



# **PLANNING COMMISSION**

## **WEDNESDAY, JULY 14, 2021**

### **I. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

A. Consideration of the June 9, 2021 PC Meeting Minutes

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 9, 2021  
6:00 P.M.**

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

*Draft PC Minutes to be  
reviewed and approved at the  
July 14, 2021 PC Meeting.*

**Minutes**

---

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

Chair Kamran Mesbah called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m. Those present:

Planning Commission: Kamran Mesbah, Jennifer Willard, Ron Heberlein, Jerry Greenfield, Aaron Woods, Breanne Tusinski, and Olive Gallagher

City Staff: Miranda Bateschell, Ryan Adams, Daniel Pauly, Phillip Bradford, Georgia McAlister, Kim Rybold, 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 May 12, 2021 Planning Commission minutes  
The May 12, 2021 Planning Commission minutes were approved as presented.

**II. INFORMATIONAL**

A. Annual Housing Report (McAlister)

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, noted the Annual Housing Report was a favorite presentation topic for the Planning Commission. Looking back on the housing that had developed and that was approved in the prior year was always interesting in order to understand what development would be seen on the ground in the upcoming couple of years. Middle housing was another big housing work program with regard to the ongoing build-out in Villebois and Frog Pond West and soon, master planning would begin for Frog Pond East and South. Once the master planning concluded, the next Housing Needs Analysis (HNA) would be done, which would be a year and a half from now. The last HNA completed was adopted in 2013 and that analysis recommended the City track its annual growth. The annual growth in housing was fast at the time and exceeded growth expectations of the region, and tracking the data was helpful to understand the growth, particularly in comparison to available land. In Oregon, the City was required to look at its housing need in relationship to Wilsonville's 20-year land supply, looking at housing activity was recommended. Over the years, Staff found a lot more very valuable information to track in the process, aside from the housing development characteristics and how much of the land supply was being used, such as affordability, long-term growth initiatives, and whether the housing needs matched the city's growing population. This year provided an interesting snapshot, and she was interested in this Housing Report as it related to the past few years of growth that had been tracked. And, looking forward as the city began growing in other neighborhoods, she was interested in what the next HNA would set for the next set of growth initiatives and recommendations for policies, particularly since the City had adopted an Equitable Housing Strategic Plan. The Planning Commission had been in the middle of all of these discussions, particularly thinking long-term, and now it would hear the most recent activity and trends.

Georgia McAlister, Assistant Planner, presented the Annual Housing Report via Story Map, highlighting the report's background and describing the state of Wilsonville's housing in 2020 by reviewing housing inventory, housing permitted for construction, costs of renting and owning a home, housing development characteristics by neighborhood, housing development trends, affordability and growth trends in the housing mix, and key trends to watch moving forward.

Commissioner Woods stated one of the key takeaways was the affordability piece. There had been an increase in residents coming in and in the years ahead, he expected that more residents might not be making the kind of salaries to afford even today's housing prices. Affordability was a major issue that needed to be addressed with the developers building homes in Frog Pond East and South because the trends showed things would not get any better. He asked how those trends would be addressed for those expected to move into middle housing, particularly with regard to affordability.

- Ms. Bateschell responded the City would use the Equitable Housing Strategic Plan as a guide and get input from City Council and the Planning Commission on how to implement the strategies within that Plan to move the needle on affordability. The Plan had specific actions about looking for projects and partnering with non-profits to identify specific construction projects for additional affordable housing, as well as strategies about looking for funding, tax abatements to incentivize more affordable housing, and diversifying the housing stock, all of which would be done creatively, particularly when planning Frog Pond East and South. Different housing types would be considered, but also trying to build partnerships, not just from the for-profit side but with non-profit partners who might be interested in developing in Frog Pond East and South. Conversations would be held about how to increase affordability along with analyses on affordability, increased opportunities for accessory dwelling units (ADUs), and considering how infrastructure was financed with system development charges (SDCs), and potentially using variable rates for SDCs related to the size of homes or lots.
  - The outlook for affordability was not great and was a crisis the region and the State had been struggling with for some time. A multi-pronged approach and effort was needed at the forefront of multiple actions taken to address the crisis, which Staff intended to do when moving through the City's next big planning efforts.
  - The next HNA would be in 2023 and would look what had changed in terms of the growth and policies adopted since the last HNA in 2013. At that time, there was no area plan or master plan for Frog Pond, nor was the land in the urban growth boundary, which were key recommendations, as was revisiting and increasing the ability for housing opportunities in Town Center and taking actions on affordable housing. The Equitable Housing Strategic Plan had also been adopted, so a lot had been done in the last decade related to those recommendations, but much had changed so another HNA was needed.
  - Additionally, the State now required a housing production strategy, which was similar to some of the recommendations from last time, but it was more specific to how the City actually implemented the production in a way to meet the need. The Housing Production Strategy was similar to the Equitable Housing Strategic Plan, but it would probably take an additional step and would be completed side-by-side with the HNA in the 2023-2024 timeframe to pull everything together and set the stage, in terms of future actions to continue work on these issues and move the needle in the right direction.

Commissioner Heberlein:

- Thanked Staff and asked what the average number of people was in each home and how that had changed over time, whether there were more residents or if that number was stable.
  - Ms. McAlister noted the breakdown of the number of people in the households had changed some since 2016, but not significantly. While there were a few smaller sized homes and a small increase in one-person sized households, the number had stayed fairly consistent over the years.
- Noted that looking at the median home sale price and how Wilsonville compared to its peers, affordability was a regional and statewide issue more so than just a Wilsonville issue. He asked what was being seen at the State and regional levels that would impact affordability and make a bigger difference. Middle housing in HB 2001 was an attempt to help, but he was not sure how much middle housing was really going to help.

- Ms. Bateschell responded the significant policy changes at the State level would trickle down through Metro and impact every city in the state, so all cities would be working on the issue in terms of housing diversity.
  - The next biggest piece was the Metro housing bond passed three to four years ago. The bond would collect millions of dollars with different targets around affordability, and those targets were both in terms of different median household income, as well as housing size to ensure a certain percentage of units built were family-sized units. Affordable housing projects were often just studios or one-bedrooms because they were more affordable to build, so the housing bond specifically included targets for family-sized units. The bond money would be distributed through the counties and Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) recipients. For Wilsonville to see money or a project that would benefit from the Metro bond, it would go through the Clackamas County allocation and the targets the County had based on those regional targets.
    - Two rounds of applications for the grant would be held. One had already passed, and a lot of the projects that were funded were projects already in the loop through the Housing Authority or nonprofits that then were able to secure funding for projects that had gaps in funding. The next application round would be next year, and Staff was looking at potential opportunities to bring projects to Wilsonville.
  - The State legislature this session was talking about funding for affordable housing projects. She was not sure of the status and whether a bill was to come or what the level of funding would be, but she believed the State was talking about affordable housing in terms of real money for real projects.

Chair Mesbah noted the graphics of the Housing Report were becoming more refined and seeing the report develop, mature, and communicate clearly and better was good progress towards making the functioning of the City transparent for the average citizen, who wanted to look up the report online and figure out what was going on.

B. City Council Action Minutes (May 3 & 17, 2021) (No staff presentation)

There were no comments.

C. 2021 PC Work Program (No staff presentation)

There were no comments.

### III. WORK SESSIONS

A. Town Center Streetscape Plan (Bradford)

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, noted over many years, a lot of conversations had been held about the Town Center and the community's vision for the project. The Town Center Plan was adopted in the summer of 2019, and there were multiple different implementation actions to be taken. A few of those actions had been completed, including adoption of infrastructure projects into the Transportation System Plan, and one of the key components connected to that was the Streetscape Plan. Some different concepts were floated with the community for input, and the River concept was the highest favored but with a desire to keep some of it streamlined without being too curvilinear to respect a streetscape and acknowledge some of the components of the Technological Innovation concept that was also favored. The project team had some additional detail for the Commission to review with design elements that would capture what the combined concepts would look like on the ground. The draft plan in the packet showed what they were starting to look like, but the team wanted early input from the Commission in order to be strategic about where the most investment should be done or where any extra money should be spent. There was not enough money to implement everything that was wanted everywhere, so the team sought the Commission's thoughtful input on where to invest and put more time, attention, and detail into Signature or special treatments while recognizing the Town Center Plan.

Philip Bradford, Associate Planner, noted the Commission last reviewed the Town Center Streetscape Plan in March and confirmed the hybrid concept of River Environment and Technological Innovation concepts. Tonight's

presentation was initially planned to present the draft plan; however, the project team would present two design-related questions prior to finalizing the draft for review, so tonight's presentation was a preliminary draft with additional elements to be added later. Due to the large size of Town Center and the cost involved in providing higher levels of design, the project team outlined locations that would include additional details in the plan and wanted to know which locations the Commission believed warranted higher levels of investment.

Ben Weber, SERA Architects, presented the updates to the Town Center Streetscape Plan via PowerPoint, briefly highlighting the project's background, the Planning Commission's role and project schedule, and then describing the locations and levels of investment related to the proposed Standard, Enhanced, and Signature designs and recommendations. The Streetscape Plan would return before the Commission for a deeper review in August with the adoption hearings anticipated in this fall. At the end of the presentation, he posed the following questions to the Commission for discussion (Slide 14):

1. Do you agree with the locations identified in this draft of the Streetscape Plan to receive detailed design direction and investment levels in Town Center? (Slide 13)
2. Of these locations, which areas warrant either a Standard Design, Enhanced Design or Signature Design?

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

- In order to determine where the most focus and investment could go, decisions needed to be made about flow and where the center of the development was located. The center of the development needed to be the most enhanced as it moved outward.
  - Mr. Weber noted the streets needed to offer a lot of mobility solutions, and the project team was taking cues from the Town Center Plan two years ago, particularly with the signature locations, like Park Place and the Park Place Extension, which were considered the main streets of Town Center and shown as Locations 3 and 4. These were festival streets or streets that accessed the retail core. Another signature location was Location 12, the Promenade, which was a no-car street; a high-quality walking and biking location, particularly to make a link to the I-5 bridge. (Slide 13)
- The most bang for the buck should be put in the areas where most people were going to be and where there would be the highest level of enjoyment and appreciation, rather than in pass-through areas without as much traffic.
  - Locations 3 and 4 in the middle would be the main streets of the redesign and redevelopment, and because that would be where the focus of traffic, especially pedestrian traffic and activity was centered, the signature design elements would address that design principle.
- The Town Center Land Use Plan showed the main street district highlighted throughout Park Place from north to south, so the signature design should be highlighted for the entire route to Town Center Loop, and not just the lower two-thirds of Park Place.
  - Mr. Weber clarified that northern segment of Park Place was identified as Location 2. He explained investment recommendations were not applied to every street in the Town Center. The team had focused on identifying the seven locations that would be detailed out through the Streetscape Plan. Locations 3 and 4 captured a lot of the key features of Park Place, right by the park, and the Extension. Location 2 was not being ignored; the attention was being turned to the other locations to get them detailed out.
  - Location 2 should not be an orphan street, as it had to be used to get to Park Place from Parkway and was an important location to welcome people to Town Center. If the idea was to create an atmosphere to bring people into an environment, Location 2 should also have a signature design.
- Town Center welcome signage at Parkway or at Canyon Creek Rd would make sense for those coming from the north.
  - Mr. Weber understood some welcome signage would be off Wilsonville Rd, but he would need to check the Signage and Wayfinding Plan.

- People going to the park would not go around Town Loop and come up the extension, but would enter straight in. The location of atmospherics should be based on the ingress and egress; the flow of people coming in and out.
- Mr. Weber confirmed the three locations were not the only places that would have signature design but were the areas on which the team would focus to create prototypes grounded in actual locations.
  - Ms. Bateschell clarified the Plan would identify the investment level for every street in Town Center, whether internal street locations, the different components of main street, Courtyard, etc. Renderings would not be provided for every segment of every road. The renderings would feature the prototypes of the seven different locations, calling out the specifics of what would be incorporated for the different types of streets in Town Center, whether a signature, enhanced, or standard design. The prototypes would be the investment levels with detailed renderings that would guide the project team in the future at implementation, whether the City or a developer was constructing a road. The prototypes would set the framework for what needed to be included in the signature design for a specific segment.
    - Before the final adoption document, the project team would inventory where the different signature, enhanced, and standard designs would be applied. However, specific renderings of every single street would not be done, as 15 to 20 roads would be highlighted, and the budget did not support 20 renderings. Therefore, prototype renderings would be created and Staff would know how to apply the designs moving forward.
    - She appreciated the Commission's input to include the northern part of Park Place, so that the full main street from Town Center Loop to Wilsonville Rd would all be the Signature design. She welcomed other observations on the different pieces of the road network for Town Center, such as how to treat the existing Courtyard Dr.
    - She noted the Commission was also being asked if these were the seven locations for the prototypes or if there were other locations the Commission wanted depicted with renderings that were different from what was shown on the map.
- Ms. Bateschell stated identifying the phases of the Town Center project partly depended on if development was seen in the short-term, which would influence identifying phases in the 25-year plan. Staff was working on an infrastructure funding strategy that would look specifically at phasing, but that was also influenced on whether any large applications were received between now and the next year or two.
  - When presenting to City Council, Staff should make it clear up front that the phasing was not yet determined, but the project team was looking at selected segments as prototypes for design that would then be put in the context of whatever phasing made sense in the coming year or so.
- The Commission agreed Locations 3 and 4 should be Signature segments and were representative for that kind of design treatment.
- The Parkway segment that connected Town Center to Town Center Loop W between Locations 4 and 6 warranted a more Enhanced or even Signature design, because it would be one of the first and most heavily trafficked areas through the early phases, regardless of where the improvements started. The segment was significantly highlighted in the Town Center Plan with open space and was a bit different from the other prototypes seen so far.
  - Mr. Weber confirmed the area of the angled Park Place was not on the map but was a City-identified framework project for Town Center, and the team was assuming it was a signature quality street, similar to the prototype for Location 12 which captured most of the elements of a promenade street. If Park Place between Locations 4 and 6 felt immediate and central enough to the early phases of Town Center, consideration could be given for making it a prototype.
  - Kim Rybold, Senior Planner, clarified that Park Place was envisioned in the Town Center Plan to be converted into a promenade in the future, similar to Location 12. Staff had identified illustrating Location 12 as opposed to that Park Place location because no cross section was adopted with the Town Center Plan, as there was more uncertainty with how exactly that space would transition. Staff envisioned that potentially, there could be transit in that location in the future with bicycle and pedestrian spaces, but it was less clear how that would lay out. The cross section for Location 12 had a bit more certainty to work from, which was why Staff recommended illustrating that location in lieu of

the Park Place location. Any other ideas or input regarding how that Park Place segment should be designed would be taken into account.

- Phasing would bring into play what went first. If the Park Place diagonal was turned into a promenade before Locations 4 and 6 were constructed, traffic would not be able to use the diagonal as a detour while those locations were constructed. Locations 4 and 3 would need to be completed first, so the main street would have traffic and the side street could be taken out of service and turned into a promenade. What happened first, what followed, and what made sense in the design, functioning, and implementation of the infrastructure had to be considered.

Chair Mesbah asked for the Commissioner's input on having Locations 6, 8, 9, and 12 as prototypes.

Commissioner Heberlein stated he was okay with the prototype locations. For presentation to City Council and others, he believed talking about prototype design locations would be clearer than talking about recommended locations or investment, which might send the wrong message. Making a choice on investment without knowing the cost was difficult. Different messaging would help eliminate confusion.

Commissioner Greenfield agreed, adding he was curious how the new streetscape in the Town Center Streetscape Plan would be integrated around the existing Town Center Park. He would like a visual example to see how that juxtaposition might be treated, particularly with Location 3, which was more amenable to more immediate development. The identity of the entire area could be built out to occur from that central location. Town Center Park was well established and had an identity. He was not aware how amenable the establishments across from the park were to early change, but there was opportunity for substantial redevelopment in the Fry's property across from Town Center Park. Location 3 was in the middle and should be considered for early development to take advantage of the existing landmarks available at Town Center Park.

Commissioner Tusinski agreed with the other Commissioners' comments, adding she liked Location 6 as more of the Enhanced design as it would have a lot of traffic even though it was not the main artery. The plan looked good so far.

Commissioner Woods stated Commissioner Greenfield's comment made sense and asked where initial construction would start.

- Mr. Weber responded initial construction would depend on the overall phasing and what minor or major site redevelopment warranted new streets or adjacent street improvements, whether it was Fry's or anything else. The framework streets had been identified as priorities within Town Center to be jump-started by the City and a potentially greater share of public investment, so the framework streets would potentially happen at an earlier phase as a catalyst for the Town Center. A lot moving pieces would need to be considered as to what happened first, as well as the phasing for construction, traffic flow, detours, and minimizing disturbances as much as possible. The Plan would speak in general terms about implementation and making the streets ready for a variety of different phasing options in the future and would include guidance on how to build half-streets or stub-out streets at intersections that would be set up for later completion when other sites redeveloped. Location 3 was a very central street with adjacency to the park and with qualities as a festival street; and because the street would potentially be realigned to link with the Park Place Extension (Location 4), the street would be favored for detailed design attention.

Mr. Weber confirmed the Commission had asked for more clarity about distinguishing prototypes from investment levels as well as some of the implementation and phasing relationships. He posed the project team's last question for the Commission:

3. Are there any other key elements or considerations that should be included in a refined draft Streetscape Plan? (Slide 15)

Commissioner Woods asked if the flow of transportation, including SMART transit, had been considered or if it was too early in the project. It would be important for residents in other areas to be able to get around via city transit.

- Mr. Weber noted the project team was looking at transit shelter design and how to fit a shelter or conventional post stop into the streetscape in a variety of locations and was coordinating with Eric Loomis at SMART to identify a couple likely transit stop locations in Town Center. The team was working to make the plans flexible enough for SMART to be able to reroute with different stop locations or have a consolidated mini transit center within Town Center.
- Ms. Bateschell added the City and Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) had worked with SMART during the Town Center planning while developing the different cross-sections designed for all of the street types to ensure street widths and cross-sections could accommodate transit and bus. SMART's preference was for converting on-street parking to serve as a transit pull-out, though other potential designs would be considered. The Courtside Dr rendering would include an example of that pull-out, as Courtside Dr would most likely be one of the locations for a future transit stop. Transit was a very important priority to keep in mind.

Chair Mesbah noted the designs were doing as much as possible to maintain flexibility in different uses and changes of uses over time and in different seasons. He encouraged that continued effort, noting it was difficult to know what the spaces would be used for and how they would look. The design and expenditures in the infrastructure needed to be flexible enough to accommodate changes.

Mr. Weber welcomed any additional comments and suggestions from the Commissioners on the draft Streetscape Plan which could be sent to Mr. Bradford.

#### B. Middle Housing Infrastructure and Design Standards (Pauly)

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, noted the Commission had been discussing Middle Housing almost every month for the last six months and knew the purpose of the project, as well as the important decisions made to date. Some updated revisions to the Middle Housing project were now before the Commission, and some Commissioners had expressed interest in a report from City Council, which would also be provided.

Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager, updated on City Council's Monday work session, noting Council had received many comments often with differing views, but there were not a lot of questions regarding the larger package the Commission reviewed last month. Discussion continued about the 10 percent middle housing requirement in Frog Pond, which made sense. He believed there would be further conversation with the Council, but at this point, the project team had moved forward with integrating the requirement into the Code edits. Again, just a short summary paragraph...

- He introduced the project team and started the Middle Housing presentation via PowerPoint, reviewing the project's desired outcomes and describing the infrastructure analyses and the Design Standards Compliance Options for the Commission's consideration.

Discussion and feedback from the Planning Commission on Design Standards Compliance Options were as follows with responses by Staff to Commissioner questions as noted:

- From a broad perspective, the recommendations reflected the Planning Commission's discussions pretty well.
- Having a better understanding of the State model code and how it differed from what was seen in Frog Pond and Villebois, for example, would be helpful to get a better feel for the level of rigor behind the Code and what that might look like in the rest of the developments.
  - Mr. Pauly noted the State model code standards were of the same flavor as seen in the existing residential neighborhood zone, such as the percentage of windows in public view sheds, the required articulation on longer façades, driveway approaches and locations, widths of garages, etc. The project team was comfortable with the standards, as they were similar to what was seen in Frog Pond.



Kate Rogers, Angelo Planning Group (APG) added that Frog Pond and Villebois had more architectural design standards as opposed to things like windows and doors, so things like façade details were regulated that were not covered in the model code. The model code was a pretty limited set of design standards that regulated some of the core features of design, such as windows, doors, and driveway widths.

- She continued the presentation, describing the new general Design Standards for single-family and middle housing throughout the city, which were inspired by the existing standards in Frog Pond and also responded to the visual preference survey and the features people appreciated in residential design. (Slides 17 & 18)

The Commission responded the following two questions posed by the project team, who also responded to questions as follows:

- Do you support applying these standards to all single-family and middle housing?
- Do you like the option of a unified roof structure to promote a “single-family appearance” as an alternative to articulation? (Slide 19)
  - The break in rooflines was preferred over the unified roof structure. The articulation was architecturally more interesting than driving down a street and seeing the same roof at all the same level.
  - The unified roof picture did not do full justice to the concept. Excellent examples existed in the Frog Pond buildout with a more unified look and appeared at first glance like a single building, but they were distinct duplexes. The appearance was not a matter of the roof style, but an overall architectural effect, even in the façades, that gave the building a unity. The architectural quality of two or more units needed to be unified, as specifying a unified roof structure was not enough.
    - Ms. Rogers clarified the architectural consistency standard would apply regardless of roof structure and would create more architectural consistency and unity.
  - The unified roof structure looked like a big box with no style to the structure with the roofing straight across.
  - The impression on the left was superior to a slab front, but that was not the choice. A slab front did not need to be the alternative to the articulation of the picture on the left or a straight roof line.
  - Allowing the unified roof structure provided more flexibility, and the more flexibility, the better as more middle housing might be built.
    - Ms. Rogers added a building could have both a unified roof and also meet the articulation standards. Articulation was not just about the roof.
  - Applying general design standards to all single-family and middle housing came down to the cottage clusters and whether the house plan variety was too restrictive and if there was another alternative for cottage clusters. Cottage clusters provided an opportunity to have truly affordable housing. Was the house plan variety putting a larger burden on small houses by requiring them to be different architecturally, and therefore structurally, and driving costs more than needed in those types of developments? Applying the standards to duplexes and quadplexes made sense, but perhaps not to cottage clusters.
    - Mr. Pauly noted the project team had looked into defining the standards a bit more, in terms of things like color, because that was shown in the visual preference survey. At this point, defining color difference to be clear and objective had been difficult, but the team could continue to explore those details. The visual preference survey had shown the appearance did not need to be a lot different to provide visual variety. Sometimes, even a different color shade was enough to provide visual variety.
    - Additionally, with such a small front area, a prominent tree in front of a cottage cluster house might make the fact that it was the same elevation less noticeable. Other more cost-effective details could be used rather than a different physical house features.
  - In carrying forward previous standards that many people liked, was there any standards that the project team decided could be left behind based past experiences of them not working?
    - Mr. Pauly noted the City had learned from Villebois what standards did not work and could be left behind. Villebois standards were very detailed, and a consultant architect had to be used to even review the plans. Staff learned that even simple variation standards had substantially the

same effect, so such detailed architectural standards were not needed. Focusing on some main features made a big difference, and then the market really delivered the rest and provided the variety.

Ms. Rogers continued the presentation, reviewing the Design Standards specific to each middle housing type, which were adapted from the State's model code and modified for Wilsonville. The project team posed the following question for the Commission's feedback:

- Do you support the "unified roof structure" as an alternative to unit definition for townhouses? (Slide 25)
  - Ms. Rogers asked if the same option should be offered for townhouses as that offered for single-family and other types of Middle Housing. She confirmed the Commissioners' response was the same for townhouses as that given previously; the unified roof structure standard was not supported. She added the project team would consider that further.

Additional comments from the Commission regarding the Design Standards for the middle housing types were as follows with responses to Commissioner questions as noted:

- Ms. Rogers clarified an applicant could either define each unit with an architectural element or feature, or a unit could be defined with a unified roof structure without any articulation.
- The idea of making a middle housing development look like a large single-family residential house had worked in many parts of the country, but there was uncertainty about whether a unified roof structure was the mechanism used to achieve it. Overall, the Commission's preference was to define each unit in a better way than the unified roof structure while still being objective with the standards. The unified roof structure examples shown in the presentation did not resonate with the Commission, as they did not look like large, single-family residential units.
  - Ms. Rogers stated the single-family appearance was very difficult to regulate and while there were a lot of different ways to approach it, putting that into clear and objective Code language was hard.
- There were some good examples in Charbonneau, as well as a couple of brand new examples in Frog Pond that had achieved that single-family appearance and could be photographed.
  - The question was whether clear and objective standards could be developed in order to get to the single-family appearance. If the examples were pushed to an extreme, the result would be an old-fashioned motel with a unified type of roof and cubbyholes that people checked into, which was not the look anyone wanted.
  - Not every design could have the taste level the Commission was discussing.
- The Commissioners agreed that identifying a unified roof structure as an alternative was inviting architectural abuse.
- Ms. Rogers confirmed cottage clusters would have a 1,100 ft footprint with an attached garage. (Slide 26)
- Mr. Pauly noted the cottage cluster standards were not designed to have the full two-story type of cottage, but the push was more for smaller, single-story or story-and-a-half cottage clusters.
- Would there be any restrictions on the 200 sq ft garage allowance? Did the space have to be a garage?
  - Ms. Rogers responded the garage standards would be discussed at the next meeting along with some of the parking space standards, but she understood the space had to be a garage rather than a habitable floor area.
- Ms. Rogers noted ownership and maintenance of the community building in a cottage cluster would depend on the ownership scheme. For example, if the units were condominiums, there would be some kind of legal shared ownership of the space, but if they were rental units, whoever the property owner was would own and manage the space. If the cottages were subdivided to be a subdivision development, a homeowners association would have joint ownership and shared management of the building. (Slide 27)
- Ms. Rogers clarified that cluster housing units were essentially detached versions of duplexes, triplexes, and quadplexes, so they were not cottage clusters but cluster housing, which was a separate housing type. (Slide 29)
- Commissioner Gallagher left the meeting at 8:43 p.m.

- Ms. Rogers explained the driver for the 150 sq ft courtyard for the cottage clusters was taken directly from the Model Code. Basically, the City could not require more than 150 sq ft without going into the alternative design standard that had to be justified. The standard was pretty limited compared to existing cottage cluster codes that already existed, but the intent from the State's perspective was to be more flexible and to not require such a large portion of a site to be covered by lawn space, for example. She confirmed additional courtyard space could not be required but could be allowed. (Slide 27)

Ms. Rogers continued the presentation, reviewing the updates made to the Frog Pond Residential Neighborhood (RN) Zone and Frog Pond West Master Plan based on direction from the Planning Commission. (Slides 30 to 37)

- She and Mr. Pauly clarified the cottage clusters currently defined in the Frog Pond Code would still be allowed, but they were not the same as the HB2001 cottage clusters. The subject cottage cluster units had larger footprints and were individual lots under the Frog Pond definition. The clusters were essentially smaller lot, single-family units gathered around a courtyard rather than the cottage clusters defined by the State.

Commissioner Greenfield believed the Frog Pond Code updates were ready for a wrap.

Commissioner Woods stated he did not have any additional comments to what had been shown, and he supported the minor changes that were proposed.

Commissioner Heberlein:

- Asked whether limiting the entrance height to 4 ft above grade was too restrictive. Some of the single-level homes in Frog Pond were up higher on grade. He agreed he did not like the idea of the top picture, but he was not sure 4 ft was enough to still provide the development flexibility for the given lots and topography of what the development might be. (Slide 36)
  - Commissioner Greenfield suggested saving that standard for an exception to be made either administratively or by the DRB in a particular case.
  - Mr. Pauly noted that perhaps grade needed to be clarified. Grade was not necessarily from the sidewalk. For example, for a graded lot with a retaining wall at the sidewalk, was the grade measured from the top of the retaining wall? Such things needed to be clarified.
  - Ms. Rogers believed grade was specified in the Code and that the average grade was measured along the foundation. If a house was raised up above the sidewalk level, grade was measured from where the foundation started.
- Stated that with that definition of grade, 4 ft would be okay.

Chair Mesbah asked if a design similar to the top picture would be allowed with the driveway leading to a basement garage that was below grade, which was a design seen in some urban areas.

- Ms. Rogers believed the design standards would allow that. (Slide 36)
- Mr. Pauly noted basements were not popular in the area and given the natural topography of the area the standards would be applied to, a basement or garage below grade was pretty unlikely.

Commissioner Tusinski stated she liked the design standard of not having the entranceway over the garage, as it looked a lot better.

Chair Mesbah noted the set of standards were reasonable and met the intent of the City's Equitable Housing Strategic Plan, as well as the State's intent without being really off the top. He was happy with the outcome thus far.

Mr. Pauly noted all of the discussion had gelled into the proposed standards, so he appreciated the feedback and the project team would move forward.

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, announced the City would be participating in a commemoration of Juneteenth, which would be the first time the City celebrated the occasion. A public celebration would take place on Saturday, June 19th at 10:00 am in Town Center Park, and she wanted to make sure the Commissioners were aware of the event to schedule it on their calendars. She noted Commissioner Woods would be participating in the event.

Commissioner Woods stated the Juneteenth celebration was an old African American celebration recognizing the actual end of slavery, even though the June 19, 1865 date was two and a half years after the Emancipation Proclamation of January 1, 1863. The date was important and in light of a lot of the things that had happened last year was being put in the forefront. He hoped the Commissioners would take time to attend and support this first annual event.

#### **IV. ADJOURNMENT**

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

Respectfully submitted,

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