



PLANNING COMMISSION

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 11, 2021

I. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

A. Consideration of the July 14, 2021 PC Meeting Minutes

**PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, JULY 14, 2021
6:00 P.M.**

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

*Draft PC Minutes for review and
approval at the August 11, 2021
Planning Commission Meeting*

Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

Chair Kamran Mesbah called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. Those present:

Planning Commission: Kamran Mesbah, Jennifer Willard, Ron Heberlein, Aaron Woods, and Breanne Tusinski.
Olive Gallagher and Jerry Greenfield joined the meeting after Roll Call.

City Staff: Miranda Bateschell, Ryan Adams, Chris Neamtzu, Daniel Pauly, 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.

Doris Wehler confirmed that the Planning Commissioners had received the petition with 28 signatures from residents in Frog Pond West asking the Commission to not increase density in that neighborhood beyond what was required by State law.

Chair Mesbah clarified that no public hearing was being held on Middle Housing tonight. He noted the petition would be kept on file until the public hearing in September when he understood it would be introduced as part of the Items Received.

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

A. Consideration of the June 9, 2021 Planning Commission minutes

Commissioner Gallagher joined the Planning Commission meeting at this time.

The June 9, 2021 Planning Commission minutes were accepted as presented.

II. LEGISLATIVE HEARING

A. WIN Program Urban Renewal Plan (Vance)

Commissioner Greenfield joined the Planning Commission meeting at this time.

Chair Mesbah read the legislative hearing procedure into the record and opened the public hearing at 6:12 pm. He noted that no public hearing was required on the Wilsonville Investment Now (WIN) Program, Urban Renewal Plan, but one was being held anyway to encourage input.

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, noted last year, the Planning Commission received a briefing on the WIN Program, a local economic development program that was an evolution of the site specific urban renewal area (URA) Program the City used to have. The intent of the WIN Program was to attract high-wage jobs and

high-value development in the city. The first application was received earlier this year since adopting the WIN Program, and the project team would present more about that exciting opportunity tonight. The Planning Commission served an important role in overseeing the Wilsonville Comprehensive Plan and tonight, the hearing would focus on whether the WIN Zone being presented was consistent with the Wilsonville Comprehensive Plan.

Chris Neamtzu, Community Development Director, stated he was sitting in for the City's Economic Development Manager Jordan Vance. He introduced Nick Popenuk of Tiberius Solutions, the City's primary consultant on the WIN Zone along with Elaine Howard. Mr. Popenuk had worked with the City on all of its urban renewal areas for many years and was a strong resource with a great track record. As mentioned, tonight's hearing was to check the Twist Bioscience WIN Zone, which was a single-site URA, for conformance with the applicable provisions of the Comprehensive Plan. He presented the Twist Bioscience (WIN) Zone – Comp Plan Findings via PowerPoint, describing the history of the Tax Increment Finance (TIF) Zones and WIN Zones in Wilsonville, the role of the Planning Commission, the proposed Twist Bioscience WIN Zone, and urban renewal in Wilsonville with these comments:

- In 2013, the voters supported in an advisory vote and Council approved the creation of six separate properties as individual URA districts, referred to as TIF Zones at the time, that were intended to provide a property tax rebate as a development incentive for qualifying companies who invested in any of those six properties. The construct of the program largely mirrored that of the State's Enterprise Zone Program, for which Wilsonville was not eligible. The City sought to create a comparable economic development tool to make the City competitive with those places that did have Enterprise Zones. The program required an investment of \$25 million at the time, as well as the creation of 75 new jobs at specific wage levels. Ultimately, all six sites developed, but none of the projects that occurred on those sites met the eligibility thresholds identified in the program, and the TIF Zone Program was expired by City Council in 2019.
- At that time, Staff was given direction to develop a proposal that built off of that program. Mr. Popenuk, Ms. Howard, Mr. Vance, and Mr. Neamtzu held a number of meetings trying to create a new program that would emulate the prior TIF Zone Program. The project team put together a proposal that was more effective by offering flexible criteria, such as fewer restrictions on geographic location; a creative new scoring system that allowed flexible consideration of the investments, jobs, and wages; and two tiers of benefits, one at four years and one at seven years. Staff then took the proposal to the URA Task Force, chaired at the time by Councilor Akervall and comprised of community residents, business interests, business owners, and the taxing district representatives, an important stakeholder Staff reached out to on all urban renewal projects. The proposal for the WIN Zone concept received strong unanimous support from the URA Task Force, which was responsible for recommending that the program incorporate Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) criteria and prioritize Wilsonville's longstanding legacy businesses. The Task Force's feedback was incorporated into the final proposal that was adopted by City Council in October 2020 in the form of WIN Administrative Rules, which were in the Commission's packet. Council's adoption allowed Staff to market the program to prospective businesses. Staff provided a briefing on the WIN Zone Program to the Planning Commission in November 2020.
- In early 2021, the City received the first qualifying WIN application from the exact type of business Staff was hoped to attract, a large traded-sector company that would strengthen the local economy with a significant capital investment and the creation of new jobs. The project from Twist Bioscience, a California-based DNA synthesis firm, proposed to redevelop nearly 200,000 sq ft of existing warehouse space at the Parkway Woods facility, resulting in \$70 million in investment in tenant improvements and machinery and the creation of upwards of 200 new jobs in the community. The business qualified for the WIN Zone Program URA property tax rebate, so Staff then initiated the process per the WIN Administrative Rules to implement the incentive. The first step was to adopt a development agreement between the two entities, Twist Bioscience and the City's Urban Renewal Agency, which was adopted on June 7th by the URA Agency. The second step was authorization to create a single-property URA, which was completed by the URA Agency on June 21st. As part of that process, Staff was required to engage the impacted taxing districts and provide them with a 45-day

comment period. Staff was encouraged to confer and consult with all districts interested in receiving more information and was in the middle of that process. Staff was also required to come to the Planning Commission to conduct the process of verifying conformance with the City's Comprehensive Plan. A final adoption public hearing would be conducted before City Council in August.

- The role of the Planning Commission was to review the proposed Twist Bioscience WIN Zone Plan for conformance with the Wilsonville Comprehensive Plan. The statute governing urban renewal stated the proposed urban renewal plans must be sent to the Planning Commission for review, and that the proposed urban renewal plan must conform to the applicable provisions of the Comprehensive Plan. Staff had prepared findings included in the packet that demonstrated conformance with those applicable provisions, including chapters on citizen engagement, industrial development, as well as economic development. Mr. Popenuk would discuss the specifics of how this plan conformed to those applicable provisions.
 - As the Planning Commission was the body charged with reviewing everything related to the Comprehensive Plan, the City's URA process required the Commission to make a specific finding for City Council as part of adoption of the WIN Zone. Conducting the hearing was not a statutory requirement but a good way to engage the citizens in a conversation about such projects. The Commission had received written testimony from Mr. D. Vicenzi, a citizen in the community, who had observed similar bioscience firms in the Bay area that resulted in significant positive changes from his perspective.
- The proposed Twist Bioscience WIN Zone was unique in that the zone would only apply to only a sub portion of an existing building, which was a sub portion of a tax lot, which was different from how previous urban renewal plans had been approached. The site outlined in red was the approximately 4.4 acres Twist would be leasing at the Parkway Woods center, now referred to as the ParkWorks Industry Center, the former Xerox or Tektronix site. (Slide 4)
 - Twist was a bioscience company that had proprietary technology enabling it to manufacture synthetic DNA by "writing" the DNA on a silicon chip. Their products had a wide range of applications, including rare disease detection, issues related to oncology and treatment, as well as infectious diseases.
 - At the facility in Wilsonville, Twist would be manufacturing genes and proteins that would help in the construction of what is called antibody therapeutics. This expansion would double Twist's existing manufacturing capacity, increase its speed of production, and employ a range of local talent from doctor scientists to engineers to lab technicians with two-year degrees.
 - Twist was drawn to the Oregon market because of the university system, which trained people for this particular segment, providing a rich environment for a company like Twist. Twist chose to expand in Wilsonville due to its access to technology and bioscience talent, as well as the region's many advanced manufacturing firms. This tenant improvement project and Twist's investment had been noted as one of the largest investments in the Portland Metropolitan Region in this past year. Biotechnology was considered a cluster industry where firms were often geographically clustered and concentrated together to share resources and talent. With the big Twist investment in Wilsonville, it was possible other biotechnology companies would follow, helping to grow the biotech industry in Wilsonville and the subregion.
 - Wilsonville was one of a couple of different cities that Twist had looked to locate in, and the economic development incentive program resulted in Wilsonville edging out two other communities, one in southwest Washington State and another in the metropolitan area. The WIN Zone program was very important to Twist in choosing the Wilsonville location. Twist believed Wilsonville was close enough to San Francisco to allow Twist's executives to occasionally visit the site without significant travel time flying in and out of the Portland International Airport.
- Urban Renewal in Wilsonville had been a very important tool for infrastructure financing and construction of a wide variety of projects and had given the City has had very positive economic results.
 - Three existing urban renewal areas depicted on the map covered about 22 percent of the City's existing acreage, which represented about 6 percent of the City's assessed value. Two of the three plans were winding down in the coming years, and one of the plan areas was just ramping up. The area highlighted in blue was the City's Year 2000 urban renewal plan which had funded a

tremendous number of projects in the Town Center area, park projects, transportation projects, and utility undergrounding projects. The district was estimated to close in 2023. (Slide 5)

- The area in orange was the City's West Side URA, which funded all of the offsite infrastructure for the Villebois neighborhood, which was nearing buildout. Once the final project in that plan was completed, the Brown Road urban upgrade, the West Side Urban Renewal Plan was anticipated to expire as soon as 2025.
- On the north end of the city was the Coffee Creek Industrial Area, 225 acres meant to encourage employment growth in the high-tech and advanced manufacturing sectors. The district was new, being only a few years old, and was just taking off. The City's Community Development Department just completed its first major project at Garden Acres Rd that was opening up about 80 acres in the heart of the district. The first 120,000 sq ft warehouse was also under construction in the district on the south side of Ridder Rd for Panattoni. The investment would result in a significant increase in the increment in that district.
- The Twist WIN Zone was adding 4.4 acres to the City's overall portfolio of urban renewal areas, which was still well below the statutory maximum of 25 percent. The WIN Zone Program was only eligible on land that was outside of those three existing urban renewal areas, since urban renewal could not be created within an existing urban renewal area.

Nick Popenuk, Tiberius Solutions, continued the PowerPoint, reviewing the three Comprehensive Plan categories along with the related Findings described in the proposed urban renewal plan to show how the Twist WIN Zone Plan complied with the Comprehensive Plan with these comments:

- In the WIN Zone plan, the findings related to the Comprehensive Plan were described in three categories: Citizen Involvement, Industrial Development, and Economic Development. Often, urban renewal plans had findings related to public facilities and services, but the WIN Zone was such a focused program that it did not fund infrastructure improvements like traditional urban renewal plans might. Instead, the WIN Zone only provided a property tax rebate to the developer. The current WIN Zone plan before the Commission was really focused on the property tax incentives being offered to Twist rather than anything related to traffic or public services. The Twist development, like any other development, would have to go through the traditional permitting/land use process, and questions on public services would be addressed at that point in time.
- The WIN Zone was in conformance with the Citizen Involvement goals (Slide 7) due to the numerous opportunities for public involvement as the WIN Zone was prepared, conceived, and as it moved forward to adoption, including:
 - The URA Task Force, which included both private and public representatives from the community. Universal support was given from the Task Force for the WIN Zone Program overall, not for any individual site.
 - Two City Council meetings took place on the WIN Zone Program, one to discuss the key parameters of the program as it was coming together, and one to approve the administrative rules that outlined the specific formulas for businesses to qualify for the incentives.
 - Recently, Urban Renewal Agency meetings also provided opportunity for the public to get more information on this particular WIN Zone plan.
 - Tonight's Planning Commission public hearing gave the public opportunity to provide comment.
 - City Council would have another public hearing in a few months, providing another opportunity for the public to provide comment.
 - Between the URA meetings last month and the upcoming City Council hearing, there was a 45-day Taxing District public comment period. Every one of the taxing districts that would be impacted by the WIN Zone, in terms of the property tax revenues that would be foregone by those districts to instead support the WIN Zone Program for a period of seven years, were all notified of and received a copy of the plan. The districts had been invited to provide their comments and feedback on the plan and had been offered the opportunity to talk with City Staff about the proposed WIN Zone plan.
- The WIN Zone Program itself was designed with the Comprehensive Plan's Industrial Development goals in mind, as it specifically targets high-value developments with high-wage jobs. (Slide 8)

- As City Council was considering a range of possible qualification thresholds for businesses, different formulas gave different weight to employment versus capital investment. The City chose to go with the option that weighed capital investment more than employment, emphasizing capital-intensive businesses as the target of the WIN Program.
- The Twist project was estimated to have \$70 million in capital investment split between tenant improvements and machinery and equipment that would be on site, though there was still opportunity for more investment on the site. In particular, this WIN Zone would only capture a portion of the existing building, leaving the opportunity for the remaining space to have additional tenants that could bring their own investment that would not be captured as part of the tax increment financing and rebate to the specific Twist tenant.
- The WIN Zone Program conformed with the Economic Development goals (Slide 9) because it was very intentionally set up to promote the reuse of vacant buildings, infill development, and redevelopment, and the program established clear criteria to guide the use of incentives to attract or retain businesses.
 - While the Twist WIN Zone was not an existing business that would be expanding, but was a new business being brought to the area, the program did provide additional points in the scoring criteria for existing businesses in Wilsonville.
 - The WIN Zone Program was applicable anywhere citywide with the exception of existing urban renewal areas, and local businesses operating in Wilsonville would have had an easier time qualifying for the program without the same required level of investment, jobs, or wages as businesses from out of town.

Commissioner Heberlein:

- Noted in the packet, the majority of the overall score appeared to come from the capital investment, and both the packet and presentation discussed high-wage jobs. He asked what the average wage would be for the proposed jobs.
 - Mr. Popenuk stated he and Mr. Neamtzu would need to look at their packets to find the answer on wages. He noted when looking at the application, the amount of capital investment being brought to the City was sufficient on its own to qualify for the full seven-year incentive. The actual number of jobs and the wages wound up being irrelevant to Twist qualifying for the program, though certainly not irrelevant to the community.
- Believed it was interesting that 80 points was needed for the full benefits, and Twist's application was at over 200 points.
 - Mr. Popenuk noted he was opening up the Twist application from June, but he was not 100 percent certain those numbers were final as adjustments may have been made by Mr. Vance. As businesses of this magnitude got closer to development, the exact numbers for jobs, wages, and value could shift as those plans changed. He reported the average wage noted in the Twist application was \$70,000, and he would get back to the Commission to confirm if those were the final numbers used in the application.

Commissioner Woods believed this first WIN Zone opportunity was an excellent use of the facility. The site had a long history for high-tech, going back to Tektronix and manufacturing and most recently with Xerox and 3D printing. He believed it was appropriate for the site to continue with a high-tech legacy, and bringing in 200 high-end jobs involving doctorate level individuals, gene therapy, and antibodies was a major win for Wilsonville. He appreciated that Twist Bioscience had done their due diligence in looking at Wilsonville and its incentives.

Chair Mesbah:

- Stated he was looking for a clearer idea of the activities that would go on in the facility, especially the impact they might have on the wastewater and wastewater treatment. The project team mentioned those issues would not be dealt with now, as the hearing focused only on the economic development aspects. He understood the project was not complete until all of the other details were checked, verified, and qualified.
 - Mr. Neamtzu confirmed that was correct, adding everything would be locked down for the final public hearing scheduled in August. Council was interested in a similar question at the adoption of the

development agreement and had asked specific questions about things like pollution, discharge, and the materials Twist would use. A Twist Bioscience representative was available on the call that evening, and the project team had been working closely with one of their contractors out of Olympia, Washington. The representative was able to address the Council question and testified that Twist Bioscience ran a closed system that did not have discharge. Twist captured all of its waste, which was then hauled off and handled in an extremely sensitive manner; they did not have discharge filled with things that would cause consternation for the wastewater treatment plant. He noted there were ongoing discussions between the City's Public Works Staff and Twist Bioscience representatives. According to comments made on the public record, wastewater discharge from Twist appeared to be minimal or nonexistent.

- Noted with his professional background, when he saw "protein production," his antenna went up, because in Wisconsin, he had a difficult time dealing with prions, which were proteins that were part of mad cow disease in that case. As wastewater treatment did not take care of the prions, treating them was almost impossible at that time. Hearing that Twist Bioscience used a closed system was very reassuring.
 - Mr. Neamtzu added Wilsonville had a very robust industrial pretreatment program given the diversity and number of complex companies the City worked with. The Public Works team had a dedicated staff member who worked specifically with industry to address issues such as discharge and runoff. The City dealt in this space regularly with all of the existing companies, many of which were required to have special permits based on the types of activities conducted at their sites. All of the conversations had been positive so far and were definitely ongoing while moving closer to implementation.
 - Thanked Mr. Neamtzu for the additional information, adding he would follow up as the public hearing came closer, as a personal point of interest.

Chair Mesbah called for public testimony.

Tami Bergeron, Administrative Assistant-Planning, noted one person had just joined the meeting via Zoom, but they had not yet indicated if they wanted to give testimony. She suggested proceeding without their input unless she heard back from them shortly.

Ms. Bateschell noted there were no members of the public at City Hall to testify.

Chair Mesbah reminded the Commission had received the e-mail providing written testimony as mentioned by Mr. Neamtzu. He asked if any Commissioners had additional comments.

Commissioner Woods stated he was not surprised that a closed system was being used, as Twist Bioscience was a high-end organization. He reiterated the WIN Zone Plan was a good use of the area, which consisted of three buildings. It was great that an organization wanted to use that footprint, as it was a bit different given how the building was laid out with portions still occupied. Wilsonville was fortunate to have been chosen by Twist, and the tax-based revenue the company would bring was definitely a positive.

Commissioner Greenfield noted he lived in the area and was very familiar with the Parkway Woods campus and he had envisioned it developing exactly as projected. He was delighted by the whole prospect and believed it would be an inflection point in Wilsonville's city history.

Commissioner Gallagher believed it was a very promising development. She noted she was always concerned about density and traffic patterns and the implications of a new work force moving to town, but she believed Twist Bioscience was a very exciting development in terms of its industry and location, and she looked forward to hearing more.

Commissioner Tusinski agreed, adding she believed Twist Bioscience was a great first-go at the WIN Zone Program.

Commissioner Willard also agreed, adding that given her profession in high-tech developments, she was looking forward to seeing the project unfold.

Commissioner Greenfield added that he was present in the discussions that led to the original TIF Zone Program back in 2012. He believed the WIN Zone Program made much more sense, and he commended and congratulated the planning team that put the program together.

Chair Mesbah noted he had received confirmation that there were no public comments. He closed the public hearing at 6:48 pm.

Commissioner Heberlein moved to approve Resolution No. LP21-0001 as presented. Commissioner Greenfield seconded the motion.

Chair Mesbah stated as he looked at the plan, he asked himself if \$75,000 average annual income was enough to buy the average house in Wilsonville. The idea was to bring in top salaries of over \$200,000, for example. He also asked if the industries supporting the high-end jobs would provide employment to people who were not PhDs. The economy desired for a community was top-end but also covered the lower rungs and empowered the community economically. Nobody could predict whether or not that would happen; only assumptions and hopeful thoughts could be made. He shared the enthusiasm of his colleagues for Twist Bioscience coming to town and filling an empty building, but the engineer in him wanted to see more facts, which were not always present in planning. He added that all of the points in the Staff report were the boxes that were checked, and he asked if the proposal was not adverse to any of the other goals in the Comprehensive Plan. Was the proposed WIN Zone Plan really that good?

- Mr. Popenuk responded that the proposal was very focused. If a study was done of the entirety of the impacts of the Twist development, there might be some points with less clear ties to positive impacts on every last element of the Comprehensive Plan. This hearing was looking at the WIN Zone Plan, which only authorized the tax incentive program, so a shorter list of the Comprehensive Plan provisions was included.

Commissioner Gallagher stated she wanted to see more facts because she lived right there. She was already aware of Grace Chapel, the new construction building, the density of traffic and how it was changing and the very tough traffic situations already occurring on Stafford Rd. She wanted to see more information about the impact on the general community of bringing in a workforce, how the workers would get to the location, where they would live, whether they were commuting, and how SMART would be impacted, for example. She was all for the industry and believed it was a great step forward, but it would impact the community.

Commissioner Woods noted he had worked on the campus for over 14 years and during that time, close to 600 people came in daily. The only time there was any impact was when people were leaving and getting onto the frontage road; but other than that, with the two exits, there was not a major impact. With 200 more individuals coming back onto the site after many of the previous 600 people had exited, it would be interesting to see if there was any traffic impact. Having lived five minutes from the campus himself, he knew the traffic patterns very well and had seen no impacts to the community.

Commissioner Gallagher noted that was before Amazon and since then, nobody wanted to be on that frontage road at 11:00 in the morning.

Commissioner Greenfield stated the Amazon employees had moved and were gone from the parking lot. He lived across from the campus and at the height of the Amazon activity, he did not observe any kind of a problem.]

The motion passed unanimously.

III. WORK SESSION

A. Middle Housing Parking Standards and Other Updates (Pauly)

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, noted tonight marked the seventh work session on Middle Housing in Wilsonville, which was big both in importance and scope, and had required Staff and the Commission as a team to visit all the facets of the Code, Comprehensive Plan, related policies, and the Master Plans while looking forward on how to implement House Bill 2001, as well as the City of Wilsonville's Equitable Housing Strategic Plan. She thanked the Commission for all of the thoughtful discussions thus far and noted that tonight, the project team was presenting some of the finer details and fine-tuning some of the items the Commission had provided feedback on previously. The project was getting close to being wrapped up into a final package which the Commission would consider in September. Tonight, the project team would also highlight next week's public forum and the Planning Commission's participation in that as the Committee for Citizen Involvement (CCI).

Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager, introduced the project team and began presenting the Middle Housing Parking Standards and Other Updates via PowerPoint, noting tonight's topics would involve the finer details on driveway and parking design, parking standards, and updates to the building design standards. Tonight's discussion would focus was on the last two desired project outcomes regarding usable standards around design and minimizing parking congestion. (Slide 4)

Kate Rogers, Angelo Planning Group (APG), continued the presentation, reviewing the middle housing Draft Code and Plan updates regarding the project team's general approach and the key options for driveway and parking design for several middle housing types.

The Commission responded to the following question from the project team, who also responded to questions as noted (Slide 13):

1. Do the driveway/parking standards appropriately reflect public comment and present the best option for the City?
 - The driveway/parking standards reflected public comment pretty well and the best option for the City. If people wanted more of a single-space driveway, perhaps there should be a little more focus there, but having other design options was good in case a single-space driveway did not fit what was being designed or the lot in particular.
 - No mention had yet been made for considerations in the cluster arrangement to accommodate handicapped or disabled individuals, who would have to deal with group parking rather than having access to their unit.
 - Ms. Rogers stated as far as she knew, there were no ADA requirements with middle housing to provide accessible parking spaces, but that was more of a Building Code than a Development Code issue. The standards did not require shared parking areas, but did allow individual typical garage parking for each unit, so there would not necessarily always be shared parking spaces. Requirements did exist for pedestrian pathways to connect the parking spaces to each of the units, so a hard surface path would connect to the parking spaces.
 - Commissioner Gallagher confirmed she wanted the question to be pursued. Having been disabled for 20 years, she had to leave several places in Portland because she could not have parking close enough to where she was living that was safe for her to move from her car to her front door, particularly in bad weather. She believed addressing ADA requirements should be an issue. Unless accommodation for the disabled was brought up, oftentimes it was overlooked, and yet, it was essential to the person dealing with the disability. She offered to share her perspective to the project team.
 - Specifying some minimum distance between the shared parking and the most distant unit that was accessed from the parking could be sufficient, but with no handicap parking available she was unable to get out of her car in a shared parking situation because a car was right next to hers. ADA requirements and ADA rights should be addressed now before there was a problem.
 - Mr. Pauly replied that he would follow up with the building team to see what options could be integrated if they were not in the Building Code.]

- Chair Mesbah added that ADA requirements had not been part of the Equitable Housing discussion either.
- The consultants had incorporated the feedback from the Commission very well to this point, which was appreciated. The public comments had been interesting to go through, and while not gathered in a scientific way, there were some general tendencies and important concerns that resonated with the Commission's comments and concerns.
- On Slide 9, a corner lot with multiple dwellings was pictured in the lower right-hand corner, yet in the Draft Code Amendments, there was a note at the bottom saying, "Note: Both options are depicted here for illustrative purposes only. The standards do not allow for both options A and B on the same site."
 - Ms. Rogers explained that sites with more than one street frontage on a local street could either have access on one street with a total width of 32 ft for all of the driveways, which could be either one big driveway or multiple smaller driveways, or they could have one driveway per frontage that was a maximum of 16 ft. Having both one frontage with 32 ft of driveway and also a 16-ft wide driveway on the other frontage would be a lot of driveway for one site with only four units. The standards were not totally reflected by what was shown in the image, as there would be more driveway width than what was depicted.
 - The City had the option to allow more driveways or more driveway and move away from the model code to allow more flexibility. On sites with more than one frontage, there was a greater option for providing parking to the rear. For example, if the driveways depicted in Option A were not there, the driveway in Option B could provide access to all of the units, which would be more feasible on a corner lot than on an interior lot. The standards encouraged that direction for parking on corner lots, because parking to the rear preserved more space for fewer curb cuts, was safer and more pleasant for pedestrians, and preserved more on-street parking.
- No public comments from the survey results favored having a shared driveway. Given the number of responses and that there was such a polarized opinion about a shared driveway versus a separate driveway, the focus should be on having separate driveways.
 - Focusing on the single driveway would be more advantageous than looking at shared driveways and reflected the overwhelming public comment.
- Was there a standard or requirement for the number of parking spaces provided based upon the number of cottage clusters? How many additional parking spaces would be considered, especially when taking visitors into account, for example?
 - Ms. Rogers replied the minimum number of spaces that must be provided was not in the design standards but in the minimum parking ratios section of the Code, also included in the packet. She believed one space per dwelling unit was required for all middle housing types. In terms of the maximum, she did not believe there was any limit on how many parking spaces could be provided, though that would be limited based on the size of the site, other development and design standards that would apply, and what the developer wanted to provide. A larger cottage cluster development could potentially have room for extra visitor parking, but in an infill scenario, room for extra parking spaces would be more constrained.
- ADA parking for cottage clusters also needed to be considered as it had not been discussed before and was an important piece that needed to be added to the mix.
- Parking in front of townhouses was only allowed if certain criteria were met; otherwise it had to be in the rear. (Slide 11) Rear-loaded garages did not have a driveway for parking but rather for accessing all of the driveways, which led to street parking density. People did not use their garages for parking very often, especially in middle housing. Garages would be used for storage and probably anything but a car. Driveways in the rear should be at a sufficient depth to allow parking a car.
 - Ms. Rogers agreed that many alley-loaded sites typically did not have the minimum driveway depth, and only had a garage a few feet from the alley.
 - Mr. Pauly added the most important thing was to not have something in the middle. The preference was always having an outside/exterior parking space, but garages should still be allowed. One requirement was having a garage big enough to store a vehicle without also storing trash containers, for which

specific standards had been introduced in Villebois, for example. If garages were used for parking, they should be kept accessible and usable for parking. Some developers did not want to make garages that big because it impacted the floor plan of the house, so they would add a garage from a market standpoint but also meet their minimum parking standard exteriorly. The standard in Villebois required exterior parking to be long enough to be a standardized parking spot rather than a weird, middle-sized driveway that could not be used for parking because it was not big enough. He noted the standards would be double-checked to make sure to avoid the alley-loaded paved areas that did not function as parking and could lead to vehicles sticking out in the alley and other issues the City was trying to avoid in terms of parking congestion.

Mr. Pauly continued the presentation, describing the parking standards proposed to minimize parking congestion.

The Commission responded to the following questions with responses to questions from the project team as noted (Slide 22):

2. Are the recommended new parking standards helpful to ensure usable and accessible parking on-site?
 3. Do the shared visitor parking provisions provide a useful option for development while not unduly reducing lot size or open space?
- Whether the recommended parking standards truly ensured usable and accessible parking was uncertain, but the standards were helpful in trying to understand if usable and accessible parking was feasible.]. The reduced lot size option to provide shared parking presented a problem with who got to use the parking. (Slide 20) The shared visitor parking provision provided a useful option for development based upon the amount of reduction of the lot size, but how many visitor parking spaces would be provided in the example given? It did not seem like that was a good option.
 - Mr. Pauly clarified that the first question was about making the one required parking spot usable and accessible rather than the visitor parking space, and the second question focused on the visitor parking concepts. He confirmed the question was not about ensuring the parking spot would get used as a parking spot but rather ensuring the spot was usable as a parking spot.
 - Additional methods of putting up signage inside private garages and having other enforcement mechanisms to ensure garages were used for parking seemed intrusive as opposed requiring dimensions to make it possible or more likely that they would be used for parking. A large enough garage with a big enough turning radius to get in and out, for example, made the garage more usable for parking.
 - The Commissioners agreed garage privacy should not be invaded.
 - People might not use the garages very often, even if they were made the right size. Not all garage-based parking worked very well, so other ways of ensuring parking options, such as driveways, should be explored.
 - The shared visitor parking provisions were effective at providing additional visitor parking options without undue burden on the site overall.
 - The new parking standards were not helpful. Even with garages large enough to fit most cars, the cars were still in the driveways because people wanted the covered space. If the City wanted to ensure an on-site parking space, a requirement for an outdoor parking space was needed, and the only way to ensure maximizing the probability that people would park in the area designated as parking.
 - Parking space had to be provided, but whether the new parking standards would be helpful was a conundrum
 - Ensuring that parking was not competing with trash and recycling container storage and that there was adequate size for both would avoid undersized garages automatically being used for storage. Having adequately sized, usable and accessible parking on the street, in a shared parking area, or in a driveway was important because undersized parking in those outside areas was problematic.

- Mr. Pauly clarified the parking space size requirement would apply for both garage and exterior parking. (Slide 17)
- Increasing the garage size would not necessarily promote garage parking, since people would see the space as more storage room.
- While some Commissioners did not like the concept of reducing open space to create parking, the shared parking provisions were a useful option. [1:569:15]
- Having an HOA maintain enforcement of how parking was utilized would work, but there would probably be some cyclical pain points if the City relied exclusively on the HOA to enforce the parking.
- The parking issue was a sticky problem that came down to human nature. Ultimately, the only thing that could be done in terms of Code was to force people to use their space for parking, or to not have a car, or to park in some distant location, which would also require strict enforcement by the HOA or the City of whatever restrictions the community was able to establish. Some HOAs had certain prohibitions on parking, and if all of the allowable curb was used, there was no recourse except to park outside of the immediate neighborhood. Many Wilsonville neighborhoods did not have much curb space, and people with alley entrances often used the curbs out in front. All that could be done was to hope people would regulate themselves, and if parking became so restricted because of usages, they must use their garages, park in a distant location or give up their car. There was no good solution Code wise, and it caused a built-in community friction when there was not enough space for all of the cars.
- If adequate parking was not ensured inside the garages based on design standards, the garages would not get used as car storage. Adequate garage parking should be ensured, because even if the garage did not end up not being used for a car, it could be used for a car.
 - Storage was an issue that was tied to affordability. In Wisconsin, basements were used for storage, which added to the cost of houses, but that market there was not at the cutting end of affordability like Wilsonville. As prices increase, approaches to cutting costs became part of the design of the house, and not having a basement was one approach. With the proper design and engineering, basements could be constructed in this area, but crawl spaces were cheaper. The needs that were satisfied with that level of facility in a house ended up getting displaced somewhere else, and in Wilsonville, it had gone into the garage. Even a two-and-a-half car garage would still end up only housing one car and one in the driveway, and the rest would be storage or an exercise area, for example. Making sure the garage was the right proportion was a no-brainer.
- In Charbonneau, visitor parking worked fine and the HOA did not have to do anything, but there were also driveways and garages. In a cul-de-sac of 21 houses, there were seven parking visitor spaces, and on some Friday nights, they were all used along with some spaces on the street, which worked.
- Grasscrete could be used for visitor parking so that at least some of the open space function, such as groundwater recharge, was maintained and runoff was minimized.
- Urban areas have urbanity to them. Most people usually did not feel irritated if they could not find a parking space right in front of their house. Part of urban living was getting used to driving a block down the street to find a parking space and just being happy to find one. Nobody would think to live in Chicago and have no street parking because everybody had a parking garage and parked inside. Parking on the street was part of the urban fabric.
 - Wilsonville was a suburban area on the edges of the urban area, and people were trying to maintain the aesthetic that had been part of Wilsonville as it was a smaller village and had grown into a bigger city. At some point, the City would get used to being a more urban area. The central redesign for downtown would have parking ramps but also on-street parking, and that was part of the downtown image.
- All of the approaches were helpful in dealing with the fact that the community was not a walkable community and still car dependent. Car dependence would eventually be reduced with the use of autonomous cars that did not need to be parked while shopping and doing business because they could go dock themselves somewhere. However, the use of autonomous cars seemed to be far away.

- Constructing a lot of infrastructure for something that might not be here in 25 years was not desirable. Maybe at that point, a lot of studio units would be built as second apartments in the garages that were so nicely dimensioned by the City.

Mr. Pauly noted that with regard to the building design standards, he had driven through some neighborhoods to see what made houses look like single-family homes. He had visited Villebois to see the different design standards for middle housing there, revisited the First Addition in Lake Oswego where middle housing was mixed in with single-family. He focused on which houses did and did not look like they fit in with single-family, and why. He had discussed those findings with the design team as well as the Commission's comments about housing variety and how detailed the variety should be, and he believed the team had come up with some good solutions.

Ms. Rogers continued the presentation, reviewing the updated building design standards for both single-family and middle housing citywide based on the Commission's feedback about architectural standards and concerns about unnecessarily increasing costs. Mr. Pauly also provided additional comments.

The Commission responded to the following questions with responses to questions from the project team as noted (Slide 29):

4. Does the updated house plan variety language strike the right balance of avoiding aesthetically monotonous development while not unduly increasing development cost?
5. Does the Commission support the two-pronged approach to encouraging "single-family like architecture" by (a) encouraging architectural elements that visually tie together different units and (b) requiring a variety of architectural elements?

- The Commissioners all agreed that the project team's approach was on target, and they liked the improvements to the design standards. They commended the project team for incorporating the Commission's feedback.

Mr. Pauly encouraged the Commissioners to e-mail or call him with any further comments. Noting the virtual Public Forum on July 20th, he described the role of the CCI which was another hat the Commission wore to lead involvement, get input, and exchange of ideas in a less formal format than a public hearing. He believed this was an ideal time for the CCI, as there had been some great public input during the middle housing project with the survey, virtual meetings, and the focus groups with the Latinx community. The feedback from the public helped inform the middle housing project, so now was a good time to get back out in the community, share what had been done, what had been heard, how the project had come to fruition, and to remind the community about what the middle housing project was all about and its anticipated impact on the community.

- The CCI format was similar to a panel discussion He and the APG team would present some of the more technical components and telling some of the story. However, he had been very impressed with the Commission's ability to tell part of the story and hoped the Commission could share their experiences and thought processes as part of the CCI panel. He had heard some compelling discussions from the Commission that he hoped could be brought into the public forum as well, including honoring past planning and how the project related to the Frog Pond West Master Plan; the requirements in Frog Pond West and how they related to the Master Plan; and the general idea of keeping the look and feel of existing neighborhoods.
- He sought feedback from the Commissioners about whether these were the right topics for discussion, if additional topics should be shared with the community, and if any Commissioners wanted to take a lead on any certain topic and do additional preparation and be the lead to start the story during the presentation.

Commissioner Willard noted she had advocated for honoring the past planning process and not jeopardizing the trust in that process, but hearing from the other Commissioners how not inclusive that process was and how it amplified a minimum minority's voice versus the entire community's voice. Brining that to the conversation was important to help people understand why the Commission would take such a drastic measure. The public

needed to be informed that while going back and reopening past planning work was a drastic measure, it was being done with very good intentions to make sure to take into consideration the needs of the community.

Mr. Pauly agreed the community's voice and the discussion about the different voices heard was important to highlight better. He confirmed the presentation would outline what the discussions had been. He encouraged the Commissioners to be prepared for the conversation and offered to e-mail the presentation topics so the Commissioners could note what they want to share.

Ms. Bateschell added the idea was that Mr. Pauly was looking to support all of the Commissioners in the event and as a part of the CCI panel. Hearing from the Commissioners individually and not just through Staff or the project team was important for the community to understand the nature of the discussions, the Commissioner's positions, and the conclusions the Commission had come to on a few points that were salient to the project and to the community members. The project team was trying to think through what high-level points to summarize and would work with the Commissioners who were willing to be on the panel ahead of time to think back on what had been discussed and the salient conclusions drawn over the past nine months to develop the talking points. Staff understood the Commissioners were volunteering their time tonight and again next week to participate in the forum, so they were willing to work with the Commissioners to make the process as easy as possible, because offering the voice of the Commission instead of just the voice of Staff was beneficial. Staff wanted to hear about any conclusions that had been drawn through the process, and she encouraged following up with Mr. Pauly independently in preparation for the Public Forum next week.

Chair Mesbah believed the forum was a great idea, adding that the Commissioners' thinking had evolved as they had asked questions, seen evidence, and received responses from the community that expanded their own view of what they were dealing with. Through the conversations, the Commissioners had come to a very different set of conclusions than they would have probably jumped to nine months ago when the project began because all of the impacts and issues were not yet known. The purpose was to inform the community of the evolution of the formation and continuation of the idea of Wilsonville being an equitable community for all, as opposed to just a selective or exclusive few. The story to be told was of the journey the Commission had been on that was coming to a conclusion with the last pieces falling in place.

Commissioner Heberlein said he wished he could be there to support the meeting next week. A lot had changed since the 2017 planning process for Frog Pond, and the expectations as a nation, a city, and as individuals had changed in terms of where the priorities were now versus where they were four years ago. He believed a key thing to highlight in the conversation next week was that Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) was not talked about a lot in 2017. There were twinges on the periphery, but DEI was not a focus area, and the changes now were bringing DEI more to the forefront as something in which all of the community could participate. He added that while DEI was more of a focus, the City was also trying to minimize the impact to already developed neighborhoods while still doing the right thing.

Commissioner Gallagher added she felt pretty objective being so new still, but in her observation of and the privilege she felt serving on the Commission, this forum was a branding opportunity. She was not sure the community in general understood the Commission's intention, and perhaps that would be a way to approach how the Commissioners presented themselves. The intention was to hold onto everything that was good and special about Wilsonville and at the same time, apply the requirements imposed upon the City, while figuring out how to make changes and still respect the things that people valued the most. From the few e-mails and comments received from the community, she had the impression there were factions in the city that felt the Commission was against them and did not have their interests at heart. This forum was an opportunity for Commissioners to present themselves as having the best of intentions with a very firm ethical position of trying to do the best and look to the future for a city that they all cared about.

Mr. Pauly noted the topics Staff would cover included describing middle housing, revisiting HB 2001, discussing density and parking, and talking about the areas most impacted, the target timeline and involvement. He

thanked the Commission for its many hours spent talking through middle housing, which would be very important to the community and be a legacy for many years.

IV. INFORMATIONAL

- A. City Council Action Minutes (June 7 & 21, 2021) (No staff presentation)
- B. 2021 PC Work Program (No staff presentation)

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, stated that with the governor's announcement on June 30th that all COVID-19 restrictions were removed, operations at City Hall had changed as well. Masks were no longer required in the building. Mask were still allowed and provided at the front door along with multiple hand sanitizer stations, and good precautionary behaviors were still encouraged. The City was moving towards having all board, commission, and other meetings back to the prior in-person format. City Council had already begun to meet in person. Current protocol had been maintained for July, but Staff was excited to see the Commission in person in August at City Hall. Opportunities would continue to be provided for citizens to participate both at City Hall as well as virtually or remotely as had been done throughout COVID-19. She encouraged Commissioners with questions to reach out to her directly.

- She clarified that Staff had not yet discussed the possibility of Commissioners who were traveling to dial into meetings rather than having to miss the meeting, which was hard particularly with public hearings.

Commissioner Heberlein noted as a pre-COVID-19 frequent traveler, he would like to recommend Staff investigate the possibility, because he expected he would be traveling again and he still wanted to participate when the schedule did not allow him to attend Planning Commission meetings in person.

Commissioner Greenfield added the mechanism was already set up and the Commission was used to attending meetings virtually, so he believed it was an ongoing resource that should be taken advantage of as necessary, such as for illness, for example.

Ms. Bateschell stated there were complications in having the Commission meet in hybrid, which was experienced by City Council where it was either all-in or all-out. Having the opportunity to call in might be possible rather than using the video, and Staff could work with the IT Department to figure out how to make that work. Some advanced notice would be needed, but she believed Staff could figure it out. She reminded an entire public meeting was held during a wildfire when nobody was at City Hall.

V. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Mesbah adjourned the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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