



PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

June 8, 2022 at 6:00 PM

City Hall Council Chambers & Remote Video Conferencing

Draft PC Minutes were reviewed and approved at the July 13, 2022 PC Meeting.

CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

A regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission was held at City Hall beginning at 6:00 p.m. on Wednesday, June 8, 2022. Chair Heberlein called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m., followed by roll call. Those present:

Planning Commission: Ron Heberlein, Jennifer Willard, Aaron Woods, Breanne Tusinski, Olive Gallagher, and Andrew Karr. Kamran Mesbah was absent.

City Staff: Miranda Bateschell, Amanda Guile-Hinman, Daniel Pauly, Amy Pepper, Kimberly Rybold, Georgia McAlister, and Mandi Simmons.

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.

Mimi Doukas, AKS Engineering, stated she was working with West Hills Development on Frog Pond East, noting they preferred Alternative A because the road network worked best, and the commercial concept was the most viable option. Moving the commercial farther south involved real physical limitations due to the land being more parcelized and the existence of wetlands. Commercial is a challenging type of land use, particularly in newer areas as a lot of rooftops were needed to make it work, so any additional challenge could make the use not viable. Putting the commercial adjacent to the Grange, as presented in Alternative A, was likely the best chance for success.

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. Consideration of the May 11, 2022 Planning Commission Minutes

The May 11, 2022 Planning Commission Minutes were accepted as presented.

WORK SESSION

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

Dan Pauly, Planning Manager, presented the ongoing work on the Frog Pond East and South Master Plan via PowerPoint, reviewing the existing conditions for infrastructure beyond streets with additional comments from Development Engineering Manager Amy Pepper.

Staff addressed questions from the Commission as follows:

- The new water storage facility would be located on a City-owned parcel outside the city limits east of Villebois between Wilsonville and Sherwood. The City was revamping an old land use decision with the County. The facility was for the overall capacity of the city in general.
 - With the 2026-2027 timeframe, the storage deficit would not impact the timing of development in Frog Pond East and South. The deficit regarded city development overall as a lot of increased water needs were anticipated throughout the city. Frog Pond East and South were just a small component of those needs. The indication was water storage would not be a critical path item for development at this point, and that would be verified as the infrastructure work continued in the coming months.
- While there were multiple connections into the water grid, all the wastewater from Frog Pond East and South would go through Boeckman Rd down to the Memorial Park pump station. If the line broke in an earthquake, for example, it would be a single point of failure for this neighborhood. To improve efficiencies and flow rates, water systems were looped so water came from multiple directions. With sewer, the only goal was to get it to a disposal point of one system using gravity.
 - Stormwater was completely dispersed into the creeks and the City's MS4 Phase 1 permit required the City to prioritize low impact development (LID) to get stormwater to mimic more natural flows and how it got into the earth. Staff anticipated stormwater facilities would be dispersed and had learned lessons from Frog Pond West, where a lot more green streets with the street side swales were assumed, but because of the number of conflicts, there were more ponds than anticipated. The lessons learned from Frog Pond West helped with accommodating stormwater management into future development area.
 - For the Master Plan level of review, because stormwater was treated more at the source, closer to development, no creek or infrastructure needs were identified, and no problems were identified in this area.
- When testing the "what if" scenario involved the difference in density from what was likely to be built versus what additional infrastructure would be required if it were built to accommodate 20 dwelling units per acre (du/acre). The idea was to test what additional infrastructure might be needed across the planning area. (Slide 9)

Joe Dills, MIG|APG, continued the PowerPoint, describing the purpose of the engagement, noting the importance of involving community members who might not participate in planning, and highlighting the activities that had occurred. Georgia McAlister, Assistant Planner, described the work done with the housing focus groups, providing a quick overview of the key responses received from those involved.

Commissioner comments and responses to Commissioner questions from Staff were as follows:

- No housing preferences were expressed in the community workshops because cottage clusters and the plexes were comingled into the types presented.
 - In the focus groups, single-family homes were the number one preference, then cottage cluster were mentioned more frequently than expected, and then town home/duplex spaces that still felt independent; shared side walls and ceilings were a concern.
 - One survey question directly asked what the preference was if one could not afford to buy a single-family home and townhouses were the top choice. A vast majority of respondents were

current Wilsonville homeowners, and some currently rented apartments or had other arrangements.

- The focused effort to gather input from a variety of backgrounds and opinions provided a more accurate picture of what the community as a whole needed, as well as a better ability to weigh all the different voices.
 - The survey respondents were primarily existing homeowners, who preferred single-family housing because that was what they had. The team was commended for making the extra effort to seek input from beyond the standard homeowner and involve renters, who would likely consider an alternative to an apartment building, such as duplexes or townhouses.
- Some people within the affordable housing group were looking to buy their first home and financing was discussed a bit, including working with Proud Ground and Family Support to get funding. Many people in the group were at the beginning phase, trying to learn about the options available. There is certainly a thirst for financing options, particularly down payment assistance and being able to bridge that gap to get started as a homeowner. Additional work was needed to see what the City might be able to do with different partners and Staff would continue to pursue options.
 - Financing was a major concern given the cost of homes. The team was strongly encouraged to spend time on creative, financing options to provide financing options to potential homeowners so people could stay in Wilsonville.

Mr. Dills continued the PowerPoint, reviewing the Community Design Concepts shared during community meetings as well as the housing types and input received on housing type locations with additional comments from Mr. Pauly. Mr. Dills noted that affordability and affordable housing choices discussed in tonight's presentation regarded providing opportunity within the array and range of housing types and what could be put on the land. Regulated affordability that served the lower ends of the spectrum and discussed in a memo in February was an implementation strategy that involved a different level of involvement from the City. The input received from the workshop break out groups on the housing type locations helped inform the draft alternatives. (Slide 20)

- Mr. Pauly clarified that tiny homes, which were less than 800 sq ft, could be accessory dwelling units (ADUs), which were allowed throughout the city, including with all types of town houses; therefore, tiny homes could be incorporated within any of the three housing types.

Mr. Dills and Soumya Kini, Walker Macy, continued the presentation reviewing the three Draft Master Plan alternatives, describing the destinations and connections, land uses, and the housing subdistricts of each proposal, as well as opportunities for community design and various options for circulation and connectivity both within the neighborhoods and to surrounding destinations. (Slides 22-31)

- Mr. Dills noted that with regard to the pros and cons of the various commercial sites, Leland Consulting Group had stated the Brisbane location for the main street commercial was more feasible from a market perspective. If more localized mapping was available to see the site conditions in that area, the team would love to see it. He added the team was also discussing with the transportation group how left turns would work at the Brisbane location.

The project team addressed clarifying questions about the presented alternatives as follows:

- In theory, a cluster of tiny homes could be put in the upper right quadrant of Frog Pond East, subject to how the regulations were framed as further details were addressed. (Alternative A, Slide 24)
- Mr. Pauly confirmed there had been no discussion with the property owners about relocating the cell tower and the team did not assume the cell tower would move at this point. As the finer points of the plan were implemented, the team would be thoughtful about the existing cell tower and property lines.
- Mr. Dills explained that the dwelling estimates for the alternatives did not assume a level of future infill via HB2001. For example, under the Middle Housing rules any detached lots within Type 3 could have duplexes, triplexes, and quadplexes on them, but no assumptions were made about that infill. HB2001 was not infused in the proposed alternatives other than providing lots of opportunity for middle housing.
- Mr. Pauly stated the team had not gone back to determine how many dwellings the Area Plan would have had if HB2001 was in place at the time. The approach was to take the Area Plan and add in the Equitable Housing Strategic Plan and additional understanding received through the Middle Housing project, as well as the public comments received through the Middle Housing process and this Draft Master Plan process; all those layers were added to the original Area Plan to inform the alternatives being presented to the Commission tonight.
- Chair Heberlein noted that some segments of the population would choose Alternative B because it was closest to the Area Plan so if the number of dwellings was higher than the 1320 dwellings defined in the Area Plan, a clear and concise explanation as to why should be provided to the community.
 - Mr. Dills noted the short answer at this point was to provide more affordable choices.
- As far as the logical transition of size and density, was any further development anticipated to the west, north or south of this area? Whether those areas were expected to grow or that was the final city boundary would determine how impactful the transition of density was.
 - Mr. Pauly explained the subject area was different from Frog Pond West, where the area to the north was an urban reserve and expected to be pulled into the urban boundary and developed. Most of the area around Frog Pond East and South was rural reserve, which was expected to remain rural for 50 years after adoption, so the assumption was that the edge of the area would remain rural for decades.
 - He clarified the homes being built to the east and south were being developed at a rural level on large lots with septic systems and not at an urban density.
- Mr. Pauly noted future transit was shown extending onto Brisband Rd, but there was no talk of transit going into Frog Pond West so that future transit line should curve back onto Stafford Rd. (Alternative C, Slide 28)
- Could the subdistricts be mixed and matched between the alternatives, exchanging or replacing subdistricts amongst the alternatives?
 - Mr. Pauly clarified input was not requested by subdistrict, but the team did ask for preferences on East and South, what was preferred north and south of Advance Rd. Further mixing and matching could be discussed during the roundtable after the polling was complete.

The Commissioners were polled on their preferences for five elements of the alternatives with the following results:

1. Which alternative(s) show(s) the preferred commercial location?
Alternative A-Frog Pond Lane at Stafford = 1
Alternatives B/C-Brisband Street at Stafford = 5
None of the above/something else = 0

2. Which alternative shows the preferred residential pattern for Frog Pond East (area north of Advance Road)?
Alternative A = 1
Alternative B = 2
Alternative C = 2
None above/something else = 1

3. Which alternative shows the preferred residential pattern for Frog Pond South (area south of Advance Road)?
Alternative A=0
Alternative B=0
Alternative C= 6
None above/something else = 0

4. Which alternative shows the preferred location of an East Neighborhood park?
Alternative A = 1
Alternative B = 1
Alternative C = 4
None above/something else = 0

5. Which alternative shows the preferred layout of streets in Frog Pond East (north of Advance), particularly the Frog Pond Lane to 60th connection?
Alternative A-straight lines offset from BPA easement = 1
Alternative B-curvilinear = 3
Alternative C-straight lines with segment adjoining BPA easement = 2
None above/something else = 0

Roundtable

The Commissioners addressed the Discussion Questions (Slide 32) and explained why voted for the alternative options in the poll.

Commissioner Tusinski said she was undecided about Alternative A or C being her preference. Though Alternative B had the lowest density, it did not have as much room to integrate the different neighborhoods and densities that had been discussed during the planning process. Alternative A was most preferred, but she liked the commercial and park locations in Alternative C better. Based on summaries from the community engagement, it was good to have Type 1 and Type 2 options, since it

seemed like townhouses and cottage clusters would be the most affordable and the second choice to standard detached housing. Alternative C was probably her favorite.

- She liked the centralized radiation element of Alternative C and had voted for Alternative B for the street layout, but Alternative A or B was her choice for the street layout.

Commissioner Karr said he preferred the commercial section by the Grange, noting the focus groups revealed commercial developers preferred Alternative A. Unless the City could find a way to own the land and not make it an expense to the developers while the project was built out, since the commercial section would not be viable until closer to build-out, there would be a blank plot of land. This could be used as a community park, together with the Grange, until there were enough rooftops to warrant a commercial build-out. Alternative C was preferred for the street layout, because someone with a house backing up to the green space would put up a fence due to the trails and people, detracting from the beauty of having the easement and the area being an open space. The south side of Alternative C was also preferred because of the density. He also liked the park up by the Grange because of the 10-acre community park south of Advance Rd. Perhaps, 15 acres of park were not needed since little neighborhood parks would be incorporated in each of the segments. He preferred Alternative A with the commercial at the Grange for Frog Pond East but liked Alternative C for Frog Pond South density as well as for the street layout for both East and South.

Commissioner Woods liked a lot of elements of Alternative B, but preferred Alternative C more because of the park's separate location, adding he did not like it being near the Grange although he understood the reason behind that location. With the focal point on Stafford and Advance Rds, a larger scope of Type 1 dwellings radiated out from there to Type 2s and 3s, but it also allowed for additional mixing of land use types. A key piece was having units for more potential affordable housing, which was a major target. The radiating of the streets was also preferable, so Alternative C was his favorite overall.

Commissioner Gallagher stated she gravitated toward Alternative B because of the flow, placement of the park, and because the park and commercial area were a bit more centrally available to both parts of the development, rather than at the top. Did having the park a little bit separated from the commercial area provide a safety corridor for playing children away from what could be a very busy street? There was not enough information to make an informed judgment regarding the density and would leave it to the experts to see where it went. She complimented the project team for the look and feel all that had been presented tonight.

Commissioner Willard stated her preference was Alternative C because the park and the Grange were separated, which created different and separate points of interest. The larger park embedded around the dense area would get used a lot, as opposed to the location in Alternative A. The configuration where the commercial hits a road and then there was a big park is the same configuration as in Orenco Station in Hillsboro where she often walked during lunch, so she believed that configuration worked well. The suggestion by a community member to have a senior center in the "thumb," the place between the middle school and future community park, sounded like a lovely idea and was probably why she preferred Alternative C for Frog Pond south. She also liked that the road was adjacent to the easement, which would create access points for people that did not live in the neighborhood and only knew of the smaller, more narrow access points.

Chair Heberlein stated that in general, he preferred Alternative C. He had voted 'none of the above' on the residential pattern for Frog Pond East primarily because he had a two specific changes. In Frog Pond East, he preferred to have Type 1 housing around the commercial center, so that generally, the higher density was near the commercial center and then radiated into Type 2 going east. Essentially shifting Type 1 (brown) to be more like Alternative A, but with the same density as Alternative C. Second, he recommended Type 2 housing on the south side of the two subdistricts north of the BPA Easement and then transitioning to Type 3 moving toward Kahle Rd, rather than having it clustered in the center. From a commercial development perspective, he liked the idea of having some type of green area near the commercial center, whether across the street, as shown in Alternative C, or by creating an L-shaped commercial area in the locations identified in Alternatives B or C, and make the lower, right-hand quadrant the park area to provide some integration into the commercial street for a Piazza type development with more space. If the Brisband alignment was better for commercial development, that was where the commercial center should be located, even if he preferred the park area configuration shown in Alternative A. He wanted to ensure the commercial center was commercially viable first to give it the highest probability of success.

Commissioner Willard added with all the development in Beaverton and Sherwood, the areas with denser product along the road resulted in a very abrupt experience for people on the roadway. Placing higher density along the road would create a very abrupt experience when people entered Wilsonville.

Chair Heberlein noted if the Type 1 was moved to around the commercial center, there could still be a north/south transition with Type 1 in the lower right-hand corner around commercial area and then transition out near the Grange at Type 2, so it would not be straight to Type 1 coming into the neighborhood.

Chair Heberlein called for public comment.

Sparkle Anderson stated the power line easement was not being used for anything, which had been her gripe all the way along. At a prior meeting, someone had said they would not want to be under the lines; however, new lines were installed about 6 years ago that no longer snapped or popped or make your hair raise up when you are underneath them. Hardly any noise was heard except in the fall when the rain starts. The area under the power lines was no longer an unpleasant place to be and she was sorry to see that large expanse of land not being used for infrastructure. Noting parkland was shown on her property, she asked who purchases park land.

Mr. Pauly noted the diagrams did not show anything under the powerlines, however, there was still potential for parking to support commercial or residential uses and street connections, such as from the Grange to the portions of Ms. Anderson's property along Kahle Rd. There were several scenarios related to park purchases, the developer could donate parkland, which could also be purchased by one or a group of developers.

Commissioner Karr stated he lived within 1,000 ft of the powerlines and confirmed Ms. Anderson's comments that the crackling and popping had diminished. A park was located under the powerlines in front of his house, so it was possible to do something on that land, though the BPA easement likely had restrictions about what development would be allowed. Between agricultural property east of his

house and the city park in front of his house was a wasteland, which the BPA maintained. He would prefer that the land area be more unified rather than left to the wild.

Mr. Pauly believed adding some stormwater features might also be possible as much of the land in the area naturally sloped toward the BPA easement.

INFORMATIONAL

3. City Council Action Minutes (May 2 & 16, 2022) (No staff presentation)
4. 2022 PC Work Program (No staff presentation)

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, noted due to ongoing construction of the front counter at City Hall, the Planning Commission would not meet in person in July; however, an in-person meeting could be possible in August. She believed supply chain issues were part of the problem, along with the coordination of contractors' schedules.

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Willard moved to adjourn the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 7:57 p.m. Commissioner Karr seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

By Paula Pinyerd, ABC Transcription Services, LLC. for
Mandi Simmons, Planning Administrative Assistant