses must be allowed in areas zoned for single-family residential. This project was built on Wilsonville's history of a variety of housing. Staff would be looking at areas of new growth and changes in existing areas of the city. Staff conducted an audit of the Comprehensive Plan and Development Code. The presentation to follow would be on the consultant's audit of Staff's work and recommendations. He listed next steps, which would include an audit of master plans, a discussion on siting and design standards, work sessions, and public outreach. Staff planned to propose amendments by May and have all amendments adopted by the end of 2021. He introduced the project team, including Mr. Weber and others who had been involved in the project, as well as the lawmaking process.

Joe Dills, Senior Project Manager, Angelo Planning Group (APG), said this Code update would involve a lot of detail and the search for those details really mattered. The presentation would cover three goals of the necessary Code amendments: compliance with HB 2001 and the administrative rules; the likelihood of use by developers and property owners that would result in actual change; and equitable housing outcomes. The project team was requesting feedback on how to achieve those goals.

Kate Rogers, APG, presented the Middle Housing Code Update via PowerPoint, reviewing the purpose and approach of the project (Page 4, Staff report), the three goals being applied to the Code update process (Pages 6, Staff report), key issues (Pages 8, 9, 13, & 14) and recommendations. She noted that the key issues mentioned in the presentation were identified in the Staff report and detailed in the memorandum.

Discussion regarding the options to address key issues included the following comments with responses to Commissioner questions as follows:

#### **Key Issue: Allowing Detached Plexes (Page 8, Staff report)**

- Ms. Rogers confirmed that detached triplexes did not share walls and differed from accessory dwelling units (ADUs), which had size limitations. A triplex could be defined as three units on a lot in any configuration, regardless of whether they were attached or detached, or could be called something else. However, HB 2001 specifically defined plexes. If multiple detached units were allowed, the standards would have to address setbacks and other options that would apply to the buildings on the site. The project team could look further into the semantics and find out if the term "plex" must be used. However, the team sought input from the Commission on the desired outcome.
- Commissioner Heberlein believed the cost of building attached units would be less than detached units. However, many new and young homeowners would be amenable to either attached or detached from a

cost perspective. Therefore, the aesthetics of the area should be retained, regardless of whether there were two or three houses on a lot.

- Ms. Rogers responded that the Code changes required by the bill would most likely result in a single-family unit on a large lot being torn down or adding one or two infill houses, depending on the lot. This could also help preserve existing single-family units that were more affordable.
- Ms. Rogers explained that as defined by HB 2001, cottage cluster housing must be limited to a 900 sq ft building footprint and have a shared courtyard. A detached quad development could also have those features, so a cottage cluster development could be differentiated by requiring a minimum of five units. Alternatively, the City could allow the Applicant to decide whether to permit a development as a detached quad plex or cottage cluster.
- Mr. Pauly said Staff had not yet ironed out the possibility of a lot being subdivided after detached triplexes were built.
- Commissioners Woods, Tusinski, Greenfield, and Chair Mesbah each stated they preferred to allow units to be either attached or detached.
  - Chair Mesbah believed that balancing density with equity and affordability might result in a tendency towards detached plexes because they are more like single-family units, which would encourage gentrification. He also believed that if the definitions of triplexes and duplexes is going to be retained, a lot of education would be necessary for the residents. He did not want it to appear that the City was zoning for duplexes but allowing single-family houses.
- Commissioner Millan questioned how building individual units would help accomplish the City's goal of more affordable housing. The cost of building individual units seemed to be more expensive.
  - Ms. Pauly responded that allowing middle housing would not make housing affordable. New construction tends to be more expensive than existing homes. However, allowing flexibility to add units would increase housing supply, which will bring housing costs down over time.

**Key Issue: Cottage Cluster Units on a Single Lot vs. Individual Lots (Page 9, Staff report)**

- All the Commissioners stated that they supported maximum flexibility by allowing cottage clusters on single lots and individual lots.
  - Commissioner Greenfield added that the cottage clusters on Wood Ave were attractive. He did not know if they were on a single lot or individual lots, but that did not seem to make any difference.
  - Commissioner Tusinski expressed concern that individual lots would drive up prices.
  - Chair Mesbah believed that flexibility ~~would~~could allow the City to buy lots and develop affordable housing.

**Key Issue: Enabling New Housing on Small RA-H Zoned Lots, Including Old Town (Page 13, Staff report)**

- Mr. Pauly explained the City would not be rezoning residents' properties without the owner's consent. In a conditional rezoning, property owners have the opportunity to have a say about what happens to their property. Additionally, both the zoning and the Comprehensive Plan must designate an area as residential in order for the middle housing rules to apply.
- Chair Mesbah did not believe conditional rezoning would be reassuring to residents who had trepidations about what Old Town would become unless design standards were in place. He confirmed with Staff that only the regular sized lots in Old Town would be impacted by conditional zoning.
- Mr. Pauly stated the financial impact of conditional rezoning would be minimal compared to legislative rezoning.
- Commissioner Heberlein believed the City should allow either conditional rezoning or legislative rezoning, and that the City should not amend the RA-H zone or expedite the Zoning Map amendment process, because the two rezoning options would be a lot less work and take less time.
  - Mr. Dills noted that through the rezoning process, the City could have different RA-H zones that create sub-areas with unique plans. Mr. Pauly added that this would be a complex process because separate standards would need to be created for residential and for non-residential.

- Commissioner Millan supported amending the RA-H zone because she could not see where doing so would cause a problem. She also supported legislative rezoning. Simply changing the zone would make the requirements unilateral and easier to explain to people.
  - Mr. Pauly reiterated that the RA-H zone included residential and non-residential areas. Future development should not have such a high value that redevelopment of the property became economically unfeasible. Within most of the RA-H zone, land divisions and future urban development was expected. However, the smaller lots in Old Town were single-family residential where a change in use was not anticipated. Additionally, the area along Montgomery Way had restrictive covenants. He also noted there would be issues with the RA-H zoned lots on Wilsonville Rd, Brown Rd, and Canyon Creek Rd.
- Chair Mesbah believed that learning the history of the RA-H zoning in Old Town might help the Commission make a decision. He supported legislative rezoning. Commissioner Greenfield agreed.

Mr. Dill noted he would present more on Frog Pond in January.

Mr. Pauly noted the old planned development approvals for the new Town Center zoning would apply to the new rules in the Stage II Master Plan. So, the Commission would need to decide when the grandfathered status should expire. The Code edits could have substantial impacts throughout the city.

Commissioner Heberlein believed all of the Code changes would be contentious with residents, as parking was always a very hot topic.

- Mr. Pauly responded that if garages were to count as parking, they would actually need to be available for parking.

Ms. Rogers stated the project team's presentation in January would focus on master plans, siting, and design standards.

### **III. INFORMATIONAL**

#### **A. Wilsonville Investment Now (WIN) Program (Vance)**

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, said the City had received a new Tax Increment Financing (TIF) Zone application for the WIN Program. She also noted that Mr. Vance would be moving to Australia in a few weeks.

Jordan Vance, Economic Development Manager, and Nick Popenuk, Tiberius Solutions, gave a PowerPoint presentation on the WIN Program, describing the history of the program, the program's purpose, benefits, eligibility and scoring criteria, the approval process, the program's timeline, annual reporting requirements, and the payment of benefits. Details of the program were also outlined in Exhibit A on Pages 9 through 13 of the Staff report. They briefly described the differences between the original TIF program and the new WIN program, noting that some aspects of the TIF did not achieve desired results and conditions had changed since it had been implemented. The presentation included hypothetical examples of businesses participating in the program to demonstrate how the program could be implemented, as well as the resulting benefits to the business and the City.

Commissioner Heberlein suggested making tenure more valuable in calculating the points. As presented, for 60 points, businesses would get a 7 percent bump, and at 80 points, businesses would get a 5 percent bump, which did not seem to adequately show appreciation for long standing employers.

Mr. Popenuk stated he worked with City Council and Mr. Vance to develop the point thresholds. The original intent of the program was to incentivize high value and high wage investments, so the amount of capital investment had been emphasized. Local business tenure and diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) were added because those were things the City wanted to encourage or reward without overwhelming skew to the core focus of the program. City Council wanted the program to focus on bringing in new taxable assessed value.

Mr. Vance noted that the local business tenure and DEI were also added for tie-breaker consideration. Also, four points was equal to \$2 million of investment, which was significant.

Commissioner Greenfield stated he was present at the inception of the TIF program and had observed the entire process. The WIN Program was a tremendous improvement.

B. City Council Action Minutes (October 5, 12 & 19, 2020) (No staff presentation)

C. 2020 & 2021 PC Work Programs (No staff presentation)

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, explained the December had been reserved for a continued discussion of the middle housing policies, but the Commission had covered all of the policy questions tonight, so the December Planning Commission meeting would be cancelled. She recognized Commissioner Millan's service to the City, noting that this was her last meeting.

Commissioner Millan stated it had been an honor to work with City Staff, adding she was amazed by Staff's dedication and the amount of work they did on each project. She was glad to know that the new Commissioners were also dedicated to making Wilsonville a great place to live. She commented how rewarding it was to see that the work the Commission did really makes a difference in the community.

The other Commissioners shared their appreciation for Commissioner Millan's questions, input, and insights, and the diverse thoughts and different perspectives she provided.

#### **IV. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Mesbah adjourned the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 9:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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