

**PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 2021
6:00 P.M.**

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

*PC Minutes reviewed and
approved at the March. 10,
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, Jennifer Willard, Aaron Woods, Breanne Tusinski, Ron Heberlein, Jerry Greenfield, and Olive Gallagher

City Staff: Miranda Bateschell, Ryan Adams, Daniel Pauly, Khoi Le, 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 January 13, 2021 Planning Commission minutes

Chair Mesbah noted there were a number of edits he was not sure were worth the Commission's time to present, adding they were mainly typos or editing comments.

Commissioner Greenfield commented that Scrivener's errors did not require any kind of action.

The January 13, 2021 Planning Commission minutes were accepted as presented.

II. WORK SESSION

A. HB 2001 Compliance Middle Housing (Pauly)

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, noted this was the Planning Commission's third work session focused on Wilsonville's Middle Housing project and there were still a lot of details to work through and decisions to be made. The project was to be wrapped up in the summer and fall in preparation for future planning and additional housing work resulting from House Bills 2001 and 2003. The goal was to integrate changes from the State bills, as well as the newly adopted Wilsonville Equitable Housing Strategic Plan into the City's housing policy changes to be more inclusive of middle housing in the city's single-family residential neighborhoods. On February 1st, City Council was presented the discussion from the Commission's January work session on integrating the Equitable Housing Strategic Plan, particularly in relation to Frog Pond West and some of the siting and design standards. Tonight's work session would focus on the discussion at City Council as well as the changes Staff and the project team integrated following feedback at the last Commission meeting. The Commission's continued input was needed on several policy questions to further the process regarding the Code amendments.

Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager, introduced project team members Joe Dills and Kate Rogers from Angelo Planning Group and Ben Weber from SERA Architects. Mr. Pauly presented Middle Housing in Wilsonville via

PowerPoint, which included a review of City Council's desired project outcomes, updated Frog Pond West concepts, existing Planned Development Code concepts, siting and design cut sheets, and outreach plans. Members of the project team also provided additional comments for the presentation.

Key discussion points and input from the Planning Commission on the following project components and policy questions posed by the project team were as follows with additional comments from the project team as noted:

Frog Pond West Master Plan Concepts

- Should two-unit townhouses continue to be an allowed use in addition to the required allowance of duplexes on all remaining undeveloped lots in Frog Pond West?
 - Mr. Pauly noted that because the State currently viewed the structures differently, the initial allowance of two-unit townhouses would not need to be on every lot. While similar in structure and within the marketplace, two-unit townhouses would be primarily ownership opportunities, while duplexes provided more rental opportunities, thus meeting different housing needs.
 - Ms. Bateschell explained the terms 'two-unit townhouse' and 'duplex' were used interchangeably to some degree, as they were the same in form; even if defined by Code as a two-unit townhouse, it might still be called a duplex. She confirmed the only difference was the location of the property line; however, the issue was not about how the City defined the terms. When the State adopted HB 2001, specific definitions were given for each middle housing type: duplex, triplex, four-plex, etc. A duplex was defined as two units on a single lot. The City often allowed flexibility to developers to either provide two units on one lot or a duplex with a divided parcel line down the middle of the structure with a zero-lot line on the shared wall, allowing the unit to be sold as two townhomes, or one unit per lot, which in form, the City still considered a duplex. However, it could no longer be called a duplex, because it did not meet the State's new definition.
 - Staff wanted to understand what the Planning Commission wanted to continue to allow. The City was required to allow duplexes on every lot, so should two-unit townhouses also continue to be allowed in the areas the City previously allowed in order to meet the same definition, which would now be written as a separate definition due to the complexity with State law.
 - She confirmed it could be difficult to determine from appearance alone whether a structure was defined as a two-unit townhouse or a duplex, which was determined by how the line was drawn on the plat.
 - Referencing the Duplex cut sheet, Mr. Pauly noted the structure could be a two-unit townhouse or a duplex depending on whether the property line ran between the units. (Slide 11) As displayed, the structure looked like two buildings, but it could also be designed with one roof to look like one building, similar to the duplex examples on Slide 7.
 - Allowing either duplexes or townhouses would allow for flexibility and provide opportunity for ownership. Each structure type would rent the same, allowing for both renters and to open the market for lower-end homeowners.
 - The functionality of duplexes was more amenable to multi-generational families living together in one compound, because they were under one ownership.
 - If the State wanted to ensure duplexes were allowed on each lot, based on setbacks and availability of space, and developers were moving toward building rowhouses or individually-owned, attached units, would developers eventually run into a problem with the State because technically, no duplexes were built because the majority of the potential development involved a rowhouse approach? Would the State's intent to create more middle housing be satisfied if no duplexes were created?
 - Ms. Bateschell responded that duplexes were required to be allowed on every lot, but not townhomes, which required more siting and design standards. In theory, depending on the lot size, both could be allowed on any lot. She did not believe the State had a preference over which housing type was built. The City already reported to the State each year on the housing constructed and that report would now be more refined to different housing types, including middle housing.

- She understood the intent behind the legislation was to consider the fact that many duplexes were essentially single-family homes with two entrances, but they could vary in form and look and function like two rowhomes. The State was trying to determine if and how the proposed legislation would impact the definition of duplex.
- Chair Mesbah stated, in that case, he did not have any preference for townhouses or duplexes, but he hoped the City's would ensure that both functioned the same way, especially for those who preferred multi-generational living, which could be based in culture or kids having to move back home due to economic issues. Having one unit with two entries would assure privacy and freedom between generations, so such duplexes should not be overlooked as a preference.
- Market demands would impact whether developers built a duplex or rowhouse. The house bill was not prescribing what was built, but rather providing an opportunity for them to be built.
 - Ms. Bateschell added that while duplexes were required to be allowed on every lot, there was no need to also require two-unit townhomes on every lot where duplexes were required. Two-unit townhomes could be treated differently in the sense that they would still be allowed in Frog Pond West, but perhaps, only where they were currently allowed. That nuanced ability existed because that was not currently how the State defined duplex.
- HB 2001 would allow the flexibility to respond to the market and the needs of the community. Single-family as an exclusive category was no longer a viable option. Since the 1970s, those in the planning field have implicitly created exclusive communities across the country by requiring single-family zoning, which was now being remedied. Opening up the zoning to allow flexibility that actually allows the market to respond to the needs in every community was huge. Full communities across the country specialize in single-family, high-priced housing; that was why they were exclusive, which was not acceptable anywhere.
- The Planning Commission consented to include attached, two-unit row or townhouses in the mix of middle housing types in Frog Pond West.
 - Mr. Pauly confirmed that duplexes were being considered in every type of neighborhood, including those with medium-sized lots. The market would likely drive against building a small attached house with a large yard because land in Frog Pond was not cheap.
 - Mr. Dills added the project team was testing the setbacks and other development standards to ensure each of the lot size subdistricts of Frog Pond and all other zones of the City would work with the middle housing types being added as uses.
- Should incentives be provided for building cottage clusters to add additional unit capacity in Frog Pond West?
 - Mr. Pauly confirmed cottage clusters were already allowed in Frog Pond West, but they had to be on individual lots, and each lot still had to meet 80 percent of the otherwise minimum lot size. Also, each unit counted toward the density map. Not counting cottage clusters might incentivize cottage cluster development and help raise the overall density toward the required 8 dwelling units per acre (du/acre).
 - Cottage cluster homes, which could be as small as 450 sq ft, would not fit well within the Frog Pond West area because of the cluster layout and the design styles with one- and two-story homes. How would the existing or future residents respond? (Slide 14) Cottage clusters in Frog Pond East and Frog Pond South were a different story.
 - Mr. Pauly said it was important to keep in mind the assumption was that a lot could be redeveloped. Someone with yard space after the initial development could build a cottage cluster in the remaining yard.
 - Cottage clusters was a housing type that downsizing seniors embrace; however, other necessary support facilities needed to be available nearby. A housing type/neighborhood must function properly for the audience for which it was intended.
 - Making a cottage cluster blend in with the look and feel of the rest of the Frog Pond neighborhood was technically feasible.

- Mr. Pauly explained the potential incentives involved two changes. First, allow multiple units to be built on a single lot. Currently, cottage cluster units had to be built on individual lots and a reduced lot size was allowed if the units were grouped around a courtyard. The State standards eliminated the minimum lot size that currently existed in the Frog Pond West Master Plan.
 - The second change regarded the density bonus, where the additional homes built after initial development would be exempt from the density maximum. Currently, detached single-family units on their own lots had to surround a common courtyard, as seen in the housing pods on Canyon Creek Rd and in Villebois. The current standards allowed for a similar product type which would tend to be in the small lot subdistricts because the lot size would decrease in a cottage cluster from a 4000 sq ft lot to a 3200 sq ft lot. Under the rules defined by the State, four to six units around the courtyard could be added on a 10,000 or 14,000 sq ft lot even if the average lot area for each unit was below the minimum lot size.
- A 450 sq ft cottage cluster unit was smaller than what was allowed for accessory dwelling units (ADUs).
- Ben Weber, SERA Architects, confirmed the cut sheet represented possibilities for cottage cluster development prototypes, showing a range of small dwellings from a 450 sq ft one-story unit to an 1100 sq ft two-story unit. (Slide 14) If market conditions or developer interest in the Frog Pond area dictated that 450 sq ft was too small to be an appealing product, there was room in the development standards to build something larger. The trade-off would be that there might be fewer units on a lot, but the standards would allow a very broad range of unit sizes per cottage. The 450 sq ft unit was an example, but not a rule. He confirmed the 900 sq ft footprint was a rule, but since two stories were allowed, more than 900 sq ft was allowed.
 - The drawings showed what was allowed and possible under the State rules. Two stories might not be appealing to potential buyers or within the real estate market, but that was a different conversation.
 - He confirmed the cut sheet was not intended as a site design, but to show a range of sizes that could fit on a 900 sq ft lot and to test the different sizes and parking configurations.
- Mr. Pauly confirmed the incentive would allow cottage cluster homes to be owned similar to a condominium rather than each unit on its own lot. The concept was to have detached units surrounding a courtyard on common property with subsequent condominium platting such that each unit could be sold as a condominium unit.
 - He understood the Commission had some uncertainty whether cottage clusters were fully appropriate to include as an additional allowance for initial build-out and that more exploration and public input was wanted on the appropriateness of cottage clusters and how different siting and design standards might impact how they worked with the look, feel, and function of Frog Pond West.
- Providing some examples might help illustrate what was being proposed that was allowed versus not allowed in the current form, and what different designs could be done compared to what was already allowed.
- Additionally, determining where such a development would be appropriate and functional in the Frog Pond neighborhood might address concerns about how cottage clusters would fit in Frog Pond, which was a fundamental challenge. A duplex sitting next to a \$1.5 million home in the R-10 area might not be something the City and the residents wanted from the Frog Pond neighborhood.
- The appropriateness of whether middle housing types like cottage clusters were appropriate adjacent to certain other zones had been addressed by the State saying they would be allowed. The matter seemed to be out of the City's hand though it had some say about where middle housing was appropriate.
- Knowing where the control line was between the State mandate and what the City was proposing to allow was difficult.
 - Mr. Dills noted that during the master planning process for Frog Pond, some site studies looked at cottage clusters in the area close to Boeckman Creek, where a property owner might have some portions of their property that were unbuildable due to slopes and trees. The cottage cluster form for layout and site planning looked promising and was part of the rationale for inclusion in the use list of the RN zone. He confirmed that cottage clusters were allowed, but not required.

- Three-Plus Unit Townhouses
 - Mr. Dills noted the Frog Pond West master planning process had not focused on three-plus unit townhouses as a choice, but rather focused on overall density and the preference for single-family detached housing. He clarified the Commission was being asked if three-plus unit townhouses should be added as a residential use type during initial buildout.
 - Even though the City could say no and still meet the intent of the law, three-plus unit townhouses should be included as an option if the City was serious about providing more diverse housing types. This type of townhouse would be built compared to other middle housing types, which might not necessarily be built.
 - No commercial property was envisioned in the Frog Pond West area. The multi-unit townhouse attached dwellings seemed more appropriate in an area adjacent to some kind of commercial offering.
 - The three-plus unit townhouses seemed to be a big departure from the original intent of the Master Plan. Honoring the master planning process and keeping the Master Plan in tact was preferred where possible.
 - The townhouses would have to be two-story to fit well with the existing homes; a three-story townhouse complex was not recommended.
 - Commissioner Greenfield noted the State was requiring a backing away from some of the terms of the hard-fought compromise adopted for Frog Pond West, which was fine. He had favored approaching Frog Pond West more like Frog Pond East was envisioned. Allowing more duplexes and two-unit townhouses in Frog Pond West was enough to keep within the law and within the spirit of moving toward equity and inclusion to accommodate the newly emergent interests.
 - Three-plus unit townhouses would be a more appropriate focus when planning Frog Pond East, which would be a great location. The townhouses were not a good fit with what was already planned in Frog Pond West.
 - Inclusion and affordability were certainly important, but it seemed they were trying to put everything possible into Frog Pond West and that would not provide a sense of integrity about the area. There was a place to meet and exceed all the requirements, but why try to put everything into Frog Pond West?
 - Chair Mesbah noted while inclusion was an important element that needed to be thought through with every step, the bigger issue was design functionality because the neighborhood had to work. A three-plus unit townhouse product was part of a walkable neighborhood with its own commercial village center supporting local small businesses, which had unfortunately not seen success nationally in new developments. While supportive of diverse housing types, he questioned where a three-plus unit townhouse would properly function and fit in Frog Pond West without a commercial center.
 - Perhaps some examples could be provided of opportunities or possibilities for implementation that the Commission was overlooking.
 - Focusing on the center of town made more sense when creating affordable housing, inclusion, and diversity than in a far-removed neighborhood. People who were not interested in or able to buy large luxury homes still wanted to live in a nice community with access to nearby supermarkets, drug stores, and other resources, like SMART, if they did not have a car. It made sense that people living farther from the center of town might have bigger families and more cars.
 - Mr. Pauly clarified the discussion was not about starter homes, but rather a price point anywhere from \$300,000 to \$500,000. Those who traditionally lived in a suburban, single-family type of development, which was not attainable in the current market, might choose this type of development. People making good incomes, such as teachers, firefighters, and even attorneys, were still priced out of the current housing market. The emphasis was not on a small group of people. The idea was to include everybody in every neighborhood.
 - Income was only one of the elements of inclusion in housing policy and when discussing a wide range of products. Lifestyle choices were also important. An urban professional might not want a huge house with

a garden and yard. Owning a private unit in a three-plus unit townhouse that cost \$500,000 might be what they want at that point in their life.

- Should Triplexes and Quadplexes be included as a product option for initial buildout?
 - The triplexes and quadplexes examples seemed similar to the three-plus unit townhomes, and were disliked for the same reasons. Some triplexes and quadplexes were more like a cluster with entrances coming from east/west angles.
 - Some good examples of triplexes and quadplexes could be found in Charbonneau. The designs could be done in much better harmony with single-family neighborhoods.
 - Again, the focus was on design as opposed to functionality. The introduction stated the product used all the standards of a single-family home, but the examples did not look like a single-family home, which was a problem. Being more specific about the design would be fine.
 - Triplexes and quadplexes should be kept as a possibility for expansion and redevelopment to provide property owners with flexibility as their needs changed.
 - Whether triplexes and quadplexes were appropriate for initial buildout was questionable, as only a niche market would be interested in brand new units.
 - From a functionality perspective, there seemed to be no significant difference between the triplexes and quadplexes and three-plus unit townhomes. If there was no market for this product, why put in the work into Frog Pond West to allow the units?
 - Mr. Pauly confirmed anyone who owned a suitably sized lot anywhere in Frog Pond West could build any of the middle housing types, even if the lot was a single-dwelling lot. Regulations would apply so that certain products could only be built on certain sized lots, for example, a triplex could not be put on a 4,000 sq ft lot.
 - He clarified tonight's discussion regarded whether the options should be available during initial build out, but ultimately the products were allowed on all lots.
 - Design standards would be important considering that all of the presented products would be allowed during redevelopment.
 - Mr. Pauly explained the cut sheet examples were designed to test the limits of the middle housing options.
 - He confirmed the Commission was more amenable to siting and design standards that resulted in structures that looked more like a single structure from the street, rather than a row of attached structures.
 - He also confirmed the Commissioners favored duplexes and attached two-unit townhouses during the initial buildout of the Master Plan, and were concerned about how the other products would fit into the planned urban form of Frog Pond West.
- Where should middle housing options be allowed within Frog Pond West?
 - Mr. Dills explained that Frog Pond West was planned for a bit more than 6.5 units per acre and approximately 517 homes. To meet the State requirement of 8 du/acre, 125 units would need to be added to the subdistricts and about 100 acres of undeveloped land were left of the 180-acre area. The question was whether to spread the additional units amongst many subdistricts or focus on more individualized locations for middle housing during initial buildout.
 - He confirmed that the 100 remaining acres needed to have a zoned capacity of roughly 10 du/acre to meet the overall 8 du/acre requirement, but there was no requirement for that capacity to be developed.
- The Commission consented that having a greater distribution of housing types over all of Frog Pond West was a better plan for diversity and inclusion and would create variety on every block and from every view. The Commission did not want to go down the slope of deciding which zones would have their density increased.

- With minimum housing costs already in the \$500,000 range, anything that could be identified as clumping lower income should be avoided; such segregation by income was not an ideal that should be pursued.
- The Siting and Design Cut Sheets would be utilized in community and developer outreach as a way of discussing some of the development outcomes and design standard considerations. The cut sheets represented the maximum a developer might want to feasibly do in order to begin thinking about what needed done to ensure the best fit of the design into existing and planned neighborhoods. (Slides 27-42)
 - The general concept of using the cut sheets for providing details was good.
 - Mr. Pauly confirmed different names could be considered for “detached duplex”. The term “two-unit cluster housing” would be introduced to the community, but for tracking purpose the City wanted to be sure to reference detached duplex, which was the State called the structures. The City’s definition of “two-unit cluster housing” would reference that the structure was a detached duplex under State law.
- Project Outreach and Community Meeting Questions
 - It seemed a wide net was being cast to get as much feedback and input about the project from as many residents as possible.
 - Mr. Pauly briefly reviewed the outreach plans for the Latinx community, which included three specific focus groups that would be conducted in Spanish and for which a large number of participants had already signed up for thanks to recruitment efforts by Centro Cultural. The partnership with Centro had enabled the City to reach and engage the Latinx community in new ways.
 - He clarified that some of the outreach would be more general to the broader community, while some was more specifically focused on Frog Pond West, such as working with developers who had options or were actively working with property owners to get a sense of the feasibility of the amendments being considered. While Frog Pond West would be the focus of much of the engagement, middle housing would also be discussed on a broader scale. He noted discussions were also happening with affordable housing developers.
 - The community’s response to Frog Pond West would be more conservative than for communities that were not yet master planned. Separate outreach would be important, so people could express their preferences for Frog Pond West separately from other developments.
 - Mr. Pauly noted that with regard to other diverse communities, the outreach was meant to cast a broad net and outreach specific to the Latinx community was based on the growth of the Latinx community and as identified in the Equitable Housing Strategic Plan. The City had received grant funds from Metro for this particular Latinx component of outreach.
 - How would the project team ensure the feedback and input from the Latinx community had the same weight as the rest of the community or the very vocal part of the community that was looking for something specific?
 - Mr. Pauly responded those components would all be part of the data brought forward to the Planning Commission and City Council when making decisions. The input would be integrated equally at the project team level and any opposing feedback or views would prompt further discussions with the Commission. The Latinx outreach was intended to have a real tangible impact on the project, which was a focus of the grant request.
 - Conversations would also occur with the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Committee, which would be integrated into the process as much as possible.

III. INFORMATIONAL

A. Transportation Performance Evaluation (Le)

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, noted the Transportation Performance Evaluation presentation was the most recent performance report update since the last major Transportation System Plan (TSP) overhaul. The

purpose was to evaluate investments made and how they compared to the performance of the system overall, as well as to report that information to the community, but also to the Planning Commission and City Council since many of their decisions impacted the transportation system.

Khoi Le, Development Engineering Manager, explained the presentation would provide important data and findings from this year's evaluation of the transportation system. The City of Wilsonville was very active in monitoring and evaluating the transportation system to track how well planning efforts impacted transportation design outcomes.]

Scott Mansur, DKS Associates, presented the Wilsonville Transportation Performance Report Update via PowerPoint, describing its purpose, detailing current Wilsonville statistics, and reviewing transportation performance goals as well as the existing and recommended projects and action steps related to those goals. The update would be presented to City Council on March 10, 2021.

- He confirmed that Slides 6 and 8 should be corrected to indicate Boeckman Rd west of Stafford Rd and Advance Rd east of Stafford Rd.

Commissioner Heberlein asked if any information about the cluster of Injury A Collisions at the Boeckman/Canyon Creek Rd intersection would identify whether a signalized intersection would have mitigated the injury events.

- Mr. Mansur replied the City's TSP included a plan to install a signal at that intersection; however, the City was also designing the bridge structure to the east which involved grade changes, so any work related to installing the signal had to wait. Once the bridge was complete, a signal would be installed.
 - He noted the all-way stop was still a safe option. He highlighted the injuries he could recall at the intersecting, adding he would review the data further before the Council meeting.]

B. City Council Action Minutes (January 4, 14 & 21, 2021) (No staff presentation)
There were no comments.

C. 2021 PC Work Program (No staff presentation)

Commissioner Heberlein noted a lot of time was often spent on work sessions, leaving less energy for informational sessions. He asked about swapping the order of agenda items so the Commission could offer some energy to the informational sessions as opposed to just the work session.

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, said she appreciated the question, noting the agendas had always been ordered that way, but she was happy to accommodate swapping the order when appropriate. She thanked Mr. Le and Mr. Mansur for their patience in sitting through such a long work session to deliver a brief presentation.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Mesbah adjourned the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 9:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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