

**PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2022
6:00 P.M.**

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

*Draft PC Minutes were reviewed and
approved at the March 9, 2022 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, Ron Heberlein, Aaron Woods, Breanne Tusinski, Olive Gallagher, and Andrew Karr

City Staff: Miranda Bateschell, Ryan Adams, Daniel Pauly, Kimberly Rybold, and Georgia McAlister

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. Introduction of new Planning Commission member: Andrew Karr

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, welcomed Andrew Karr as a new Planning Commissioner, noting his long history of volunteer service with the City which included serving on the Development Review Board (DRB) and Budget Committee and that he had participated in the Civics Academy.

Commissioner Karr added he has lived in Wilsonville for 19 years. Volunteering on the Planning Commission seemed like a natural progression, especially having served on the DRB, and he wanted to be part of the vision for how the city would expand and grow. He has worked for a software company in the construction vertical for more 25 years and in the construction vertical prior to that, so he was well versed in construction, plan reading, assorted materials, etc.

The Planning Commissioners introduced themselves, welcoming Commissioner Karr and noting how long they had served on the Commission and had lived in Wilsonville, and highlighting their professional backgrounds, personal interests, and reasons for volunteering on Planning Commission

B. Planning Commission Chair & Vice Chair Nomination

Ryan Adams, Assistant City Attorney, reviewed the rules for nominating and electing the Chair and Vice-Chair.

Following a brief discussion about voting on Zoom and the order in which to vote on multiple nominations, the Commissioners consented to follow the same process as last year where the first candidate receiving the majority of the vote would preclude voting on any remaining nominations.

Jennifer Willard nominated Ron Heberlein for 2022 Planning Commission Chair.

Aaron Woods nominated Kamran Mesbah for 2022 Planning Commission Chair.

Following a roll call vote, Ron Heberlein was elected as 2022 Planning Commission Chair by a 4 to 2 to 1 vote with Aaron Woods and Ron Heberlein voting no and Olive Gallagher abstaining.

Commissioner Mesbah passed the Chair responsibilities to newly elected Chair Heberlein.

Aaron Woods nominated Andrew Karr as 2022 Planning Commission Vice-Chair.

Jennifer Willard nominated Aaron Woods as 2022 Planning Commission Vice-Chair. Mr. Woods declined.

Brenda Tusinski nominated Kamran Mesbah as 2022 Planning Commission Vice-Chair.

Kamran Mesbah nominated Jennifer Willard as 2022 Planning Commission Vice-Chair.

Andrew Karr declined the nomination.

Following a roll call vote, Jennifer Willard was unanimously elected as 2022 Planning Commission Vice-Chair.

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director thanked Commissioner Mesbah for being a great Chair to the Commission.

C. Consideration of the December 8, 2021, Planning Commission Minutes
The December 8, 2021, Planning Commission minutes were accepted as presented.

II. WORK SESSION

A. Frog Pond East and South Master Plan (Pauly)

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director noted this was not the Commission's first work session on the Frog Pond East and South Master Plan and Commissioner Karr had been brought up to speed on the project. The Frog Pond Area Plan set the concept plan for West, East, and South and the Master Plan was only for Frog Pond West because East and South was not in the urban growth boundary (UGB) at the time. Since then, the land had been added to the UGB, and the City was now planning for East and South in alignment with the requirements of that adjustment of the UGB, and also in line with new State law. The project team had already introduced and received input from the Commission on the affordable housing topic. A lot more work had been provided in tonight's meeting packet and she looked forward to having a robust policy discussion about affordable housing. The project team had a couple topics to introduce and get direction on, but tonight's focus was on housing and planning for needed housing in the community.

Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager, introduced the project team and noted tonight's work session would continue discussion on affordable housing and accessory dwelling units (ADUs) in further detail and begin discussion on the Neighborhood Commercial Center Evaluation to get the Commission's initial feedback. He began presenting the Frog Pond East and South Master Plan via PowerPoint, noting the key considerations for setting reasonably achievable housing targets for Frog Pond East and South and reviewing the funding opportunities and barriers for housing targets for households making less than 80% median family income (MFI), adding that affordable home ownership was a Council goal. The City had ongoing efforts around vertical housing tax credits, housing development on land owned by the City next to the SMART station, and a number of other efforts related to middle housing projects that were forthcoming.

Kimberly Rybold, Senior Planner, added that Frog Pond East and South was a unique place with unique characteristics that made some aspects of affordable housing development more feasible than others.

Becky Hewitt, Senior Project Manager, ECO Northwest continued the PowerPoint, reviewing the findings from the Affordable Housing Analysis and the resulting proposed housing targets for government-supported housing and a market-rate mix of units in East and South, as well as affordable housing examples and strategies for hitting the proposed affordable housing targets.

Joe Dills, Angelo Planning Group (APG), noted the memo and meeting materials included a lot of background on what housing types serve what types of incomes, which was important to keep as part of the context, and what the housing mix would be if the area plan was developed as it stood today.

Commissioner Tusinski:

- Asked why first-time homeowners were targeted toward townhomes and cottage clusters versus condominiums.
 - Ms. Hewitt responded there were several reasons, including increased liability as condominiums face greater legal risks from construction defects, which was a challenge for condo development in general. Habitat for Humanity built condo development in some very high-cost markets, like in the Bay Area, but in the Portland region and Portland suburbs, their housing was predominantly townhouse style with some detached housing. Some other land trust models did condominiums occasionally, but it was less common. Doing a condominium with a community land trust involved more levels of complexity. Small detached or smaller attached housing that stayed within the residential building code tended to have lower construction costs, less legal risk, and worked better on scattered small sites, depending on the scale of the project.
- Noted comments that ADUs could be sold separately and asked what that kind of ownership would look like, if the ADU would be sold together with the land underneath it, and what would happen with ADUs attached to the original structure.
 - Mr. Pauly explained that as part of the recent Middle Housing Code updates, the City allowed for middle housing land divisions to include ADUs so the portion of underlying land on the lot could be divided off and sold with the ADU. A condo-type scenario would also work, if it was interior or made more sense otherwise. Generally, see middle housing land division type approach because [inaudible].
- Noted some brownstone-type units in Villebois had an ADU at the bottom of the structure and asked how the land division would work if that ADU was sold separately.
 - Mr. Pauly responded that middle housing land divisions only worked for horizontal division; for vertical division, a condo type division would be done.
- Asked how the ADU would be part of the deed going forward, if it be conveyed in a condo or easement style; how would it be conveyed to a future owner?
 - Mr. Pauly replied a condo would be conveyed as a condo to the future owner and the middle housing land division would be more like a traditional property transfer.
- Understood that if the original owner of a basement ADU sold the ADU, it would be considered a condo, perhaps with some kind of easement for ownership purposes.
 - Mr. Pauly said there would certainly be some easements involved, but he had not drafted one up yet.
 - Ms. Hewitt added that in some cases, a condominium association would be created with a condo for the main house and a condo for the ADU, so they would become a two-unit condominium association and it would function like a condominium. A block of townhouses where all the units were being sold as condominiums might be a larger condominium association.
- Asked how a lender would provide a loan for someone buying that property, as it seemed a little tenuous.
 - Ms. Hewitt replied it would probably be more complicated than buying a lot resulting from a land division, but not necessarily more complicated than buying a condo ownership in a condo tower. It was a different physical form, but the form of ownership and shared and individual pieces were the same structure as other condominium development. The detached ADU could have an actual land division and the buyer would own the land itself.
- Stated with regard to the questions, she believed the targets were the right direction. She would like to see housing be a lot more affordable than Frog Pond West. She supported pursuing the housing strategies,

adding she wanted to study how the ADUs would be conveyed a bit more, but everything else looked good moving forward.

Commissioner Mesbah said he liked the direction, and had read the analysis, which provided a factual outline of the parameters and constraints in the neighborhood. The neighborhood was on the edge of Wilsonville and accessibility was a consideration. With all the work done on the Town Center neighborhood redesign and the units expected there, it would be a much better place for some of the more affordable units. Not that Frog Pond was not a suitable place; the analysis showed what could feasibly be done in East and South. He liked the mix of approaches and encouraged the City to move with policies and programs to improve the limited infrastructure and allow it to be more active and implement what was being proposed. The Frog Pond neighborhoods should be used as a springboard for the City to reach the level of being able to buy land and give it to a land trust so they could develop and implementing other approaches being proposed. He hoped the City would use this as an opportunity to expand its capabilities. He liked that the strategies were pretty comprehensive. He had read about Council's discussion about wanting ownership, but he believed a balance was needed with rentals. The analysis showed the affordability of units and access to housing was facilitated with rental units much more readily than ownership; therefore, rentals should not be ruled out completely from East and South because that seemed to be only hope for some people at lower income levels. All in all, like what he saw and looked forward to how it expanded, evolved, and developed.

Commissioner Willard:

- Noted the targeted number of developments was very small; less than 15% of the houses being offered were being hit with the targeted developments. (Exhibit 14) The balance, 85 percent, would be high-income over 120% MFI and middle housing income, which would be 80% to 120% MFI, which was not displayed in Slide 7. She was surprised that such a small portion of the housing offered would be targeted for affordable housing. This approach did not seem to be addressing the gap identified in Exhibit 15 very aggressively.
 - Mr. Pauly replied that got back to the multi-pronged approach and what was reasonably achievable. It was an excellent observation. It had come from the data the team received and the thoughtfulness going into the analysis was not expected at the level Commissioner Willard was conveying. The level of change or impact that could be made was fairly mild, even with a fairly aggressive program. The multi-pronged approach would be a lot stronger as part of a snowball effect with other projects around the city.
- Liked how the graphs indicated that a lot of middle housing could be offered, which was expected to free up some of the low-income housing currently occupied for different households. She was looking forward to seeing more, noting the concepts were new and being multi-pronged, they could be quite complex.

Commissioner Woods commended the project team for the work done so far. A lot of variety had been brought for the Commission to consider and it was tough getting a balance for affordability for low-income individuals. The affordable housing target was the right direction, but he was a bit skeptical about whether it was reasonably achievable. As far as the appropriate balance of ownership and rental opportunities, at the last meeting, the Commission was not sure about the rental opportunities, and as mentioned tonight, how would a balance be achieved without having some rental homes in the mix. He believed rental homes were needed. He confirmed with Staff that there were currently no places governed by a land trust in the city. A land trust was one way of getting lower-income people into homeownership relatively early, and he would like to explore that further. He commended the different affordable housing strategies that were proposed, adding the difficulty in achieving some of those strategies had been brought to the forefront. The Commission would need to dig deep to figure out the best approach to those strategies and he believed the team was moving along in the right direction.

Commissioner Karr:

- Stated when comparing Exhibit 14 to the Equitable Housing Strategic Plan (EHSP), one graph on Page 7 indicated what the future households would look like by MFI. It seemed the distribution of housing for these projects was heavily weighted on the high side, and the distribution needed only 49% in that area, leaving 55% on the lower side. This would result in having to focus on some type of low-income/median-income

housing, whether they be apartment complexes, townhouses, or cottages, especially since Frog Pond West was almost exclusively geared toward mid- and high-income housing, which seemed where the city was trending. The city could not have segments of the development isolated by income brackets so they needed to provide for some intermixing of the housing types.

- Liked the ideas that had been presented, especially regarding the commercial segment. Moving out in a circle from the commercial area, he liked how it started with some rental units and then there were larger lots moving farther away from the commercial area.
- Asked if there were any current limitations in the Code that prevented land trusts or had they just not been used.
 - Mr. Pauly responded he could not think of anything in the Code that would specifically limit land trusts, but there were other barriers like financing and controlling land were also factors.
 - Ms. Hewitt noted it was possible that some land trusts operating in the Portland Metro region could own some individual homes within Wilsonville. She agreed it was not an issue of regulatory barriers as having the opportunity to acquire property and having the funding available to do so.
- Asked about any complications with HUD housing, if any existed in Wilsonville, and whether the housing was scattered across the city.
 - Ms. Hewitt responded that regulated, affordable housing did exist that received funding through HUD.
 - Ms. Rybold believed there were between 400 and 500 units. A table in the EHSP called out the specific complexes and the number of units provided in each. A few different projects were integrated into Villebois, a couple were located along Wilsonville Rd, and Creekside Woods was across from City Hall, but the majority of HUD units were on the western side of Wilsonville.
- Understood one side of the city would not be overwhelmed if HUD housing was considered on the eastern side. He liked the current direction and the analysis when the EHSP was considered as well.

Chair Heberlein:

- Noted Exhibit 15 and said in comparing the proposed target to the need gap and city distribution, 14% about 185 homes of the required 1325 units would be affordable. He questioned if that was enough and if the goal was aggressive enough. The city distribution was a snapshot of all the housing inventory and covered multiple decades of growth. He was curious to see the subset of the city's distribution in Villebois to get an idea for how that very recent development looked. In Wilsonville, Villebois was kind of a goalpost of a mixed development with high-income and middle-income and he wanted to see how much lower-income housing was there to gauge what Frog Pond East and South might be able to achieve.
- Suggested raising the percentage to 20% and asked the project team to describe the conversations that resulted in the proposed 14%, including discussions to raise the percentage and the pitfalls of doing so.
 - Mr. Pauly responded land acquisition and land control were big factors as well as feasibility. If the City could acquire land, a nonprofit or another affordable housing developer had to compete in the open marketplace with market-rate developers. Infrastructure costs were quite steep when developing new urban areas. Besides land costs, construction costs were also quite high, which was a barrier.
 - Ms. Rybold said an inclusionary zoning policy was one tool some municipalities used to provide either incentives or requirements for affordable housing in Oregon, but not typically used for multifamily development. Those requirements ranged from 10% to 20% and 20% to 25% were seen as fairly aggressive, so she was uncertain whether the overall percentage was that far off from how some of those programs typically ran. She noted there were 449 government-subsidized units in the city.
 - Ms. Hewitt explained the 14% was not intended as a precise number at this stage, partly because the previous plan and the 1325 units envisioned no multi-family, so the total number of units would probably be higher with multifamily, affordable housing in the city. The targets shown were how the team backed into an achievable goal. Having one typical multifamily rental project was not ambitious in light of the work the team had done, yet very ambitious in the sense that the City would have to make some moves it did not have a history of making, particularly in a Greenfield area in private ownership. Villebois was a different situation, starting out with public ownership. It would be a real win and a real feat for the city to get one affordable development of the different housing types. However, the Area Plan showed it

was not a foregone conclusion the City would get any affordable housing development in the area, and a do-nothing approach would likely result in zero affordable units below 80% of medium family income.

- Affordable housing developers could possibly make it work on their own with no help from the City, but that was not very likely. The City could get to that roughly 14% target if it operated differently than in the past, but still within the realm of what cities about Wilsonville's size could do and have done. It was plausible for a city like Wilsonville to do some of these things, even though they were new.
- The target was ambitious on some levels even though it might not feel that they would achieve as much as the Commission would want; actually hitting those targets in East and South would take some work and the City would be proud of having done that.
- Believed the project was going in the right direction but he wanted to make sure it was achievable. He would rather err on the side of trying to get more affordable housing, As far as the balance between ownership and rental opportunities, rentals were important part of the strategy for having meaningful affordable housing based on the report. He supported the strategies and liked the idea of land acquisition being one of the high priorities because it did give the City control, although it was a new thing for the City. The parking reductions were on the low side. Having been in Wilsonville for 10 years and hearing about some of the challenges and concerns around parking and multifamily housing, the idea of making that problem even worse was concerning and an issue the Commission would have to tread very carefully on.

Commissioner Mesbah stated there was a time when cities acquired land and developed housing on their own, but now all kinds of market analyses were done. Buying land was a great idea; however, that should have been done before the area came into the urban boundary causing land prices to skyrocket because everyone knew it would get developed. The City of Wilsonville had a housing strategy, but it needed an affordable housing program. Not having a program handicapped the City in many ways in achieving an affordable housing strategy because no program existed to implement it. He asked for a future Staff presentation on the requirements, staff, budget, etc. involved in setting up a housing program and how could the Commission encourage City Council to move in that direction.

Commissioner Karr asked how much of an impact waiving, reducing, or deferring SDCs would have on the overall build of affordable housing units. (Slide 10)

- Mr. Pauly believed the impact would be pretty large, adding the project team would learn more about that in the coming months. The initial financing and outlay for building the necessary infrastructure could be substantial especially in new urban areas, but if the reduction in SDCs was too big, how would the infrastructure be built.
- Ms. Becky added that the recommendation was for income restricted housing and reducing or waving SDCs would not change the affordability of the housing per se but would reduce the other subsidy needed to deliver it. The rent that the household would pay would not change, but it would reduce the gap between what they could afford and what the actual cost was. The interplay between the affordability strategies and infrastructure financing strategies would be explored further.

Mr. Dills added that in April, the Commission's discussion would be around crafting the initial thoughts on alternatives. A range of housing programs would be considered in combination with additional information on commercial, and some of the base mapping and initial design ideas. That discussion would provide the opportunity to look at the affordable housing types in combination with the strategies in the report. The important thing was the approaches and not the exact specific numbers of each housing component. Some alternatives might consider a range between 14% and 20% of the total housing. Secondly, the comment about integrating affordable housing into the total housing form of the area highlighted a very important planning strategy. Affordable housing should not stand out or be the only tall buildings but be combined with market rate housing types. One should not be able to tell the difference between the affordable and market rate housing. Such ideas would be discussed in context of alternatives in April.

Chair Heberlein agreed integrating the housing types was critical to the look and general feeling of the neighborhoods. He understood that to be successful on the housing targets for the different housing types, the City would need to do some things differently to facilitate those things happening. He asked if it would make sense to define what the City would need to do in a fifth column when presenting to Council. (Slide 7)

- Ms. Hewitt responded that some things were hypothetically possible with no action by the city. For example, the bottom two rows were hypothetically possible, just not very likely if the city did not allow multi-family, did not give any money, acquire any land, or waive any SDCs. Multi-family, the top row, would not even be allowed under the Area Plan land uses. There were a range of strategies the City could use to make any of the housing types more likely. It did not have to be land acquisition, though that was a great way to get there if it could be done. It was a question of going through a probability that was very small to a probability that was very high or a probability that was at least somewhere in the middle, depending on which strategies the City would implement and to what extent.

Mr. Pauly continued the PowerPoint presentation highlighting what the City had already implemented to support ADUs and additional potential changes to regulations to further encourage and allow ADUs. (Slide 13)

Ms. Hewitt added the team heard that interested developers were likely to be active in the area, particularly in ADUs within a townhouse setting, such as the brownstone configuration seen in Villebois, so allowing for larger ADUs aligns with what had been heard and would likely increase the uptake and delivery of ADUs in East and South.

Commissioner Karr:

- Noted in looking at Exhibit 3, the majority of ADUs was for supplemental income for homeowners, not separate ownership. ADUs were being sold separately in the Portland area. He asked if the developers interested in doing ADUs in townhomes anticipated the homeowners renting out the ADUs while still maintaining ownership.
 - Ms. Hewitt responded one developer expressed interest specifically in a for sale product, selling it as a condominium separately. The survey information, research, and focus on ADUs had been on homeowners building them in an infill setting with an existing home. The motivations and outcomes could be pretty different when an ADU was built that way versus a home builder building both the house and ADU at the same time and then selling them. Somebody buying a home with an ADU built and sold as part of the main property might align more with the survey. Not all ADUs that might get built in this area would necessarily be sold with the main home. Concerns were heard about a higher price point up if somebody had to buy a home and the ADU, which was kind of a trade-off.
- Liked the having ADUs as a mechanism to have some affordable housing, regardless of whether it was a rental or separate ownership. It would be nice to survey the developers to see why they wanted to develop ADUs as opposed to smaller units.

Commissioner Woods noted Exhibits 1 and 2 on Page 33 identified the top reasons for ADUs, 67% were to have someone close by but still living separately, and 64% to help someone elderly or who needed help with chores. These were the reasons he thought about ADUs initially, but he liked the idea of an individual being able to purchase a home, and at some juncture, be able to add an ADU for whatever reason. He still struggled with the idea of selling an ADU on a property which could cause some problems as mentioned. He liked ADUs from a rental standpoint as well, but not from an ownership standpoint. Perhaps the City was trying to do too much in expanding ADUs in order to achieve affordable housing. He did not really support the ownership approach but did believe ADUs should be part of the housing mix.

Commissioner Willard said that as a mother of two young adults with special needs, she loved and supported ADUs.

Commissioner Mesbah said he agreed with including ADUs and the strategy being pursued. The ownership issue raised by Commissioner Woods was interesting, and it seemed there could be difficulties in the neighborhood. If

somebody decided to subdivide, their neighbors might not like that. It would be helpful to look at where such lot divisions were happening or were likely to happen. Selling ADUs in a townhouse seemed to be like condominiumizing an existing apartment building, and if it worked design wise, that was fine. But he was unsure about splitting single-family residential units into two single family lots, so knowing how many were possible would be helpful. He noted Exhibit 3 showed that more than half of the ADUs were becoming rental units, which was another affordable unit and a good use of the existing land and existing housing stock. It would deal with affordability and variety, providing a mix of houses.

Commissioner Tusinski said if smaller ADUs were initially sold with the bigger townhouse or property, it was difficult to call them a house and ADU, especially if in more of a condo-style ownership. She would prefer that they just be called condos, even if one was significantly smaller than the other. Additionally, she suggested talking to lenders for additional information about loans on properties with ADUs because getting a loan based on any additional income from an ADU rental was difficult.

Chair Heberlein said he generally like the idea of ADUs as another tool in the toolbox. Until mention of the brownstones, he had struggled with figuring out how the typical detached ADU would fit in Frog Pond East and South, knowing the majority of the lots would be smaller. He was nervous about reducing setbacks due to the impacts on the look and feel of the neighborhood. Moving forward, he wanted to talk about which setbacks should be relaxed to better understand the tradeoffs. Reducing the front setback by half might be a pretty significant difference with only one house on the block that had an ADU in the back, which would look very out of place. Using brownstones to encourage ADUs in smaller lot developments seemed like a reasonable way to facilitate ADUs without being out of place with the character of the neighborhood.

Commissioner Karr added some developers wanted to build ADUs if they were sold separately but it was uncertain whether that would fit the model people wanted to buy. Would the City be directing developers to build a bunch of ADUs that were not sellable or encouraged to be sold? He like the idea of ADUs for family members, rental units, etc. which seemed to be a practical application; however, if the builder was not going to build them, it would become a moot topic. He would like to hear from builders about what their propensity would be to build ADUs, if they knew they would be sold as rental units. Then, the initial purchase might not be affordable, but the rental unit might be.

The Planning Commission took a brief recess at 8:05 pm. The meeting was reconvened at 8:10 pm.

Mr. Pauly introduced the Neighborhood Commercial Center Evaluation, noting the evaluation would be discussed in more detail in April. A neighborhood commercial center added important amenities, such as gathering spaces, services, and benefits, like making a neighborhood more walkable. Feasibility, the types of services available, how the commercial center should be built, whether it should be phased over time, were some of the questions to consider, especially with today's retail market being so interesting right now.

Sam Brookham, Leland Consulting Group, continued the PowerPoint, presenting the Neighborhood Commercial Center Evaluation, providing a refresher of the previous plan and commercial analysis and an overview of the project team's intended evaluation, which would include consideration of alternative locations for the commercial center. Also highlighted were the current retail trends and shifts in consumer behavior, competition with nearby retail centers, and case studies of neighborhood retail nodes.

Responses from the Commission to the questions displayed on Slide 26 regarding the vision, location, and additional suggestions regarding the commercial area were as follows with responses to questions as noted:

- The overall vision had not really changed since 2015.
- The location and size of the retail area were good. The commercial area would not only serve people in Frog Pond, but those commuting on the two main roads as well since it was so easily accessible. No big stores were needed as a smaller retail location would be ideal with a coffee shop, small market, or a nail salon, perhaps, for Frog Pond's residents.

- The proposed area would work well to serve the neighborhood and it had good exposure that would be helped by traffic.
- The sensing being done on the retail trends was good, and further evaluation of experienced based retail would steer the project team in the right direction.]
- Mr. Brookham clarified “click and collect” was buying something online and picking it up at the store, a kind of hybrid version of shopping.
- Mr. Brookham explained there were a couple strategies to think about from a housing perspective as far as how the commercial center would fit in with the housing expected in Frog Pond East. Retail strategies were flexible so they could evolve with how an area built out and upcoming trends. For example, a buffer zone surrounding the retail node with some slightly higher density residential, and at some point in the future, the existing concentration of retail could evolve and kind of move out into the higher density residential as mixed-use ground floor commercial. That was one way it would interact with surrounding housing units. Fundamentally, thinking about [inaudible] spending and the consumer spending habits of any future residential tenants would be important to the team’s analysis and the primary source of revenue for all retail tenants.
 - With regard to traffic congestion, as market analysts and real estate strategists, their work was to make recommendations on how sites might build out to accommodate light speed traffic, and in later phases, what side of the street was more accommodating to in/out commuters, as well as planning access and parking configurations, etc.
- Traffic was a very important consideration especially because with the school up the road on Advance Rd.
 - Mr. Pauly noted the access on the arterial was quite a way back from the intersection, so a lot of access would likely have to come off a local street rather than directly off the main arterials. Access and circulation during certain times of the day were important considerations. The traffic team would look at congestion as part of their analysis. Spacing standards and many other things would help ensure congestion was unduly being added in any area.
- Was a multi-level or one-level structure a being considered for the commercial center? Considerations for Town Center involved retail on the bottom and housing on top, which in this case would be office space.
 - Mr. Pauly explained there was specific direction in the Area Plan to look at mixed-use residential with retail, which the Commission would discuss, as well as the feasibility of whether that was a good idea in this context.
- The proximity to the school and potential foot traffic needs to be considered when considering location, which would impact traffic. At the main intersection, people on the arterial roads would be driving into a neighborhood and pushed closer to the primary and middle schools, which was a concern.
 - Commercial ground-floor shops with housing units above was suggested. Even with a multi-floor structure, multifamily apartments should not stick out like a sore thumb, so there could be multi-story commercial buildings that transitioned to multi-story multifamily housing units, and then transfer out that way, in essence creating a multifamily ring around the commercial area. This matched the commercial buildings in the middle surrounded by multi-floor condos shown in one of the examples.
 - The Westlake Center included gift shops, dry cleaners, massage salons, a wine bar, and jewelry stores. The proximity to the school might influence the retail in the subject commercial center; perhaps food businesses would be considered.
 - The commercial center was far enough away from Town Center that it probably would not have an influence. The general location proposed in Frog Pond was good because it would attract people driving out on Stafford Rd to go home.
- The proposed location was the right place when citing commercial to get closest to the largest number of people. Any farther north on Stafford Rd or any farther east on Advance Rd would be farther away from the population center, which did not make any sense.
 - One important thing was to work with SMART to make sure the transit stop was aligned as closely as possible to the commercial development. Relocating the transit stop to support both the school and the commercial node, making it more convenient for people to get there would only help with increasing the viability of the commercial model.

- Having retail nodes examples more closely aligned to the amount of traffic expected in Frog Pond would help the Commission understand what was viable. Areas with three times the amount of traffic could have a significant impact on the viability of a development.
- Other considerations included rooftops within its circle of gravity, and income.

Mr. Dills concluded the PowerPoint presentation, highlighting additional project updates. The project team was making maps, updating the existing conditions work, and making a buildable land inventory where constrained lands were netted out to determine the land base. The fieldwork and a draft memo had been completed for an arborist report mapping the trees and assigning priorities to their condition and health. The information will be married up with the housing and commercial information provided so far.

- The April discussion would be a good launch point for the collaborative outreach discussed to date. The active, design-oriented meetings would follow the Commission's discussion in April.

Commissioner Karr understood the UGB had been expanded to include the land, but the chart showed only the school area being in the UGB.

- Mr. Pauly confirmed the subject land had been included in the UGB, but the presentation showed an old line. (Slide 29)

III. INFORMATIONAL

A. City Council Action Minutes (December 6 & 20, 2021, January 20, 2021) (No staff presentation)

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, provided a brief update about the Aurora Airport Comprehensive Plan policy discussion, noting the item would return before the Commission in April following some outreach to gather community input and feedback on potential issues, use of the airport, interests, how citizens interface with the community, etc. to just track the different areas in which the City should be thinking about the policy.

- Staff was in the process of putting information about two virtual open houses on March 9th and March 10th into the Boones Ferry Messenger, and launching the Let's Talk Wilsonville page.
- The survey would be open for almost four weeks, bridging late February into early March. Additionally, several stakeholder interviews were being done based on the input received from both the Planning Commission and City Council last month. All this information would be used to help the project team draft an outline or draft policies to bring before to the Commission in April.

B. 2022 PC Work Program (No staff presentation)

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, confirmed March's agenda looked very light, though the information session on the Boeckman Road Corridor Overview could be meaty. The big project interfaced with Frog Pond and its master planning. Engineering was prepared to update the Commission on that and answer any questions. Other agenda items might be added in March.

Chair Heberlein asked if there was anything from April's agenda could slide back into March, such as the informational session on the I-5 Bike/Ped Bridge to lighten April's meeting.

- Ms. Bateschell confirmed Staff was doing its best to pull items into the March meeting.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Heberlein adjourned the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 8:46 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

By Paula Pinyerd of ABC Transcription Services, LLC. for
Shelley White, Planning Administrative Assistant