



PLANNING COMMISSION

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 12, 2019

I. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

A. Consideration of the April 10, 2019 PC Minutes

**PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 10, 2019
6:00 P.M.**

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

*Draft Minutes for review
and approval at the June
12, 2019 PC Meeting*

Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

Chair Jerry Greenfield called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m. Those present:

Planning Commission: Jerry Greenfield, Eric Postma, Peter Hurley, Simon Springall, Kamran Mesbah, and Ron Heberlein. Phyllis Millan was absent.

City Staff: Miranda Bateschell, Amanda Guile-Hinman, Daniel Pauly, Charlie Tso, 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 March 13, 2019 Planning Commission minutes
The March 13, 2019 Planning Commission minutes were accepted as presented.

II. WORK SESSION

A. Residential Code Revision Project (Pauly)

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, explained Staff had been working on the Residential Code Revision Project for some time and it had pointed out some inconsistencies within the Development Code that were worth addressing.

Dan Pauly, Senior Planner, briefly highlighted the history of the project in more detail, noting the last overall Code rework was in 1999 and 2000, with substantial changes regarding what could be counted as open space in 2005, and some changes regarding accessory dwelling units (ADUs) in 2018. Otherwise, not much had changed with regard to the Residential Code. Through the revision process, Staff hoped to resolve the issues and provide better clarity, and ultimately, better designed communities, both for the City's developer partners and the community as a whole. The goal of tonight's work session was to introduce the project and get feedback from the Planning Commission. Two key topics of discussion regarded calculating density, much of which related to lot size, and open space requirements. He referred to these topics as land consuming requirements because they required a certain square footage to meet; moreover, the requirements had to work together in the Code. He presented the Residential Code Revision Project via PowerPoint, describing the basic project concepts, two topic areas needing resolved, (i.e. density calculations and lot size; and open space requirements), as well as Staff's draft recommendations.

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

- With regard to how ‘quality over quantity for open space’ squared with the notion of clear and objective, the revision was now clearer and more objective than the prior language. Similar to language used in Villebois, the revision required that landscape and architecture professionals design the open space to ensure concepts in those fields gear the space to different age groups, abilities, and user groups in order to maximize the open space.
 - Currently, the Planned Development Standards had specific requirements for using a credentialed planner and engineer, but there was not clear language on designing “usable open space”, which was not otherwise defined. The developers would pay for the professionals, and no push back was anticipated from the developers about the requirement, as many developers already had such professionals on staff.
- Vice Chair Postma asked if a lot of variations existed within the lot standards based upon different zones or were the variations in places like Villebois or Frog Pond.
- The comments regarding lot sizes were focused mainly on the Planned Development Residential (PDR) Zones. Currently, the Code criteria for lot coverage requirements were vastly different for lots of the same size in different zones, though some lots had been granted waivers over time.
 - Varied lots in different zones created a different character in neighborhoods, which might be desired to achieve variation.
 - The planned development process established the lot coverage for most neighborhoods in the planned development approval. The goal of the revisions was to have the same lot coverage for the same size of lot, whether the change occurred over time or for new land being developed, and to make the Code function better by having everything in one table, rather than have the requirements scattered in text throughout the Code.
 - The proposed revisions were based on working with the Development Review Boards (DRBs) and the development community over a number of years. Staff sought the Commission’s input on whether the revisions made sense and Staff was headed in the right direction.
 - All housing product types were currently allowed in PDR Zones, and no changes were proposed. Adding new Comprehensive Plan and Zone Map designations to fill gaps was an exercise of density rather than product type.
 - The lack of certain housing types in the city, such as four-plexes, was likely due to the market place over time, as well as the land available at the time. Many neighborhoods were developed in the 1980s and 1990s.
 - Throughout its history, Wilsonville, more than other communities, had allowed a variety of housing types, including condominiums, which had been built to some extent.
 - The Equitable Housing Study would flesh out why certain housing types were not being built where the Code allowed or what would be appropriate to change the number built, particularly within the PDR zone. The proposed revisions did not cover the Village Zone or Residential Neighborhood Zone being applied in Frog Pond.
- Commissioner Mesbah reiterated his position about the importance of function and performance standards rather than quality and quantity. Quality should not be versus quantity, the two need to go together. The performance standards need to be outlined; the same applied to the density, size of the lot, etc.
 - Many of the complaints he heard regarded people trying to fit themselves functionally in a space that did not function for them. Although the market could be a factor, the City was potentially creating an infrastructure that people were being forced to adapt to without considering the performance standards the infrastructure could support. For example, the garage was being used for storage rather than a car.
 - The functional elements of a space were not being considered when waivers were issued, or with regard to lot size, density, or open space functions. While considering the proposed revisions, the Commission needed to pay attention to the performance standards needed for spaces and infrastructures that would work properly for the intended use.
 - Mr. Pauly explained that discussions on open space, particularly in subsequent work sessions, would involve those details, adding he believed the City would be taking a more performance-based

approach for open space. Quality came into play on smaller projects where the current open space standards were the same for a 5-lot or 49-lot subdivision. The proposed revisions regarded scaling more for smaller subdivisions and then focusing more on a performance-based quality rather than fitting random open space areas in to meet the requirement; the focus to have cohesive open space.

- He agreed parking was an important issue, especially when looking at narrower lots. A separate project would be considering parking standards, including residential standards, which would also come before the Commission. Parking was not specifically addressed in this project, but keeping that relationship in mind was important when considering the subject standards.
- He assured the quality-quantity issue would be revisited.
- Topic 1.1 consisted of the density calculations and lot sizes. It was discovered that the Comprehensive Plan text and the map were inconsistent in terms of the highest density range. The draft recommendation was to correct the Comprehensive Plan texts and the map to be consistent with the 80% of max requirement.
- The density inconsistency found between the Comprehensive Plan Text and Map (Topic 1.1) did not appear to be because one or the other requirement was intended. A large volume of work was done by the Planning Commission during the complete Comprehensive Plan overhaul in 1999; it is possible that some details could have been missed in the process. (Slide 6)
- The changes in street width requirements or other requirements that took away available land did not really impact the discrepancies regarding Average Lot Size, Minimum Density, and Buildout Requirements (Topic 1.3, Slide 10). The land required for stormwater or Low Impact Development Approaches (LIDA) was typically in planting strips and was generally allowed to be counted as non-usable open space to meet the 25 percent open space requirement, since it was landscaped.
 - The discrepancy occurred because after a Code change in 2005 that no longer allowed backyards to be counted as open space, no other land consuming requirements were changed, so now the math did not work when requiring non-backyard open space with the same size of lots.
- Why not simply revise the PDR Zones to encompass the Max Density per Acre rather than creating a separate zone within each existing zone.
 - The proposed revision was guided by the principle of keeping the existing zones the same, so the number of units allowed per acre would not increase in the existing zones, and the allowed units would stay consistent with the current designations. Additionally, it was difficult to get to a whole number when calculating 80 percent of a small acreage number. Staff had seen over time that having such interim zones as an option would be beneficial; the interim zones would provide a clear continuum to allow flexibility for both decision-makers and developers over time.
 - While it was uncertain how often the interim zones would be used, they made sense as Staff tried to anticipate potential issues. For example, a 7,000 sq ft lot was difficult to fit under an existing PDR-2 or PDR-3. Although updating PDR-2 to a 6,400 sq ft minimum lot size would allow that lot size to occur in an area.
 - Staff could certainly consider revising the PDR Zones, but using intermediate zones made sense as Staff had looked at the issue over the years and it made the math as clean as possible.
 - Otherwise, one would have to assume no one would ever build lots or subdivisions with an average lot size between 10,000 sq ft and 24,000 sq ft.
 - Amanda Guile-Hinman, Assistant City Attorney, noted that rezoning current zones could potentially trigger a Measure 56 notice to all current property owners in the PDR zones, which would be avoided by creating new zones, though she had not researched the matter.
 - Mr. Pauly believed that after the revisions, a Measure 56 notice would likely be necessary, anyway. Measure 49 might also come into play as no existing property would be changed.
 - A similar process had been used in Old Town, where future needs and changes were anticipated and the City facilitated and enabled the Code change to occur, but nothing actually changed at that point; it was property owner driven with the consent of the DRB and Council to make any such changes in the future.

- While the additional zoning designations were intended for future permitting only, the applicability of the proposed changes was not entirely known. An applicant with a small parcel of land zoned PDR-3 that met the criteria and code, could propose changing the density to 5-6 units per acre and explain the benefits for Council's approval. The PDR zones were not anticipated to be applied in Frog Pond. In terms of adding the new zones, the biggest thing was to ensure the actual lot sizes reflect what had been built historically and what was able to be built in that zone. Both applicants and staff have stated they like the clean math of having a continuum that filled in the gaps, even though there was not a lot of applicability at this point if the changes were not applied to future zones.
- Filling in the gaps made sense for the reasons presented as well as not wanting to change the existing zones.
- Ideas for naming of the new zones were discussed because the intermixing of names and numbers was not particularly liked by the majority.
 - Renaming the zones after the correlating range was suggested, for example, PDR 0-1, PDR 1-2, PDR 2-3, etc. so that each zoning designation related to the density range.
 - Mr. Pauly agreed, adding he liked the idea and would look into it.
- As the project progressed, examples of neighborhoods with the new zoning changes were requested to help visualize how neighborhood character would be impacted.
- Utilizing zoning formats from other jurisdictions, including State and Metro tables, was difficult because other formats were more complex and often had exclusive single-family and exclusive multi-family zones, while Wilsonville had all the residential uses in one zone and was built with planned developments.
 - The Residential Neighborhood Zone would primarily be used in Frog Pond and this project pulled some of the best things from the Residential Neighborhood Zone into the PDR zone, particularly in the open space concepts. At the same time, must work with what the City had without changing too much due to the legal ramifications changing things too much, as well as creating confusion.
- The proposed filler zones were created in response to the reality of what people were trying to build and what they had to get waivers for. Many existing lots in Wilsonville were within areas that were only enabled through waiver processes.
 - PDR-1 could not be revised to allow a 6,000 sq ft minimum lot size due to the relationship to density. The 80 percent rule prohibited having a 0 to 4 range in a zone. With that upper number, the lower floor could only be 80 percent of that number; that calculation complicated the project quite a bit.
- The City's precedent had been to base the open space standard on gross area, but no issues were anticipated by shifting the calculation to be based on net usable area; smaller vacant lots would have adjustments that would result in a different number anyway.
 - Calculating open space based on the net usable area would potentially adjust the lot size that could be allowed. Using 25 percent of the gross area made the math cleaner because the net usable area was not always known due to uncertainties regarding the size and number of roads, bike paths, parking, etc.
 - The open space calculation did not necessarily affect the number of homes that could be built because density requirements remained the same regardless if open space was calculated based on gross or net usable area. The requirement drove other land consuming requirements, primarily the minimum lot size.
 - Using net acreage resulted in a slightly larger individual lot sizes because more area would be available for lots, which seemed backwards, but less land was being taken out for open space.
- The number of dwelling units should drive the amount of open space, and the current requirement worked against that. The 25 percent requirement should be based on some function or performance standard for open space. Rather, it was a citywide allocation versus requiring that every dwelling unit be within a quarter of a mile of open space.
 - The origin of the 25 percent open space requirement was not entirely clear, but that information could be provided. Currently, the waiver process did allow for waivers of open space if the developer could

show the homes were within a certain distance from a public park or other open space. There was no plan to change the 25 percent open space requirement at this time.

- For any open space, even on a large 10 or 20-acre project, 10 percent of the open space must be programmed usable park space; the 15 percent difference could be rainwater swales, preserved natural areas, etc.
- Currently, the tiered usable open space requirements were troublesome because the size of the tier was too broad and very small tiers were quite cumbersome. To achieve a tier that would do so would result in multiple tiers and substantial complexity. (Topic 2.3) A percentage formula was recommended along with a tiered floor also to have a minimum open space size.
- Without a minimum specified, an 11-unit development could have open space less than 2,000 sq ft, which would be a 20,000 sq ft lot in a PDR 6-7, but not likely. The issue being addressed was to make sure a developer could fit in open space that was large enough to be useable. It was more of an exercise of breaking up the required open space than having the total open space be 2,000 sq. ft., for example.

Chair Greenfield confirmed the Residential Code Update would be revisited by the Commission at least two more times in work session.

Ms. Bateschell welcomed the Commission's input on how to work through the Code update. She had heard requests for examples and pictures to get a sense of what was being proposed as well as what the math looked like on the ground. She asked how the Commission wanted to tackle the topics at the next work session.

The Commission decided to focus on density calculations and lot size at the next work session, and open space requirements at the following work session. Additional comments and requests were addressed as follows:

- Having examples of the inconsistencies and/or lack of clarity for a planner would help the Commission better understand how to make the Code more clear.
 - Infill projects of one to two acres were challenging because once it was up to four lots, a quarter of an acre of open space was required.
 - Developers were not comfortable using the Comprehensive Plan density because questions came up when gaps occurred.
 - Appropriate lot coverages needed discussion, particularly for subdivisions built in the 1990s. There were requests for sheds, etc. and lots were already built to the maximum lot coverage with no potential for additional lot coverage. The Street of Dreams homes were being built to max as well. When looking at the table, what should the lot coverage be? If different than the table, then how would someone get to that lot coverage for that individual lot and the planned development approval?
- More information was requested about the number of infill developments available in order to consider the cost benefit and ensure the Commission was focusing its attention in the right place. It did not make sense to update the Code for only a few sites.
 - Properties currently zoned PDR included the former filbert orchard and the residential land owned by Mentor Graphics along Canyon Creek Rd. Some urban reserve land could potentially go to a PDR zone as well.
 - A Neighborhood Zone could only be applied if agreed upon by the property owner.

Ms. Bateschell noted the Residential Code Update was scheduled for the Commission's July meeting, but it could come back in June, especially if the project was being addressed in pieces.

III. INFORMATIONAL

A. Housing Report – 2018 (Tso)

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, provided a brief history of the Annual Housing Report, which started in 2014 following a recommendation from the 2013 Housing Needs Analysis that the City conducted to look at

existing housing stock and residential housing needs for the next 20 years. Though the Housing Needs Analysis was a requirement of the State planning process, the City also wanted to understand where the city's population and household growth were headed in the next 20 years, and the potential demand and need to provide additional housing. The Housing Needs Analysis report recommended that the City conduct an Annual Housing Report to track the City's housing developments, the types of housing being developed, and the rate of growth. While the Metro Regional Growth Forecast assumed a 1.8 percent population growth increase for the City of Wilsonville, historically, the city had grown at a faster pace, so one recommendation was for the City to continue tracking population growth so that information could be included in Metro's growth forecast model, and for the City to understand what that meant in terms of its land supply and ongoing planning. Initially, in paper format, the 2018 Wilsonville Annual Housing Report had really evolved as Mr. Tso had introduced the Housing Report into the online world, making it much more interactive with many different aspects and a lot more data. Ms. Bateschell looked forward to the Commissioners' input, noting there had been some changes, even from last year based on the Commission's discussion, and Staff was looking forward to another good discussion tonight.

Charlie Tso, Assistant Planner, described the 2018 Annual Housing Report as being a snapshot of the City's housing development activity last year. The report discussed changes in the community's housing trends, the affordability of renting or owning a home, and the projected growth and future housing needs of the community. He presented the 2018 Annual Housing Report, which was included in the meeting packet and also available on the City's website. He reviewed the statistics for permitted homes, affordability trends, and the city's population growth. He concluded saying the City would have more demand for housing as it continued to attract more families, workers, and jobs to the community, but looking forward, Wilsonville would also continue to provide a variety of housing options with anticipated new development in Frog Pond and also infill development potential in Town Center.

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

- Including a metric to show how Wilsonville's housing affordability compares with neighboring cities was requested for future Annual Housing Reports.
 - A recent report in *The Oregonian* stated the most unaffordable communities in the state were in the mid-30 percent range. In the Metro area, Wilsonville was listed as one of the lowest of the cities represented, maybe the second from the bottom for rent-burdened families. Wilsonville was doing much better than neighboring communities and considerably better than the two neighbors to the north.
 - The *Oregonian* report today was limited to those of severe cost burden, 50 percent of family income or more.
 - As far as Staff knew, Wilsonville was the only city currently tracking and doing an annual housing report. When creating the first Housing Report Staff looked for examples to see what others were doing, but could not find any. As Staff has presented the information and others learn about it, they seem to be surprised and interested in what the City was doing.
 - Much of the region was talking about affordability, and the Clackamas County Housing Needs Analysis was currently being conducted that would look at all cities in the county. The City had received the first draft of that report, which provided information about how Wilsonville compared on affordability with its neighbors, including different price points and different area median incomes that could afford those price points. Staff had penciled that in on the Planning Commission's agenda and hoped to get someone from the county analysis team to present that information to the Commission.
 - Information from the County's Housing Needs Analysis would also feed into the work Staff was doing on the Equitable Housing Strategic Plan that would be kicking off soon. The same analysis team was working on it, so the data analysis and methodology would be consistent.
 - Data regarding affordability comparisons could likely be integrated into the next Housing Report. Tracking some of that information over time would be harder if Wilsonville's neighboring jurisdictions were not tracking it as well. Staff would have to figure out what data

sources would be available, if those data points were not consistently available from the neighboring communities. Staff would look to see what might be tracked over time.

- With regard to cost-burdened and rent-burdened households, when House Bill 4006 passed, certain requirements were put on local cities if a certain portion of the population was housing cost-burdened. Unlike many of its neighbors, Wilsonville did not have to comply with those requirements and take additional actions, so Wilsonville was doing a bit better in terms of price points and affordability. That might not continue to be the case, since the State might reassess who was cost burdened annually or every couple of years, so it was definitely something to pay attention to and continue to address.
- In the Rental Cost Trend graph (Figure 16, Page 38), the line for Affordable Rent for Median Income Renters showed a decrease and seemed to indicate that people in multi-family housing had less income this year than last year.
 - The affordable rent was calculated as spending no more than 30 percent of the median household income on monthly rent. Staff would double check to see if the data was trending down. However, one caveat was that the income data came from the American Community Survey and data shown for 2018 was collected in 2017, the most current data available. The year lag might explain the discrepancy between the median income increasing and the affordability rent decreasing.
- The Cost of Owning a Home graph (Figure 11, Page 33) showed a similar drop in the line for Affordable Home Price for Median Household Income, so the discrepancy was not just on the rental side.
 - The home ownership calculations had more variables because the affordability for owning a home depends not only on the household income, which was steadily increasing, but also on the interest rate used in the calculation that fluctuated every year. This year, the interest rate was higher than was used last year, which might explain why there seemed to be a bigger affordability gap.
 - Equity was another variable. Homes appreciating every year in value also increased the barrier to entry for those looking to buy.
 - Staff would check the figures used for both graphs as an error in the data seemed to have caused discrepancies; increasing income and decreasing affordability should have a 1:1 relationship.
- Affordability was a subject that required more in depth conversation by the Commission, and probably Council, because affordability was a regional, if not a West Coast, issue. If Wilsonville had the only affordable housing market in the entire Metro area, everyone would want to move here, which would push housing prices up, as well as demand. Consider the correlation of construction and the population increase; population increased the year after the housing stock increased; the more that was built, the more the population increases. The issue needed to be looked at regionally, because Wilsonville could not meet all the housing needs by building more houses because other cities were not keeping up.
 - Metro Council gave targets for the number of housing units to be built every decade, and even year to year, for all the municipalities within the Metro region and based on a regional housing goal. It did not look like Metro Council was projecting housing goals, and, if not, a few municipalities would be left with the burden of housing growth for the Metro Council, while others may not.
 - Housing affordability did need to be considered on a regional level. The City should partner with the regional government and every jurisdiction in the region to find a regional level solution. Affordability was a problem in every community in the U.S. that was growing economically. In cities like San Francisco, likely the number one unaffordable city in the United States, construction activities had been restricted throughout the past few decades, but that did not stop people from moving to San Francisco because it had a lot of jobs.
 - The City also had a responsibility to the Wilsonville community, not only to make housing affordable for newcomers, like those coming here for jobs, but also for current residents, who might be renting and want to buy a home, or whose kids want to move back with their kids to live near their grandparents.
 - Because Wilsonville was a successful community, people want to move here. If not enough homes were provided then only people with more money would be able to buy a home in the community,

- which was not necessarily a desirable outcome either. While affordability should be discussed at the regional level, it was also important to continue discussing the issue at the local level.
- Locally, job creation and housing creation definitely needed to be balanced. In other words, creating new jobs should include determining what the housing demand was for those jobs.
 - The issue of growth needed to be framed in a better context because people move where they want to, and providing them more housing would make Wilsonville look like L.A.; the quality of life would start eroding. At some point, decisions about how fast the city grows must be balanced in the context of the quality of life in the community. Was the quality of life being undermined when the City embraced an all growth perspective because the market was demanding it? Some other communities were much pickier, which usually resulted in gentrification. The City was trying to balance many different variables, which counteracted one another, making it almost impossible to strike that perfect balance. However, it was important not to create false dichotomies that say, “If we do this, that happens”.
 - There were opportunities to address concerns about quality issues and concerns that the City could not just keep absorbing more land and keep pushing out. For example, the Town Center Plan was approaching its final stage and would provide a lot of infill development opportunities for compact, walkable housing that was close to urban amenities; the type of housing both the younger and older generations, including the aging, more elderly citizens of the community were both seeking.
 - The presentation’s language stated multi-family and single-family were well balanced, but no data was provided in the presentation to indicate Wilsonville had that proper balance. Most jurisdictions had an oversupply of single-family houses, when the data was actually evaluated; however, Ms. Bateschell had stated previously there were not enough years of data collection to be able to project such trends. Caution was expressed about using language about multi- and single-family being balanced because in time, the data might indicate the city was overbuilt one or the other and it would be hard to correct the impression that these categories were well-balanced.
 - What was considered balanced, at least from a policy objective point of view, was not very well defined at this moment. As part of the Statewide Planning Rule, jurisdictions were required to have 50 percent multi-family and 50 percent single-family when planning for residential capacity. Staff’s impression was that this requirement was more of a policy decision around wanting to support single-family and multi-family and to provide both types of housing equally, as well as equal ground footing. The sense was that it was not something based on a rigorous statistical analysis about demographic growth and the housing types that would be demanded based on.
 - The balance was a sticking point when Frog Pond was being brought in to the urban growth boundary (UGB) by Metro. At that point, Wilsonville had an excess of multi-family that was of some concern, and now there was more equality.
 - While the State was trying to force some fairness in the mix, given that some municipalities wanted all single-family, it would be preferable for cities to show that 60 percent multi-family was needed based on their demographic and market analysis. For lawmakers, that could open the door for all kinds of statistical lying, but planners had more faith their ability to look at the demands for housing in a particular community and the surrounding area and provide what the community really needed as an asset, instead of randomly going 50/50.
 - From the state requirement point of view, Wilsonville was well balanced. But, the type of information needed to really know if a particular segment of Wilsonville’s population needed a particular type of housing was not available, it could not be said that Wilsonville’s housing was necessarily well balanced; that was one of the Housing Report’s limitations. Its purpose was to track inventory and build on the supply-side activity.
 - The concern was valid, and perhaps, it could be addressed deeper in the Equitable Housing Strategic Plan, which would be coming before the Planning Commission in the next couple of months. The Strategic Plan involved doing a market analysis, building on the results of the Clackamas County Housing Needs Analysis very specific to Wilsonville to have a better sense of,

not just supply, but also the demand on the market, the different price points, and the gaps in the Wilsonville's housing inventory in the different price ranges.

- The second deliverable involved doing some public engagement to get an understanding of people's experiences with housing and obtaining housing in the community to identify a laundry list of gaps and some general information about them to see which matched up with what was heard, what was seen in the data, and what seemed to be more applicable and more palatable for Wilsonville. The end goal of the Equitable Housing Strategic Plan project was to have six action items for the City to pursue as policies or programs to address the gaps identified at the beginning of the project. The project schedule was now being outlined more clearly between project team, consultant team, and Staff, and should be coming to the Planning Commission in the next couple of months.
- The Housing Report was the first step towards getting to those policies and programs; it was supposed to be driving the Comprehensive Plan.
 - The issues were very complex with lots of components to account for and balance at the same time. The market was a big piece of it, as well as the social justice issue, which was hard to deal with in city planning. There should be an aspirational issue with regard to the community's concept of itself, what it wanted to be. The City could certainly put up four- or five-story apartment buildings all over the territory and they would fill up. The aspirational part was a break on that process, there were some things the City could do that it did not want to do, and should do. So, this process needed to take a look at the issue in a whole range of ways, taking account of a lot of variables, but values must not be lost.
- The photograph in the Housing Report with Figure 2 on Page 14 would be revised as it showed the buildings that had recently burned down. Questions were asked about whether issues potentially related to the fire, and perhaps, requiring new safety standards, would be addressed by the Planning Commission.
 - Amanda Guile-Hinman, Assistant City Attorney explained it was not appropriate to discuss the matter or talk about hypotheticals because the fire investigation was still underway.
- The Housing Report was interactive and could be accessed on the City website. For example, the permit dots and house icons could be clicked on to get additional information about the permits and approved housing plans as well.

Mr. Tso concluded by thanking the Planning Commission for its feedback, which would be used to continue to refine the Housing Report each year.

B. City Council Action Minutes (March 4 & 18, 2019)

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, confirmed the information included about in city limits regarded Frog Pond.

C. 2019 Planning Commission Work Program

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, explained the Work Program looked sparse because Staff was waiting for Council to set new goals for 2019-2021 at next week's City Council Retreat, so they did not want to move too many projects too quickly until they had better information on those goals. Staff was meeting with the project team tomorrow to get a better sense for when a few other Code projects would be brought back to the Commission. Currently, there were no items for the May meeting, so if no items came forward the meeting might be cancelled.

- She clarified that at least three of the projects at the bottom of the table had been adopted or were recommended for adoption. She was working on a number of projects not led by Planning, reaching out to the project managers to determine when to plug those projects into the Planning Commission's calendar for updates or work session items.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Greenfield adjourned the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 8:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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