



I. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

C. Consideration of the December 8, 2021 PC Meeting Minutes

**PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 8, 2021
6:00 P.M.**

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

Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

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

Planning Commission: Kamran Mesbah, Ron Heberlein, Aaron Woods, Breanne Tusinski, and Olive Gallagher. Jerry Greenfield arrived after Roll Call. Jennifer Willard was absent.

City Staff: Miranda Bateschell, Ryan Adams, Daniel Pauly, Kim Rybold, Georgia McAlister, Shelley White

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 November 10, 2021 Planning Commission minutes
The November 10, 2021 Planning Commission minutes were accepted as presented.

II. WORK SESSION

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

Dan Pauly, Planning Manager, introduced the project team, who had been working on the Frog Pond East and South Master Plan since last meeting with the Commission in October. A large part of the team's work regarded housing, so discussion would focus on the housing topic and with updates provided on outreach as well. Affordable housing would be discussed tonight and throughout the coming work sessions. He explained that in this context, affordable housing was housing that was more economically attainable for more households. Subsidized, low-income housing was a subset of affordable housing; however, affordable housing was a broader term and included anything market-produced that was more attainable or an actual subsidized government or non-profit project.

Kim Rybold, Senior Planner, began the presentation of Frog Pond East and South Master Plan via PowerPoint. She highlighted the Equitable Housing Strategic Plan (EHSP), reviewing its background, policy objectives, and actions, the housing trends it identified, as well as stakeholder feedback, and how the work would influence affordable housing in the Master Planning process. (Slides 2-6)

Becky Hewitt, ECONorthwest, continued the presentation, updating some initial findings from the housing affordability analysis. She reviewed affordable and workforce housing development basics, the distribution of need by income, some affordable housing models, market rate ownership housing affordability of various housing types, and different considerations regarding accessory dwelling units. (Slides 7-12)

Mr. Pauly asked for the Commission's initial thoughts and feedback on housing types in Frog Pond East and South, referencing the questions presented in the meeting packet that were summarized on Slide 13. He noted the Committee for Citizens Involvement (CCI) would be getting input about housing types at its meeting in January.

Planning Commissioner responses to the questions posed by Staff were as follows with responses by the project team to Commissioner questions as noted:

- Extent of different housing types in Frog Pond East and South?
 - Ideas on facilitating difficult conversations about housing types?
 - Questions to answer as the affordable housing analysis continues?
-
- A variety of housing types that would suit the needs of potential homeowners was preferred. The affordable housing analysis and housing needs study should be guiding the different housing types, not anyone's personal preferences. All of the different housing types could work as long as they were high-quality and done in a way that fit in with the rest of the neighborhoods in Wilsonville.
 - Facilitating difficult conversations about housing types was a challenge given the desire for different housing types versus some of the opinions most frequently heard. The expected needs and desires for the entire community should be the focus. The focus on housing types was not just to appease one group but to make sure housing stock was available to support the entire community. Finding a way to hear from those not heard from as often in the community might help with that conversation so that it was not just one side speaking very loudly and so people see that other people want the other housing types.
 - One question to address would be if there were alternatives to loosening parking requirements for affordable housing or was there a way for the City to subsidize parking garages, for example, to still allow for the needed parking spaces, but to free up more space for developable land to put in the homes and increase the density in a different way. Though parking garages are very expensive, if the City was looking at opportunities to increase buildable units, perhaps they should be considered.
 - More information was needed from potential buyers in the community to see what specific housing types they wanted. Larger families, for example, might prefer cottage-type housing. The housing types presented should meet the needs of the individuals who might want to purchase them, and without being overwhelming.
 - Mr. Pauly clarified "difficult conversations" involved a number of biases against some of the more land-efficient types of housing that could provide more affordable options and helping to understand how those interplayed and the benefits to doing certain types of housing, even though it might have other negative impacts. Oftentimes, words around density and apartments triggered things in community conversations. The question was how to get through all of the information and trade-offs to make a thoughtful choice around these issues without getting into the triggers and information that might not be accurate.
 - Getting around such landmines would be difficult because everyone had different comments and feelings about affordable housing. The City should look at what it was trying to do with affordable housing types and generate potential answers to the anticipated questions and use that as a model to modify the difficult conversations. However, the situation would be difficult because of not knowing exactly what to expect.
 - As the affordable housing analysis continued, the questions would automatically rise to the surface. It was fairly early in the process and a lot of learning had to be done. The surveys and community engagement would help answer questions going forward. How people would look at affordable housing was not yet known.
 - A good range of housing was needed to fit the different types of buyers and the different needs of the community, but housing types should all be integrated, with single-family mixed in with multi-family homes, for example, so people did not feel isolated in the different areas and to make a better community overall.
 - Focusing on being as transparent as possible with the public and involving the community on every step of the planning, including reaching out to the leaders of the more underserved population, would help facilitate the difficult conversations.

- Learning more about ADUs, which were not commonly seen in the area, was requested. Could the Master Plan be used as a driving force in the real estate market to get ADUs more integrated into the community?
- The first thing anyone in marketing would do was to find the need and fill it. The community in general should be asked what kind of town it wanted Wilsonville to be, what quality of life it wanted, and if Wilsonville was open to everyone. There were people living in Wilsonville right now who would not be happy with some of the choices made about having a more diverse population, and not acknowledging that was skirting around an issue that needed to be confronted. If Wilsonville was really committed to the vision of being a diverse community with affordable housing for all kinds of people, a lot of the questions being asked about housing types, difficult conversations, or the housing analysis would be answered. Wilsonville could thrive in the future and stand for the fine, basic, good qualities of life that a lot of other communities had left behind for the sake of money, if Wilsonville did not make the same mistakes.
 - During discussions about a Strategic Housing Plan, the need for this community conversation and reaching a broad consensus about what kind of community citizens wanted Wilsonville to be collectively was one of the things/tasks the Commission hoped the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Committee would do.
- Frog Pond West had already been decided and planned, but there were issues when those current and future residents heard about the City wanting to do middle housing. Frog Pond East and South was an opportunity to do things differently, starting from scratch. Hopefully, the City would take advantage of that opportunity.
 - Once a precedent has been set, an expectation was established for those who were going to invest in the community and going back and changing the precedent later always caused some heartburn. This design process needed to be entered into very thoughtfully and comprehensively.
- The essence of city planning was an affirmation of values, vision, and expectations. The City was at an extremely significant inflection point in its history and seeing beyond this point to where it was going was very hard. There was a possibility of great things happening and a possibility of things falling apart. The opportunities available in Frog Pond East and South were a chance going forward for the Planning Commission to correct some of what was given up in the compromise in Frog Pond West. The Commission had the opportunity to do it right and needed to be bold and to affirm the right values.
 - When planning for Frog Pond West back in approximately 2017, a large audience had come one night to press their point of view about the density in Frog Pond West. When a comment was made that what was being pressed for was an exclusive community, the audience applauded, but when a comment was made that exclusivity was not what Wilsonville was about, the steam came out from the crowd. Despite the Commission passing the concept of the compromise on density, a lot of the steam in the room had not entirely dissipated. Difficult conversations were still to be had. The resolution was not complete and would require a real commitment to deeper values in the community that many in the community shared but some did not share. The Commission had to forge a large enough consensus to keep things on an even keel going forward through this development, which would not be an easy ride.
- Regarding the proper mix of housing, the statistics in tonight's presentation and the supporting document could be what justified the kind of housing mix for the good of the community. However, the housing should be placed in a way that made geographic and strategic sense, and the affordable housing should not be isolated. Isolating affordable and subsidized housing was one of the mistakes done in the 1960s and 1970s and was a recipe for disaster. Research now showed that children of lower-income families who were in neighborhoods and socialized with middle- and upper-middle-income children had higher goals and aspirations, just by the socialization. The community needed to be inclusive for the sake of the children and the sake of the community.
- The questions that needed to be answered and expanded on in order to educate and inform the community had to do with what kind of community was desired, but also what mistakes would turn the community into a problem community. Resilience in a community, whether economic or social, came from diversity. This was now being seen, because of the pandemic, in the problems with the supply chain, employment, and staffing shortages, etc. When importing things from far away, because people could not afford to live in the community, things could happen that prevent them from coming to the community to provide the help needed for taking care of grandmother, having home care, or help with shopping, etc. All of these aspects of

community resilience needed to be thought through and planned ahead. Otherwise, the community would price itself out of having those kinds of infrastructures necessary for a sustainable community life.

- The extent to which existing research and information could be brought in to inform the citizens would make the difficult conversations easier because they would be based on real information and not just somebody's self-serving hope for what the house in which they wanted to live. In exclusive life cultures, like in European countries with mansions entire villages had to support, at some point, all of the mansions went into bankruptcy because they were not sustainable as a lifestyle. Creating a community that was exclusive might feel good for a while, but it would not be sustainable because the resources necessary to keep it going would run out.
 - A community design charrette was needed to help facilitate the difficult conversations. A charrette could be used to bring a wide cross-section of the community together to deal with the trade-offs typically faced in designing a community, such as infrastructure costs and community needs, and would allow people to make decisions and see the consequences as part of the charrette. A charrette was a very design and problem-solving based facilitation process that required certification.
- A parking garage should be done in a way that it could be turned into an apartment building or condominium. Car dependency was one uncertainty, and these neighborhoods had a long life.
 - The climate crisis had to be considered when making decisions such as on parking. Finding places to charge electric cars was difficult. Electric cars were part of where the community was moving and should be part of the infrastructure planning. Wilsonville should be committed to having a sustainable life that respected the needs of the surrounding world. It was a value. When planning, building, and designing, the City needed to consider what those needs were going to be; none of these things were included on any of the lists.
 - Some of these things might be part of the infrastructure bill that would come to pass, so the infrastructure would be in place whether the City specifically pushed it or not because the funding might be available.

Joe Gills, Angelo Planning Group (APG), summarized the themes of the Commission's feedback as this was a learning process, to let the data and the needs of the community guide the planning, and to be clear about values and what kind of community Wilsonville wanted to be over time and to walk that talk.

- He asked whether the range of housing types would include rental housing and apartments. The planning to date had looked at ownership models in the Frog Pond Area Plan up to a townhouse level of density.
- He confirmed that the Commission wanted the exploration of the needs, whether quantitative or qualitative, to include the rental and apartment end of the spectrum. He clarified apartments would be larger than five units together, which was the zoning definition.

Additional comments from the Commission regarding the inclusion of apartments and responses by the project team to Commissioner questions was as follows:

- Frog Pond East and South were denser, with more units per acre as a result of the grand compromise to allow Frog Pond West to be less dense. Did the Master Plan explicitly spell out apartments and more dense development or did it just specifically define density units per acre?
 - Mr. Dills replied in summary, the Master Plan said apartments were not part of the spectrum for Frog Pond East and South and included up to a townhouse density with a maximum of four units put together. He understood apartments were not included as a reflection of the general concern about density at the time. The Plan had the luxury of saying Frog Pond East and South would be further defined later, but in the Area Plan, East and South were intended for up to a townhouse level of density at the high end.
 - Mr. Pauly added that based on how the conversations were going at that point, putting apartments into the Plan was not politically feasible. Concerns could be addressed with different ways to design and integrate apartments with multi-family versus segregating single-family and large apartment complexes. When the Plan was first done, the City had not done its EHSP and had not experienced the housing crisis as it was now. The City was in a different world now than in 2015 when the Plan was adopted. Certain aspects of the Plan had been further colored by what had happened since, including the EHSP and continuing community conversation.
 - Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, noted she was involved during the Frog Pond area planning project and the predominant land uses outlined were detached and attached single-family homes.

Attached townhomes could be a two-plex, a four-plex, and so forth, but the attached and detached single-family homes were primarily what was modeled and the basis for the unit counts that ended up in the Master Plan and in the conditions from Metro as part of the UGB expansion. An option was left in the area plan for multi-family above the commercial use that had gone back and forth and was identified as something to look at further as the idea for the neighborhood commercial node was refined in the master planning. She also noted many discussions on the record around the question of density and how it related to affordability that did not necessarily end up as a final recommendation. As noted, the City has learned a lot and a lot had transpired between the adoption of Frog Pond West and today, and the further adoption of things like the EHSP and inclusion goals at the City Council level would have the City look further into affordability issues which was why they were a major part of this master planning effort, which could provide different information than what was available when adopting the Area Plan to inform the Commission's recommendations.

- Given that the Area Plan was approved with up to attached single-family homes being the limit, if multi-family homes were investigated in a wider area outside just the future commercial area, would the Area Plan need to be updated before a proposal, or was it something that could be done as part of the East and South planning process, even though the Area Plan said apartments were not in the cards for those areas?
 - Mr. Dills noted procedurally, the updating could be done at the same time, as part of the package.
- Multi-family had not been flatly ruled out, particularly in Frog Pond East, and room had been left for apartment-style residences, but it might not have gotten formally into the Master Plan. The Plan was fluid as far as Frog Pond East and South were concerned, and multi-family in some form or another had been discussed, including row homes.
- Stafford Rd could easily and unfortunately become a boundary with one kind of town on one side and another kind of town on the other side that were not integrated or united. When planning South and East, it was important to figure out how the two areas could be integrated, socially and economically, as much as possible with the rest of Wilsonville. Stafford Rd must not be allowed to become a barrier or dividing point like Boeckman Rd already was to some extent. Additional attention would be required to foster that kind of integration as it built out.
 - Attractants to the neighborhood with the rest of the community as an anchor would be in the commercial area. A commercial area was more likely to be successful if surrounded by higher density.
 - The newer development provided an opportunity to create commercial entities that would bring people from Frog Pond West the convenience of coming to the other sections.
- Multi-family homes should be investigated, knowing it would generate some difficult conversations with the city as a whole. With the significant push-back during the Frog Pond planning process for multi-family housing and the perceived imbalance between single-family and multi-family housing, which drove Frog Pond West to be what it is and what drove East and South to be single-family attached or detached, the conversation would be difficult but worthwhile in pursuing.
- Apartments made sense and should be explored for all of the reasons stated, but the Commission had to be careful to not open a Pandora's box related to apartments and whether they were above commercial establishments or not, which would involve difficult discussions. The Commission would be remiss and not doing its job if it did not explore apartments.
- The commercial area would not be the size of Orenco Station, but a neighborhood core could be designed with commercial activities that attracted traffic from outside of the neighborhood. The area should be approached as a design element and should be discussed if it could be shown to be adding value and functionality. If the commercial area would isolate apartments in the middle of nowhere and cause a functional problem, the Commission could consider that information and decide it was perhaps not the right placement. The difficult conversations would be on the basis of information from the EHSP and other newer information since the Area Plan was done.

Mr. Dills thanked the Commission for its feedback and noted the more robust affordable housing and ADU memos would be prepared for the Commission's February meeting. He added that tonight was a taste of the beginning work, adding the scope of review was clear.

Mr. Pauly noted the memo included in the packet about the updated schedule and briefly reviewed the public engagement process. (Slide 14) He noted a tentative date of Tuesday, January 18, 2022, for the first Committee for Citizen Involvement (CCI) forum and asked the Commission to respond by e-mail if that date would work. The format of the last CCI meeting for middle housing was successful, and this CCI meeting would mirror a similar format. He briefly reviewed the public engagement timelines, noting the Commission would have a lot of work on this project in 2022.

Mr. Dills reviewed the public engagement timeline, noting that the Commission's feedback on the kind of outreach it was interested in had been integrated. (Slide 15) A problem-solving format was included in the two workshops, one on land use and one for the public realm, that were envisioned as two or three hours long, and very participatory with information provided, break-out rooms, reporting back, and opportunities for people to help design the plan, discuss questions, and get community involvement. The single-evening or Saturday morning workshop format was reflective of the scope and the calendar.

- The charrette model was typically a multiday format, because it was based on the power of getting feedback loops as design moved from initial discussions to a framework to alternatives to a solution. People could experience the trade-offs and see the plan grow literally in front of their eyes. With the Area Plan, some of that work had already been done. A multiday charrette would be different from the public engagement process planned so far. He noted he was an experienced certified charrette manager but was uncertain about how to do a charrette virtually; however, the team would look at the possibilities of a charrette and report back. A workshop could be bracketed with some outreach right before and right after to provide an opportunity for feedback loops without having an event within three or four consecutive days.

Chair Mesbah asked if it was possible to modify the typical multiday charrette to a model that recruited the design group from the community in a way that was representative and got people from underrepresented groups and then have the feedback loop happen in the multiple meetings of that group once a month, for example, like a task force. The group needed to be a focus group that was not just for public consumption but was a hand-picked representative group from the community that allowed the full spectrum to be present in the task force. Multiday meetings would be hard to pull off, but rather than having the typical voices show up with agendas, the focus group should be a more representative group from the community for a problem-solving and feedback loop process with two or three meetings over a couple of months.

- Mr. Dills responded that was possible, adding there was no single way to do the design workshops. He noted the goal of true diversity of representation was a good model. Whatever the timing was for a series of meetings needed to be fit to the schedule and the time available.
- Mr. Pauly noted that the workshops' format had not been finalized so it was worth exploring and discussing. The team had a lot of skills to be creative with the digital world and restrictions and trying to do broader outreach, but was limited in terms of time and capacity. The outreach plan was meant to be flexible and adapt as it progressed.

Commissioner Gallagher noted a focus group needed fresh, objective voices rather than the usual people that came with their own agendas. To find out what the community was all about, people who had maybe never done anything like this before needed to be asked what they thought or what they wanted.

Mr. Pauly noted the next steps for the Planning Commission included the CCI meeting in January and a rigorous work session in February to continue this topic.

Chair Mesbah noted for the CCI forum, perhaps a good first step in going to the community was to have a presentation that outlined what was known about the trends and needs in the community. The Planning Commission had the responsibility to look forward to meeting those challenges the community would face. Clarifying where the Commission was and why it was doing what it was doing based on the available information would be an important part of the CCI presentation.

- Mr. Pauly agreed, noting the feedback would help refine the opening presentation at the CCI meeting prior to a question-and-answer session.

III. INFORMATIONAL

A. City Council Action Minutes (Nov 1 & 15, 2021) (No staff presentation)

There were no comments.

B. 2022 PC Work Program (No staff presentation)

There were no comments.

C. Recognition of Commissioner Greenfield's Years of Service

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, stated she was honored to recognize Commissioner Greenfield for his eight years of service on the Planning Commission and his previous service on the Development Review Board (DRB). She noted the thoughtfulness and detail he had brought to so many policy decisions and highlighted the numerous accomplishments the Planning Commission had achieved during Commissioner Greenfield's service, which included the review and adoption of several master plans and master plan updates, three different Transportation System Plan updates, the Urban Forestry Management Plan, and the adoption of the Coffee Creek Form-Based Code, the first ever form-based code for an industrial area, as well as a long list of housing-related topics. Commissioner Greenfield's comments on the material tonight were on-point, thoughtful, and reflective of everything done the Commission had done on housing over the last eight years. When Commissioner Greenfield joined the Planning Commission eight years ago, the City was doing its Goal 10 Housing Needs Analysis, which set forth the next steps for the policies, choices, and recommendations the City needed to consider in meeting the community's housing needs. Commissioner Greenfield had helped Staff and the City Council with the Frog Pond Area Plan, Frog Pond West Master Plan, and had started to help with Frog Pond East and West. He had helped with the Code updates for accessory dwelling units, as well as the modernization of the Residential Code for density consistency issues, managing competing uses on a site, and ensuring open space was maintained. He was also involved in adopting the first Equitable Housing Strategic Plan, House Bill 2001 updates, and the Old Town Development Code and Design Standards. She sincerely appreciated all the time Commissioner Greenfield had volunteered, both on the Commission and in the community, to concentrate on the issues that were important and impactful to the daily life of Wilsonville's residents and the community, for his attention to detail, his focus on readability, his keen eye for design, and his commitment in service to the community. She assured Commissioner Greenfield that he would be missed. She displayed the plaque that would be sent to Commissioner Greenfield in honor of his service on the Planning Commission.

The Commissioners thanked Commissioner Greenfield for his deep and creative perspective, for being an studious example and setting a high standard for others, and for his thoughtfulness and hard work.

Commissioner Greenfield stated he had chosen to move to Wilsonville from Japan namely because of the quality of city governance and becoming part of that had been a humbling and heavy experience. He was proud of Wilsonville and wanted to be prouder of Wilsonville as it moved into the future past this inflection point.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Mesbah adjourned the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 7:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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