

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

**Development Review Board – Panel B  
Minutes– October 25, 2021 6:30 PM**

---

**I. Call to Order**

Chair **Samy Nada** called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

**II. Chair’s Remarks**

The Conduct of Hearing and Statement of Public Notice were read into the record.

**III. Roll Call**

Present for roll call were: Samy Nada, Nicole Hendrix, Jason Abernathy, Katie Dunwell, and Michael Horn

Staff present: Daniel Pauly, Barbara Jacobson, Miranda Bateschell, [Kimberly Rybold](#), Cindy Luxhoj, and Shelley White

**IV. Citizens’ Input** This is an opportunity for visitors to address the Development Review Board on items not on the agenda. There were no comments.

**V. Consent Agenda:**

A. Approval of minutes of September 27, 2021 DRB Panel B meeting

**Nicole Hendrix moved to approve the September 27, 2021 DRB Panel B meeting minutes as presented. Jason Abernathy seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.**

**VI. Public Hearings:**

**A. Resolution No. 393-B. Villebois Village Center Mixed Use Development: Pacific Community Design – Representative for Costa Pacific Communities – Applicant and RCS Villebois Development LLC – Owner.** The applicant is requesting approval of a SAP Central Amendment, Preliminary Development Plan (1) and Plan Modifications (2), Final Development Plans (3), and Type C Tree Plans (3) for a mixed-use development located in the Villebois Village Center. The subject sites are located on Tax Lots 2100 and 2800 of Section 15AC and Tax Lot 8600 of Section 15DB, Township 3 South, Range 1 West, Willamette Meridian, City of Wilsonville, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Cindy Luxhoj

Case Files:

DB21-0010	SAP Central Amendment (PDP 12 C Lot 76, Bldgs A, B)
DB21-0011	Preliminary Development Plan (PDP 12 C Lot 76, Bldg A, B)
DB21-0012	Final Development Plan (PDP 12 C Lot 76, Bldgs A, B)
DB21-0013	Type C Tree Removal Plan (PDP 12 C Lot 76, Bldgs A, B)

- DB21-0014 Preliminary Development Plan (PDP 2 C Lot 73, Bldg C)
- DB21-0015 Final Development Plan (PDP 2 C Lot 73, Bldg C)
- DB21-0016 Type C Tree Removal Plan (PDP 2 C Lot 73, Bldg C)
- DB21-0022 Preliminary Development Plan (PDP 1 C Lot 12, Parking)
- DB21-0023 Final Development Plan (PDP 1 C Lot 12, Parking)
- DB21-0024 Type C Tree Removal Plan (PDP 1 C Lot 12, Parking)

*This item was continued to this date and time certain at the September 27, 2021 DRB Panel B meeting.*

**Chair Nada** called the public hearing to order at 6:37 p.m. and read the conduct of hearing format into the record. All Board members declared for the record that they had visited the site. No Board member, however, declared a conflict of interest, bias, or conclusion from a site visit. No Board member participation was challenged by any member of the audience.

Chair Nada called for the Staff report and recommendation.

Chair Nada	And if a—because this is the second time we’re going through the same stuff and I’m sure the City Staff are not going to repeat the whole thing, I just—yeah. And this request goes for the staff, goes for the applicant, goes for all the testimonies. Let’s just try to be brief and try to only—try not to state any of the information that was stated before, unless like clear questions from people show that they didn’t get that—get what was—what happened at the last meeting. And also, because we—now I have the list of those who wishing to testify, every testimony is going to be only two minutes because we have quite a number of people, more than last time. So, please know this now, and maybe order, rewrite, or whatever, organize what you’re going to say, so make sure within those two minutes you can say whatever you want to say. This is for the citizen—for their own testimony. So, it’s going to be two minutes. I wanted to give you a heads up so you organize your time accordingly. With this, I’ll give the staff the podium.
Barbara Jacobson	To follow-up quickly on the Chair’s remarks, people who testified last time don’t have to testify again tonight. Your testimony is already in the record. So, unless you have something different you need to say tonight, you don’t need to feel like you have to testify tonight, because you’re already covered. You’re already in the record.
Dan Pauly	And there’s quite a bit on the agenda tonight, so your courtesy in getting through testimony quickly would be much appreciated by the Board.
Chair Nada	Sounds good. Cindy, want to go ahead?
Cindy Luxhoj	Thank you, Chair Nada. I’m Cindy Luxhoj, Associate Planner. And I don’t have a PowerPoint tonight. I just want to give a very brief presentation. I’d like to take a few minutes to summarize the updates about the project that were outlined in Staff memo to DRB dated October 18 <sup>th</sup> , as part of the packet tonight. With respect to alley width, it has come to Staff’s attention—and so I point it out—by a DRB

	<p>member who measured it in the field that a portion of the alley in the areas of the planned angled parking spaces on Lot 12 is not built to full width. Staff suggests a condition of approval requiring widening of the alley to match the remainder of the alley, and that standard-type parking spaces be able to be installed while still maintaining the standard alley width. And, the suggested condition of approval as outlined in the memo is DRB 1. The drive aisle on the southwest side of the alley between the existing trash enclosure and the curb of the alley shall be widened to match that on the other side of the trash enclosure. No parking spaces shall be allowed to extend into the widened alley further than the parking spaces on the other side of the trash enclosure. And then, with respect to use of Lot 12 parking spaces, the alley-based access to the parking on Lot 12 would not be evident from SW Barber St and SW Villebois Dr. A driver unfamiliar with the area would need directional signs in order to find the access. In order to remove the need for directional signs and potentially limit the frequency of trips in the alley, a condition of approval is recommended that limits parking on Lot 12 to reserved parking for residents and/or employees. These drivers would likely know the access and not need directional signs. Suggested condition of approval language is DRB 2, "All parking spaces on Lot 12 shall be reserved parking for residents and/or employees." The memo included two public comments that were received after the hearing on September 27th, and those were DRB 20—oh, DB—D26 and D27, Exhibits D26 and D27. And then since the memo of October 18th, additional materials have been received that I would like to enter into the record as well. And these include Exhibit A4, which is the Staff memo that I just outlined; Exhibit B6, which is the Applicant's Waiver of the 120-day Rule; Exhibit B7, which is the Applicant's Response to Updated Conditions of Approval and Michelle Sandlin's comment letter dated October 15<sup>th</sup>; Exhibit 20—D28, which is a comment from J. Fogerty; and Exhibit D9—or D29. I'm sorry, D29, which is a comment from Michelle Sandlin. That concludes my presentation. The Applicant is also participating in the meeting and is prepared to speak when invited to by the DRB. Thank you.</p>
Chair Nada	Okay, thanks, Cindy. Any member of the Development Review Board have any questions for Cindy?
Jason Abernathy	Hi, this is Jason. Cindy, question for you. For the widening of the street, will the builder have to purchase additional property, or is that figured out under easement or right-of-way? Or how will they have to acquire that property to widen that, because there is a curb in that area—there is a landscaping area that would have to be widened out there. That might be more of a question for Dan.
Mr. Pauly	<a href="#">[Inaudible 00:17:16]</a> the property in question is already owned by the Applicant. That whole section that's undeveloped where the temporary curb was, is already owned by the Applicant as part of Lot 12.
Mr. Abernathy	Okay.

Mr. Pauly	They can do all the improvements, add the parking, widen the alley, everything, on property they currently own.
Mr. Abernathy	Okay, great. Thank you.
Chair Nada	Okay, any other questions for the Staff?
Michael Horn	Cindy, this is Michael. I noticed in the packet, was the fence being lowered from six-ft to five, as well?
Ms. Luxhoj	Yes, and actually, the Applicant is going to speak to that when they make their presentation.
Mr. Horn	Okay, okay. Sounds great
Chair Nada	Any other questions?
Mr. Abernathy	I do have another question about the widening. If you look at the side of it — exclusively Palermo is the alley way, I believe, or going to it. It looks—if you’re looking as the—going into it from—let me get out of Street View. Essentially, it goes alley to a driveway area, and there’s not any portion as you’re coming out and they can—holy cow, how can I get out of here? Sorry, got it. I wish I could share my screen. I’ve got Google Maps up and I’m looking down at it right now. And the one alleyway that comes—that ends up on “Toleese,” —Toulouse, whatever it is, as Palermo comes around, that is very narrow and there’s no way there it looks like to widen that. Are they—are we asking for an exemption there? Because I believe, looking at some of the packet work, I don’t know how that would be widened to accommodate this.
Mr. Pauly	So, first of all, let me clarify. I know Google labels it as Palermo, but it’s actually not a named street. That’s incorrect. It’s all that—all the houses are either addressed on Villebois Dr, Barber St, or Toulouse St.
Mr. Abernathy	Correct.
Mr. Pauly	Palermo St is just a misnomer. So, it is a private driveway that’s existing that nothing in this application would trigger any change there.
Mr. Abernathy	So, it wouldn’t change that?
Mr. Pauly	The access to Toulouse? No. There’d be nothing to trigger that. That’s a standard alley access.
Mr. Abernathy	So, essentially, that would not be a throughway for this parking area.
Mr. Pauly	Again, this parking area—this property has had legal access through this existing alley since 2007. And that’s not changing here.
Mr. Abernathy	No, correct. I understand that. I’m just wondering about the widening of it to support two-way traffic.
Mr. Pauly	So, the widening for—there’s just a narrow—the portion that’s north of the third single-family home that backs up to the alley, there’s that landscaped area there. That’s the only area where there’s a temporary curb that would be widened. The rest of it—the alley, like that goes up from Toulouse, is already built at full build-

	out. It's just around the corner, kind of that south—that southeast corner of the curb is the area that has a temporary curb that would be widened with this project.
Mr. Abernathy	Okay, so that—still, what would cause traffic not to go toward Toulouse then?
Mr. Pauly	The traffic will still—I mean, traffic can go either way in the alley. It's a standard-width alley that exists throughout the development. The question is essentially, you would like—when the alley was built, there's that undeveloped portion where the parking—the alley parking is proposed that was not built out. The rest of the alley was built out. It's just kind of that vacant area there where the parking proposed that is changing. The rest of the alley does not change.
Mr. Abernathy	Okay, so the part that they're doing, that was proposed before to have, I believe, six slots of diagonal or parallel—or not parallel, diagonal parking. Is that correct?
Mr. Pauly	Four.
Mr. Abernathy	Four. Are they doing away with that?
Mr. Pauly	They're reducing it to two parallel spaces, which allows for the wider alley. No diagonal spaces. And they—I believe their presentation likely has that, or it's in the material that they submitted earlier this afternoon, as well.
Mr. Abernathy	Okay.
Chair Nada	Good, is that it? Okay, so unless anybody else have any other questions to Staff? Okay, I've got two quick questions. First, if you're going to have this parking restricted to the employee or the resident of that area, who's going to enforce? Who's going to be responsible for enforcing the rules?
Mr. Pauly	The property owner or the home—or an associate—or the Association.
Chair Nada	Or the Association, okay. So, again, kind of—kind of to—
Mr. Pauly	[inaudible 00:23:18] call a tow truck.
Chair Nada	Sorry? What was that?
Mr. Pauly	Just like in the other private parking lot, if someone's in your reserved spot, you'll call the tow truck.
Chair Nada	Okay. So, my other question is kind of like a piggyback to what Jason was saying. So, basically, what you're saying is, everything that was developed, any part of the alley that was fully developed was—it was built to the standard widths, and everything was fine. Only the part that was not developed yet, this was the only part that was less than the standard and part of this application is going to be widen to be the standard or the—have a part according to the Code. Is this correct?
Mr. Pauly	That's correct.
Chair Nada	Okay, so I have no further questions and unless any other member of the Development Review Board has a question for Staff, I will—yeah, I will ask the Applicant to present. So, will the Applicant please come to the podium with the

	<p>microphone or commence your presentation on—unmuted on Zoom? State your name, address, and present any testimonies you would like to present to the Development Review Board.</p>
Rudy Kadlub	<p>Yeah. Good evening, Chair Nada, members of the Design Review Board. My name is Rudy Kadlub, 9420 SE Lawnfield Rd, Clackamas, Oregon. I am the master developer and master planner of Villebois. Our involvement—and I’ll be brief because we kind of went through this last time as well. Our involvement goes back to the beginning of the planning of Villebois nearly two decades ago in 2001. Our planning took over two-and-a-half years of initial master planning to convert a otherwise blighted State hospital building into what has become Villebois, a nationally award-winning community. As a matter of fact, during those—that period of time, we used a number of nationally-renowned residential architects, commercial lot architects, land planners, and landscape architects to develop what has won more—a community that has won more awards than any community in the Northwest, including the National Association of Home Builders Master-Planned Community of the Year. In fact, Villebois has become a model for many communities not as large, but similar, new urban communities throughout the metro region. Our alley design has become a model for many of the jurisdictions around the region. And you can see this repeated throughout numerous suburban and urban areas, 20-ft right-of-way and 16-ft of driving surface. To clarify, I know there was some people measuring the asphalt out there, but the driving surface for the alleys is 16-ft, which includes two 1-ft curb pans, drainage pans, on either side that are concrete that are considered drivable. So, there’s 16-ft of drivable surface and in 20-ft of right-of-way. You asked me to get together with the opponents previously. I did reach out to the person who held themselves out as a contact person of the opponents. There were no new issues brought up in the discussion I had with that individual other than their concern for their property values. Nonetheless, we have addressed the concerns—some of the concerns to the best of our abilities. And my associate here, Stacey Connery, will review some of the changes in the acceptance of the conditions that the Staff has laid out for us. Stacey?</p>
Stacey Connery	<p>Thank you, Rudy. Stacey Connery, Pacific Community Design, 12564 SW Main St, Tigard, 97223. Let’s see, can everyone see the screen? Okay, thank you. Okay, so I wanted to share some of what we have concluded. We have spent some time since the last hearing reviewing the comments that were made at the hearing and reviewing our plans to see if there were some practical ways that we could respond to some of the comments that we’ve heard. And I’ll just touch on the alley width, just to illustrate. This is the portion of the alley that is also a part of Lot 12 and is owned by the owner of Lot 12. There is a public access easement across the entirety of the alley. However, this area is controlled by the owner/developer of Lot 12. And, it was left in a temporary state with a temporary curb that went right along this area with a landscaped berm until</p>

development of Lot 12 occurs. And that is what you see under this proposal today is the proposal to develop Lot 12 for a parking area that will be accessory to the mixed-use building surrounding the Piazza. And we are in acceptance of Staff's recommended conditions for improving the alley here to the standard. That was part of our plan, actually, to bring this to the standard width of a 16-ft travel surface. We have looked at the diagonal spaces provided and determined that it would be safer and more functional in this area to convert those to two parallel spaces. And so, that is what you're seeing on this graphic is the proposal to switch those to two parallel spaces.

We are in agreement with Staff's recommended condition that these parking spaces be limited to residents and employees of the mixed-use buildings. And so that will—Staff has noted that will keep the use of this parking lot to people who are actually living in the area or working in the area and will know where the access points are and be able to access this parking area without confusion or added traffic issues. Let's see—oops. I'm skipping ahead. This graphic just shows the pavement areas that will be part of the improvements that would be built as part of Lot 12, pavement that would be added to bring it to a six—bring the travel surface to a 16-ft width and provide sufficient area for the two parallel spaces. There would remain some area for landscaping to continue to provide a buffer between this parking and the adjacent residents. This shows the paved area of the parking lot. And we did work with Staff to review the height of the fence and determined that we could lower the height of the fence from 6-ft to 5-ft. And what I'd just like to remind everyone, it is a vine fence type which will not be 100% blocking view in and out of the parking lot. And we also do have three pedestrian connections to Villebois Dr which will also provide viewpoints in and out of the parking area. And with a 5-ft fence instead of a 6-ft fence, it does enhance the visibility in and out of the parking area. And we have also been able to pull the fence back from the corner than was previously shown in our application to add back into the plan a little plaza space here and continue to provide the benches that currently exist out there, you know, recognizing that this corner has been used for a school bus stop and has become part of the community. That way we can still provide this. And we spent some time, as I said at the beginning of this, trying to see what we could do to address some of these concerns. And we do think this goes a certain ways towards trying to address some of the concerns about the congestion in this corner and the visibility around the street frontage. We do feel like this will be an amenity for the community. and there have been some comments made about, "Why are you doing the parking lot? Why is it necessary?" And we have included it because we feel it will alleviate some of the on-street parking pressures that are out there. And those are concerns that we have heard over many, many years of working in Villebois is concerns about the on-street parking. And the fact of the matter is basically everything around the Piazza has developed before the mixed-use buildings, and so everyone has kind of expanded out into the space that was

	<p>there—that wasn't being utilized by these future mixed-use buildings. And when these buildings do go in, they have—as we discussed at the last meeting—they have the right to utilize their on-street parking along the frontage. And we feel this parking lot will alleviate some of those pressures that the on-street parking may experience. And by limited—limiting it to the use of the residents and the employees, it helps to minimize what would be experienced on this alley. And just a reminder, again, these alleys are private access through these blocks which are fully accessible with public free—public street frontage all the way around the block, which is where emergency vehicles and fire vehicles are planned to access from, if necessary. These private alleys are intended for just localized residential use, and they're deliberately narrow to encourage people to drive slow because they are private and at the—at the private side of the uses that exist on these blocks. And so, that is part of their function. And let's see, anything else? I guess we'll open it to questions. We'd be happy to answer any questions you have.</p>
Chair Nada	<p>Okay. Thanks, Stacey. Any Development Review Board member have questions for Stacey or the Applicant?</p>
Mr. Horn	<p>This is Michael Horn. I have a couple questions for you guys. So, I think based on the picture that you're showing right now on the screen, is the width of the alleyway the same on—coming from both directions into the parking lot? (Slide 2, Sheet 3, Applicant's PowerPoint)</p>
Ms. Connery	<p>Both directions into the parking lot? The alley standard is a 16-ft travel width that is measured from gutter pan to gutter pan. This portion of the alley was constrained because it—when that construction occurred, the franchise utilities located their vaults initially, and that encroached into the space. If I recall correctly, it's like 15.5-ft is the travel width, so it is just under 16-ft when you go gutter pan to gutter pan. These alleys do have mountable curbs which are also drivable, which adds to that space that can potentially be driven on by vehicles entering and exiting. This is not part of Lot 12. It is part of a tract that is owned by the HOA, and so it's not subject to this application.</p>
Mr. Horn	<p>Gotcha. Yeah, okay. I was just kind of getting back to what Jason was talking about earlier and trying to clarify for myself, so. Another question that I have on the—on the memorandum that was sent this morning about the total number of parking spaces. So—and let me just get to that part of the—I have to go back and forth between the camera and the—but the mixed-use development, it's required, and I guess that's part of the build. It's required to provide 149 parking spaces. And the project is designed to provide 138 off-street and 45 on, for 183. Correct?</p>
Ms. Connery	<p>Yes.</p>
Mr. Horn	<p>So, is it true that that the parking on Lot 12 is kind of an overbuild of parking in a way? You are attempting to offload some of the—as you said, some of the on-street parking into this lot?</p>
Ms. Connery	<p>Yes, this parking lot is intended to alleviate some of that on-street parking</p>



	pressure. The—
Mr. Horn	But the lot itself—the lot itself does not—is not required as—in the count of the overall numbers is what I'm saying. I think you said in the last meeting that you were 22% or so over the number of the parking spots you would need.
Ms. Connery	Yes. One thing to keep in mind is the Development Code does allow for reductions in required on-street parking spaces through the provision of additional bicycle parking and through the provision of motorcycle parking. And this project is taking advantage of both of those options to reduce our required amount of off-street parking.
Mr. Horn	Ah, I see. Thanks for clarifying
Ms. Connery	Sure.
Mr. Horn	Okay, that's all the questions I have.
Mr. Abernathy	So, this is Jason. Going back to street width because that's—this is where I'm—16-ft, 6 is what we're saying. Firetruck's 10-ft. And this is where I'm—and I kind of want to ask the city this. With having a two lane—and I know this is private property. I understand this is a private drive. But to an access to this, because we will have the ability—we'll need fire trucks in there in that area possibly, God forbid. Do we find it to be safe? Has TVF&R looked at this, is my question, to kind of give a, okay, we can make this work. I would like to bring up one of the—I just got it to the City—the Villebois petition, they posted pictures of vehicles going down these alleys. This is the same concern I've seen when I was out there. When you have trash cans—and you're talking about encroaching with the gutter pan. You're encroaching on someone's driveway with kids, everything out there. You have air conditioning units that sit on—I mean, my gosh, it's literally 4 inches from the gutter pan. I just get concerned of right-of-way.
Mr. Pauly	So, first of all, going way back to the master planning, part of what allows for alternative street design throughout Villebois and alley access is that all buildings in Villebois are fire sprinkled. And TVF&R was very much in the middle that conversation and has approved these designs. Again, the alleys that we are talking about have existed for 15 years. So, there's just one portion that is being widened by these. Really widening or changing the existing alleys of other people's properties is not in this Board's purview this evening. And they have access, it's legal access—it's—so this is—I mean I have an answer to your question, but it's kind of a moot point at this point. So, a fire truck access from the front—and in terms of those actual houses that face the alley, they are fully sprinkled and approved for construction by TVF&R with the limited fire truck access.
Ms. Connery	So, can I add to what Dan has said? As he was indicating, TVF&R has been involved in the design of this project since the very early stages, and they also review each development application as part of that review process. The entirety of Villebois is designed with the concept that fire truck access would occur from public streets. The fire trucks will not be driving down the private alleys. And

	<p>part of that agreement has required all of the structures in the project to be fully sprinkled. And TVF&amp;R has evaluated these streets and these projects to confirm that this meets the design intent and the—what they understood to be how they would provide access to projects. In the comment that you made about the gutter pan being on someone's lot, it's not actually accurate. The gutter pan is part of the alley tract. The mountable curb, too, is also part of the alley tract. The alley tract is 20-ft-wide and is—the standard is to have a 16-ft-wide travel surface, gutter pan to gutter pan, and then a mountable curb on each side. All of that is within the 20-ft-wide tract, so it's not actually on someone's property.</p>
Mr. Abernathy	<p>So, adding to that 'cause I used to live in Villebois, so I had an alleyway also—I lived on the alleyway. Who is—after this is turned over to the HOA, it's the HOA's responsibility for road maintenance, correct, or private road maintenance. Is that correct?</p>
Ms. Connery	<p>Yes.</p>
Mr. Abernathy	<p>Has that been approved through the HOAs for this?</p>
Mr. Pauly	<p>Yeah, so, let me cut in there. First of all, this access has, again, existed for 15 years. I'd also like to provide further clarification on how fire access and fire approval occurs in the city. It is not the purview of the Development Review Board. Our fire—TVF&amp;R has a process where they do a service provider letter at the beginning to confirm that the development preliminarily meets the Fire Code. And then they review all construction plans to ensure it meets Fire Code. So, that's not something—I mean, they're an independent agency that reviews that, and so, that's not really our purview. In terms of access, you know, it's required to be maintained, again—that legal access that exists. And there's associations, there's owners for that. That, you know, I think I'd advise the Board for moving away from this alley discussion. These are legal alleys that exist today that have legal access that have existed for 15 years, so I'll just leave it at that.</p>
Mr. Abernathy	<p>But—and I appreciate that. I understand that. I'm thinking of everything on a phase of safety. That's the only reason that I'm actually making these comments is just, I want to make sure we're safe in this, that we're protecting the city and protecting everybody. And that's only reason I'm bringing this up. I—you know, the only reason I'm thinking of it is you're adding 24 more cars to a mix of a daily use.</p>
Mr. Pauly	<p><a href="#">[Inaudible 00:46:18]</a></p>
Mr. Abernathy	<p>That's the only reason I'm looking at that in this way, as you and I have talked about before. You know, I love the process, what we're doing. I love that we're building the area. I think it's a great thing. I just want to make sure that the City's safe and we're safe and the builder's safe. You know, I just want to make sure everybody is okay. You know, I'm being—I'm just being the devil's advocate in here for that sake. So, I'll stop on that, and I'll go on. So, thank you for your time.</p>

Mr. Pauly	Yeah, and our Building Code—I mean, we have Building Code, we have Fire Code, we have all sorts of safety codes that are reviewed independent of what the Development Review Board does as well.
Chair Nada	And if I can have one last question then. And the current project or current application as it stands is satisfying all those code requirements—safety, Fire Code, and everything. Is this correct?
Mr. Pauly	Correct, and it'll be continued during construction to be reviewed by all the relevant agencies to ensure safety standards. So, they do preliminary review. They have reviewed them. They'll continue to look at the details as the project is built.
Chair Nada	Yeah, but the application as it stands is accord—is everything in this application is according to the current city Code or the city Code that was in place at the time of the application. Correct?
Mr. Pauly	That's correct.
Chair Nada	Okay. Thanks, Dan. So, any other questions to the Applicant from the Development Review Board members or the Staff? Okay, so thanks, Stacey. Thanks, everyone. And with this, we're going to go to the public testimonies. So, please—and Shelley's going to put the instructions here. If you wish to testify, as I just heard that there's no citizen out there—there's no one at the City Council—City Chambers, so it looks like all the testimonies are going to be via Zoom. So, if you wish to testify, please raise your hand. Use the raise your hand feature. If you don't know how to do so, please look at the shared screen right now as it shows the instructions how to do so. I can see two phone numbers. I'm assuming there's two people calling via the phone, so I'm sure the—I don't think they can see this information, so I'm going to assume that they want to testify. And I'm going to call the numbers because I don't have names here, unless Shelley has names. And if they wish to testify, you can—yeah, you can be unmuted, and try to testify. If not, we're going to move on. So, I'm going to give everybody like 20 seconds. if they wish to testify, please raise your hand. Used the raise your hand feature. And we're going to go from there. And once I have the whole list, I'm going to start going name by name. And again, I'll repeat that. Please state—stick to the two minutes. I hate to cut anybody off during the—before he finishes his point. So, please, finish the two minutes because if—yeah, we have a couple—a lot of people—yeah, at least the list that I had. I don't know how many people are actually going to raise their hand. So, we don't want to be going forever on those testimonies, so limit your testimony to two minutes. The timer is going to start. And I'm just going to say the warning. So, before I call the testimony from the audience, is there any member of the audience at the City Hall who wishes to testify who has not yet filled out a green testimony card, located at the center of the room? If so, please fill out the card right now. If there is any member of the audience in the Zoom call who wishes to testify who is not already indicated so, you wish to testify in this case, raise your hand. Use the raise your hand feature, or if you still have trouble using that, please send a message— a shared message

	to Shelley. And Shelley—and also, I don't have the phone number here. But Dan, can you just—there's a phone number you gave. Yes. So, I think I have the phone number. I don't know if it's the same or not. But if anybody has trouble—wishing to testify and having trouble testifying, I have—the phone number I have is (503) 570-1536.
Mr. Pauly	That's correct.
Chair Nada	Is this correct? Okay, so again, if you wish to testify and you have any issues raising your hand or doing anything, just call the number (503) 570-1536. Okay. Okay. So, I can only see five people who have their hands raise, beside two phone numbers. Is that all? So, okay, so we're going to go ahead. I'd like to go ahead and start with the phone numbers. I'm not sure if they're willing to testify or not. I don't have the names, but there's a phone number—(503) 510-5172.
Shelley White	I will just say if you are listening on the phone, you can press *9, and that will allow you to raise your hand if you would like to testify.
Chair Nada	Yep, I should have read what you said. Yeah, what you had right there, read it. So, yeah, thank you. Thanks, Shelley. So, yep, if you're on the phone, please press *9 if you wish to raise your hand. Otherwise, I only have 5 here, so. Okay, so I'm going to start with the first testimony. I have them listed here, I think, alphabetically. So, the first is Haley, so go ahead and start your testimony.
Haley Sabatini	Hi there. My name is Haley Sabatini. I am a homeowner. I am actually the homeowner of the townhouse directly next to the lot. And this has been my first home purchase. It was a major decision for me. And this was one of the major things that we looked at was the safety of the area that we were moving to, as well as how aesthetically pleasing it was. I grew up in Lake Oswego. I definitely really appreciate and love the design that went into Villebois. It has been a beautiful experience so far. But I am very concerned about the parking lot going in right next to us. I understand that the alleyway behind us has been a functional alleyway for 15 years. However, I think that's 15 years without the new parking lot that's proposed. And I think that new parking lot would absolutely change the area around us. My back bedroom actually faces my back neighbors directly into the alleyway here. I routinely—especially during COVID when I was working from home from my bedroom office here—saw people unable to really pass each other. When I've tried to go into my own garage, which is this very narrow corner area here, it's very difficult for me to load and unload my own possessions for camping and whatnot with my daughter, just how the alleyway already exists. And I really wanted a pleasant overall experience for my family and my daughter here—
Chair Nada	You have two seconds.
Ms. Sabatini	I got two seconds? Oh, 20.
Chair Nada	Actually, 30 seconds, sorry. 3-0.
Ms. Sabatini	Ah. Well, the other item is that I don't think that this is really a community amenity if it's only going to be helping a few—several people who are going to be having assignable parking. And I'm—I would be really disappointed if this

	happened right next to my home.
Chair Nada	Thank you. Thanks, Haley. And next is Michelle, please go ahead and start your testimony.
Michelle Sandlin	Hi, can you hear me?
Chair Nada	Yes, we can. Go ahead.
Ms. Sandlin	All right, thank you. Hi, my name is Michelle Sandlin. I live at 290078 SW Villebois Dr. My front door will face this parking lot within five feet. I direct the Board members to the two additional objection letters that were filed with the City on October 15th and earlier today, October 25th, from the now 41 Villebois Village Center residents who strongly oppose any parking lot in Lot 12, even for restricted parking. Our two letters correct and challenge statements made at the September 27th hearing, as documented in the minutes, in the Applicant's proposal, and cite potential abuse of the City of Wilsonville Development Code. What has been stated tonight—expanding the alley behind Seville HOA and moving the entrance closer to Carbello HOA and behind the Toulouse homes—doesn't solve the already potential congestion, safety, and increased gridlock issues that would come from a parking lot. So, this is now only an in-and-out behind Seville HOA. How are you going to enforce that? The alleyway behind Carbello HOA cannot handle two-way as we demonstrated in multiple handle photos that we sent you in both of our objection letters—much less handle a tow truck or a fire truck. And what is being missed is the two Toulouse homes on the inside of the alley behind the—and in the inside of the alley by the curb, they will have to be accessed through the alley by a fire truck. There is no other way to get to them. And the main association doing oversight, to me, just put the responsibility back on the neighbors to monitor this new parking lot if it goes in.
Chair Nada	30 seconds.
Ms. Sandlin	And I'm at—I'm sorry you're asking us to drive on the curb. That puts additional stress on our vehicles. So, I asked Board members, "What if this was your home? Wouldn't you be furious and angry and feel deceived if you found out tomorrow morning there was going to be a parking lot built right next to your home, right across the street, against the side of the your house, in your driveway access, or five feet outside your front door?" I—we ask you and beg you to look to look at about that. This is putting a burden on the current Village Center residents. Thank you.
Chair Nada	Thanks. Thank you for being so brief and being quick. So, with this, Duncan? I hope I pronounced your name correct. Go ahead and testify.
Duncan T. Sandlin	Can you guys hear me now?
Chair Nada	Yes, we can. Go ahead.
Mr. Sandlin	Yeah, so I'm just going to amplify my mother's point with her letter. And in her letter, we've listed a bunch of subsections given to us by our lawyer concerning that issue. So, initially, I mean, the idea of Toulouse right behind our house—we

	<p>measured it, like they said, from blacktop to blacktop at 13-ft, 1 inch. They're saying 15.5. That might be correct, but that would be tires scraping up against the curbs. Now, if you figure average car length is 6-and-a-third feet and then another foot, foot-and-a-half with rear view mirrors, you're barely fitting two cars in there at all without going up on the curb. So, that's kind of ridiculous. And that throughway will be used as a throughway whether or not you design it that way or not. That's just a fact. The fact that it's going to be a restrictive parking lot without a keycard, locked access, and a gate, and all that stuff, that's just a farcical thing to say that it's going to be regulated. The idea that you can get a tow truck in and out of there without a problem is also kind of a ridiculous thing to say. Fire trucks—as a former police officer who has actually been at a house fire, the idea that they're just going to use the main throughways and that's all they're going to do to save lives is not practical in any sense. It is kind of an issue that the Applicant stated before in the minutes that it was 18-ft all the way around through these alleyways in the previous minutes. It is not 18-ft. He is now saying it's what, 16, but that's only if you do the extensions with the people driving up onto the curb pans, the gutter pans, right? Also, as it was noted in the minutes, that the parking is not needed. And as Councilman Horn pointed out, only 149 are needed and 183 are now presented. So, it's not a necessary thing. This also kind of violates this subsection, plus there's been no traffic study done on this access, which does not necessarily comply with this subsection of the Wilsonville Code.</p>
Chair Nada	Time's up. Okay, thank you. So, moving on, Sheri is the last person at least, I see, so please go ahead and start your testimony.
Sheri Walton	Can you hear me?
Chair Nada	Yes, we can.
Ms. Walton	<p>So, okay, this is Sheri Walton on Toulouse. My address is in the testimony. I agree with Haley, Michelle, Duncan, and Jason Abernathy, actually, with his concern. I have several things I want to mention. I am one of the homeowners with the, quote unquote, "constraint alleyway" that the Applicant team brought up. In order to go on the curve, you actually go in—that is actually part of our driveway. Our driveway is so tiny. So, in order to do that, what they're suggesting is just not plausible. Also with—if this is going to go through, they mentioned that homeowners or HOA is responsible. That, again, like everyone else has mentioned, that puts a constraint on me that I don't want to be responsible for. It was even brought up on the Wilsonville local government posted at 4/18 how increased crime for cars have been happening here in Wilsonville. I don't want that brought into my neighborhood. The permits—it's going to be—you guys talked about it's for homeowners and people who work here. Does that mean we're going to be provided permits so we know who's got supposed to park there? And how much is that going to cost? Or is it going to be free because we live here? The other part, the Applicant team member, she said she feels this will help with parking, but it's not how she feels. It's how us all of</p>

	us, including the 41 people who are against it—we don't want it. We don't want the safety concerns. We don't want—again, I brought this up in the last meeting. I was part of the fires. To have that—to have the constraint of all those cars coming in and out is such a huge safety concern. And I don't know how many times I've started one way in the alley and had to go backwards because other cars are coming through that are big city cars, whether it's UPS, FedEx, the garbage trucks. It's just a huge nightmare and I hope you guys really understand what this puts on us homeowners. Thank you.
Chair Nada	Thank you. Thank you for respecting time. The next testimony—Lynne, please go ahead and commence your testimony.
Lynne Sabatini	Hello. Can you hear me?
Chair Nada	Yes, we can. Go ahead.
Ms. Sabatini	Okay, great. My name is Lynne Sabatini. I live at 11416 SW Barber St. I'm Haley's mom. And as she said, our townhome is the westernmost home in the row. Our living room windows would overlook cars, congestion and emissions. The decision to build the parking lot would seriously affect the quality of life for my family. The value of our property would no doubt decline. And regarding that alley, I've seen children of several families regularly playing and riding their bicycles in and around the area where the cars would be traveling in and out. The drivers may or may not be aware of their presence. And this reason alone I think is alarming and should be compelling enough for the committee to deny the application. The people who live in Villebois value exercise, walking, riding bikes. We enjoy the relative quiet and simplicity available and the proposed parking lot would negatively affect the lifestyle. Mr. Kadlub was one of the first to envision this community, and he directed that it's designed being keeping with the idea that the nature and beauty, tranquility and charm are to be valued. There are plenty of parks in our neighborhood. All of these elements draw people to list out this kind of lifestyle that's offered here. And last thing is I saw one of their brochures and in the brochure Costa Pacific descr—I'm sorry, do I have—
Chair Nada	No, go ahead. 30 seconds—go ahead.
Ms. Sabatini	Okay, just one last thing. Costa Pacific's description of its vision was, "The Villebois community is inspired by traditional European villages. Villebois is French for 'village near the woods.'" I'd like to point out that many European towns, including Paris, are moving toward banning cars or have already banned cars from their city centers. So, for all those reasons I oppose the lot.
Chair Nada	Okay, thanks, Lynne.
Ms. Sabatini	Thank you.
Chair Nada	Thank you. I don't see any other raised hands, so again, I'm going to give the phone number one more time just in case anybody who attended remotely—okay, I have one hand just showed up—Box PCF—sorry, I don't have the name. So, yep, please go ahead and start your testimony

Ms. White	Hi, I just want to make sure, since I don't recognize who this is, that if you are going to testify, you do fill out a testimony signup card and perhaps just the name on it is okay. I'm going to unmute it so you can clarify.
Marsha Davis	Can you hear me now?
Chair Nada	Yes, we can.
Ms. Davis	I did fill out the card. My name is Marsha Davis. I testified at the last hearing. And I just have two questions, really. If this parking lot is not necessary to meet the minimum requirements for the additional buildings that are going to be built around the Piazza, then why is it even being considered in the first place when it impacts so many people negatively? The idea of restricting it to residents is laughable. Nobody is going to enforce that. They haven't up til now and they won't. That's all. I'm finished.
Chair Nada	Thank you. Thanks for being brief. So, thanks, Marsha. I see no other raised hands. Again, I'm going to state the phone number one last time in case there's anyone who's attending remotely has difficulty providing testimony. The phone number is (503) 570-1536. (503) 570-1536. Just call this number if you wish to testify and you couldn't do so. I'm going to give about 30 seconds and I'm going to go ahead with the rest of the meeting. Okay, so it looks like we have no more public testimony period. So, does the Applicant have any rebuttal or response to testimony that the Applicant wishes to present? Any rebuttal or response, guys?
Ms. Connery	Well, we would just like to thank everybody for expressing their concerns, and we thank the Board for their careful consideration and review of the application against the review criteria. If you have any additional questions, we'd be happy to entertain them.
Chair Nada	Yeah, Okay, so thank you. So, now it's the time for all the Board members to—if you have any question to the Staff or the Applicant or even member of the audience, this is the time. So, yeah, does anybody have any questions?
Male Speaker [01:06:49]	No.
Chair Nada	So, what, if any, discussion does any Board member wishes to have to help ensure they have gathered all the information he needed to make a decision? I know this is different from the discussion that we'll need to make—the discussion we will have to deliberate once we motion—a motion's made. The discussion at this point is mostly—should only focus on ensuring the understanding of the facts presented and clarifying particular points, rather than expressing conclusions, which we will do in a few minutes. So, any discussions about any other, like, information or—that you wish to have or any questions or anything like that?
Mr. Horn	I do have one question, Samy, and this might be directed at Barbara. In reviewing the last call, I noted that Barbara said that we could—that DRB could put additional conditions onto the application. And I'm wondering, I guess, when you said that, what were you specifically referring to? I mean, what—I



	mean, obviously we can't put conditions on there that are outside the legal boundaries of the Villebois code, but—
Ms. Jacobson	So, a good example of that would be the condition that I think was suggested last time, which was to limit who could use the parking lot. And that would be something the Applicant would have the ability to say yes or no to as a reasonable condition. It may be if you thought of something that you thought was wrong or illegal in the Staff report, you could raise that as well, or if you thought there was something that you heard in testimony, or you heard from the applicants where you thought that would maybe bring people closer together, you could raise that if you— it's a set type of a suggestion change. However, I would raise it now before the public hearing is closed if you are asking the Applicant if they would consider something else because, otherwise, they really can't answer you once we close the public hearing.
Mr. Pauly	The general concept is I—to what Barbara said, first of all, let's take the parking lot, in this case, is it's clearly written in the Code Subsection 4.1253, that reference I gave you earlier.
Ms. Jacobson	I'm looking it up right now.
Mr. Pauly	—is that that parking area is allowed accessory use on this land. So, the question of whether or not they can build parking, just to be clear to the public, we understand the emotions around it, and I know the Staff hears that, the Board hears that, but the law is they are legally allowed to build a parking area on this property. I just want to make sure that that's entirely clear. So, the question is this—a condition is something like—that sets a restriction or other things that might be adds value or makes it better, but also another restriction on conditions is it can't unnecessarily increase the cost or make the project unfeasible. So, does that—that's really key
Ms. Jacobson	So, a good example—another one that happened last time was there was some discussion about being able to see around the hedge by one of the Board members. And so, during—between that meeting and this meeting, the Applicant and staff worked together and came up with a condition to make that lot more visible by simply agreeing on that a reduction in that hedge height could be helpful. So, those are the kinds of things. If you have anything else like that in mind that we—that hasn't already been covered by the Applicant and/or Staff, now would be the time to ask about that.
Mr. Horn	Okay, thank you very much. So, I do have a question for the Applicant if they're—if they can unmute for a second.
Chair Nada	You can go ahead and ask the question.
Mr. Horn	First, I'd like to say I appreciate all the work you guys have put into Villebois and the work you put into the application. Isn't the parking lot a cost to the Applicant? I'm wondering why it was included with the buildings, why you put it all together into one package and didn't separate the two into separate applications.
Mr. Kadlub	I'm very glad you asked that. In 2018, we held a neighborhood meeting, though

	<p>it was not required. And we had dozens and dozens of people show up at the water treatment facility. And what we heard loud and clear there was they didn't want any more development because of the lack of parking within the Villebois Village Center. In addition, last summer I visited with several of the HOAs within the Village Center of—there's several different HOAs that represent different projects within the Village Center, condominiums, townhomes, etc.—all of them have their own. And all of them expressed the concern of not enough parking, that there's just the street parking. It's almost impossible to find something on the street. The opponents of—actually outlined a letter and showed you pictures of the parking surrounding out on Toulouse St and on Barber St. And they use that picture to describe it's difficult to find the access to the alleys. And it's that very picture that underscores the need for more off-street parking within the community itself, even around on Toulouse St and on Barber St. So, what we've done is we're taking this out of production. We could build 8 to 12 condominiums or townhomes or apartments on that site, as originally approved, which would come with another 12 to 24 parking spaces in the same area, create higher density—another four or five story building there on that location. We're taking a 500—arguably a \$500,000 lot out of production and creating a parking lot which is going to cost us another couple hundred thousand dollars for the greater good of the Villebois community. And though it may be perceived as an inconvenience to the 14 homes that live on that alley, for the other thousand dwelling units that are in the Villebois Village Center, we felt that this was the right thing to do. And so yeah, that's why we're doing it.</p>
Mr. Horn	Okay, and that's very —
Ms. Connery	<p>Let me add on, it is included with the mixed-use buildings because it's intended to be accessory and there to provide parking for the residents and the employees of the mixed-use buildings. So, it is part of a project. And in working with Staff, Staff and the Applicant team agree—agreed that it was best to package everything together because it will function together.</p>
Mr. Pauly	<p>And adding on to what Stacy just said—technically, they are separate applications. We've packaged them together because we like to review things and see how they are interrelated and work together. So, that's just the general practice we have. Even though our parking lot application technically could stand on its own and go separately, but when we're talking about things that are related to each other, we combine them together and talk about them together because we think that that's a good practice.</p>
Mr. Horn	<p>Okay, yeah. I mean, obviously we've seen some public testimony that refers to the three buildings, but let's face it, the parking lot seems to be the most controversial by far in the application. So, I thank you for the explanation. I fully understand. Thank you.</p>
Mr. Kadlub	<p>I might add one other comment too, Mr. Horn since you weren't at the last meeting. One of the issues of and one of the reasons we have maybe an undersupply of on-street parking now is that so many of the people who live in</p>

	<p>the Village Center that have two-car garages don't use their garages to park their cars. They park on the street in front of their homes and, you know, use their, you know, half or all of their garage for something other than a car. And that really puts pressure on the street parking. And so, you know, we're just trying to help relieve that issue. I can assure you that Staff has heard over the last number of years the concern for parking, and my guess is that will continue in the future if—and this parking lot may not solve all of those problems, but it may help to relieve it a bit. Short of creating a—the City creating an ordinance to not allow overnight parking or forcing the people to, you know, not park on the street, to park in their garage, at this point it was the best solution that we could come up with that would benefit the greater majority of the Villebois Village Center residents.</p>
Mr. Horn	Gotcha. Thank you. Thank you.
Mr. Pauly	As a matter of order, I just want to note, Shelley let me know that there are people on Zoom raising their hands. And I just want to note for everyone that the opportunity for the public to testify has passed. Once we reopen testimony everyone wishes the Board—
Chair Nada	Yes, we say that because we are not—yes, we cannot allow back and forth conversation. So, we already have enough time for testimony, and we gave more time, and we gave enough time for anybody who wishes to testify. So, with this—so unless somebody else from the Development Review Board have any questions or comments or issues to discuss, I just have one question to the Applicant or request or just—yeah, which is, is it possible to have like—use technology, like what we see in the airport where you can know before entering the alley if the parking lot is full or not? So, if you, before getting in, if I know it's full, I'm not going to get in. So, this might introduce—because, yeah, I don't know how full it will be. But I can imagine there is a certain percentage of traffic that will be, oops, it's full. Get out. So, is this possible? Can you guys do it?
Ms. Connery	Okay—
Mr. Kadlub	It's possible that we could assign certain spots to go along with—which we mentioned last time, that we could make certain assignments for people, for those parking stalls.
Chair Nada	I was mostly using talking about using—about people knowing before entering the alley, kind of like any sort of electric—
Mr. Kadlub	Kind of like the airport, like red where—
Chair Nada	Kind of like the airport, you know, there's like no empty spots. So, I'm driving and I'm trying to park, couldn't find a parking space. So, knowing there's parking there, a lot of people might attempt to enter the alley just to see if they can park. So, this might drive a lot of traffic in and out just to check if the alley is full or not. So, I think something that could reduce the amount of traffic in this area, if there is any way that could indicate—to indicate that the parking is full. Once the parking is full, some sign somewhere shows that so nobody will enter the alley, so this will reduce traffic in that alley.

Ms. Connery	Well, let me try to explain what we're talking about. We're talking about assigning spaces in that parking area to specific residential units.
Chair Nada	But—okay, then—Okay, I didn't know this was part—okay.
Ms. Connery	Right.
Chair Nada	That's different then.
Katie Dunwell	I—so I want to make sure I understand that also, so thank you, Samy, for bringing that up. So, this will be numbered, assigned, restricted, and reserved spots for a resident or an employee of the one of the new buildings, correct?
Ms. Connery	Yes.
Ms. Dunwell	Okay.
Chair Nada	Okay, Okay. In that case—yeah, in this case my request doesn't count. Okay.
Ms. Connery	Thank you
Chair Nada	So, yeah, that's clear. So, with this, anybody—any member of the Development Review Board have any questions—discussions before we go to the next step?
Ms. Dunwell	No.
Chair Nada	Okay, heading on, going forward so next is the opportunity for Board member to discuss any proposal to add, remove, or define conditions of approval. This opportunity allowed discussion among the Board or with Staff that allow—as well as allow the Applicant an opportunity to respond. So, any discussion about any proposal of adding or removing any conditions of approval from the Board members?
Female Speaker [01:21:03]	No.
Mr. Horn	Yeah, I actually do have something to say on adding conditions. So the—again, back to my previous comment, the application as written combining the three buildings and the parking lot, it—it's fairly clear that the three buildings are not the issue. It's the parking lot. And I probably would have separated them into two separate applications if I was making the decision because the parking lot seems to be a little bit out of—out of context, I guess, for lack of a better way to say it. There may have been and there may be a full comprehensive parking study on Villebois in its entirety showing every available piece of land for parking lots, every on-street and off-street street parking structure, the total number of buildings, the accessibility, etc. And I'm sure that the Applicant probably knows all this information, but I do not, even though I live here in Villebois. And the Applicant makes a great point about the number of structures that could be put on that lot. However, I get the impression from testimony that people would prefer structures rather than a parking lot actually because of the aesthetics. So, you know, if I can make a condition to separate the two applications into separate entities, I would do so. I don't know that I have the right to do that, but that's what I would do.
Mr. Pauly	But I mean, they are already separate, and all of these have been brought together. So, the decision is being made on all of these under State law tonight.

	So, from that perspective—I mean, granted, you could approve parts of it and disapprove parts of it in your motion, but it wouldn't really—separating them out wouldn't be the way to go about it. So again, it's not the neighbors preference. We understand neighbors have preferences. Every land use hearing for infill residential I've heard in a decade have neighbors—have strong preferences against development, and we understand that. But it's the Applicant's property that they have a legal right, a list of legal things that they could do on that property, and they're requesting to do one of those legal things.
Ms. Jacobson	And I—
Mr. Pauly	And Barbara, do you want to add to that kind of the City's obligation in regards to that?
Ms. Jacobson	Yeah, the only other thing that I would add is reiterating what Dan said before, that the parking lot used in conjunction with development of these other buildings is as permitted, accessory use specifically under this code. So, if they decide—determined they want to put their parking in the spot and not over in that spot, that's an allowed decision that—to make of the landowner.
Mr. Horn	Okay, thanks for that clarification.
Chair Nada	Okay, thank you. Any other clarification, addition or removal? Okay, so with this, hearing no further discussion, I prepare to close the hearing confirming there's no additional discussion at this point. So, I declare the public hearing closed at 7:54. And now, it's time for the Board to entertain a motion. If a Board member wishes to add new condition, remove a condition, modify a condition, it should be included in that motion. If the motion is seconded, yeah, then we got a call. So, who's ready to have a motion?
Mr. Pauly	Barbara has a comment.
Ms. Jacobson	Chair Nada, just because there were so many additions to the Staff report, I think, and last time we stumbled on this a little bit, before we make a motion on the true matter, I think we need to make a motion to adopt the Staff report listing out the additions to it. Then, once the Staff report is adopted, that's just the base. You're still going to then vote on the motion, but you don't have to worry about saying we adopt, we—you know, want to approve or disapprove this with these conditions. It's just a much easier motion.
Chair Nada	Let's use—
Mr. Pauly	Yeah, let's use—yeah, so the first motion—to reiterate, the first motion would be to amend the Staff report indicating what additional, including any—those additional DRB conditions of approval, so you'd want to add those. And then the second motion would be to approve the resolution, which includes adoption of the Staff report.
Ms. Jacobson	Maybe sending video <a href="#">[inaudible 01:26:20]</a> .
Chair Nada	Okay, so who's ready to entertain a motion? The first motion.
Ms. Jacobson	I think maybe Cindy can help you out a little bit by reiterating where all—
Chair Nada	Yes, this would be—that would be excellent if she could do that. Can she give us the actual wording?

Ms. Luxhoj	Yes. So, what I was going to do is, there is actually four conditions. There are two that were added at the last—at the first hearing, and I wanted to reread those for you. And then there are the two DRB suggested conditions of approval from tonight.
Chair Nada	Okay.
Ms. Luxhoj	So, the first two from the previous hearing were PDB 4, which stated, “In the final configurations of the ground floor pursuant to the parts programming matrix in the Villebois Village Master Plan and Condition of Approval PDB 2 of Case File DB12-0057, at least one restroom shall be placed on the ground floor location with access to the general public from the postal center.” The second one was PDC 6, “The Applicant shall demonstrate that the solid waste and mixed recyclables storage rooms in Buildings A, B, and C, meet the requirements of Section 4.179.06, which specifies that multi-unit residential building containing more than 10 residential units shall provide a minimum storage area of 50 sq ft, plus an additional 5 sq feet per unit for each unit above 10, plus an additional 10 sq ft per thousand sq ft of gross floor area of retail use in each building.” And then, there were the two tonight, which are DB—DRB 1, “The drive aisle on the southwest side of the alley between the existing trash enclosure and the curb of the alley shall be widened to match that on the other side of the trash enclosure. No parking spaces shall be allowed to extend into the widened alley further than the parking spaces on the other side of the trash enclosure.” And DRB 2, “All parking spaces on Lot 12 shall be reserved parking for residents and/or employees.”
Chair Nada	Okay, yeah, this—it's going to be hard to repeat all that, so—
Ms. Jacobson	Right, so just so you don't have to repeat all that, what you can do ,if you want to, you can move to adopt the Staff report with the conditions as read into the record by Ms. Luxhoj if you like those, or if you don't like them, you would not approve it that way.
Mr. Pauly	And also, you could add “and add Exhibits as stated into the record” and make <a href="#">that [inaudible 1:29:38]</a> as well, rather than list—this big list of things.
Chair Nada	So, who wants to entertain a motion? Anybody?
Nicole Hendrix	I move to adopt the Staff report with the conditions read into the record by Ms. Luxhoj for the Villebois Village Center Mixed-Use Development.
Mr. Horn	I second it.
Chair Nada	Okay, so motion has been moved and seconded. All of those in favor—
Ms. Dunwell	Aye.
Mr. Abernathy	Aye.
Chair Nada	— <a href="#">of approving Staff report</a> as stated in the record, say “Aye.” <a href="#">[01:30:05]</a>
Ms. Hendrix	Aye.
Chair Nada	Aye.
Mr. Horn	Aye.

Chair Nada	Okay, all opposed, say "Nay." Okay, so if I got it right, I think I got five "Ayes," so—
Mr. Pauly	Why would—were the exhibits included in that?
Chair Nada	Sorry?
Mr. Pauly	Exhibits—
Ms. Hendrix	That were mentioned by Staff earlier?
Mr. Pauly	Yeah. Just—we'll add it in.
Ms. Jacobson	No, just add another motion.
Mr. Pauly	Just add another motion to add all exhibits as entered into the record.
Chair Nada	Okay.
Mr. Pauly	That'd be our recommendation, just to make it clear.
Chair Nada	Okay, Nicole, please, one more—one last time for us.
Ms. Hendrix	Then I'm—then I move to add all the exhibits entered into the record.
Mr. Horn	And I second.
Chair Nada	—the Staff report; so motion has been moved and seconded to add all the exhibits to the amended Staff report with all exhibits as stated in the record. All of those in favor, say "Aye."
Ms. Hendrix	Aye.
Mr. Horn	Aye.
Ms. Dunwell	Aye.
Mr. Abernathy	Aye.
Chair Nada	Aye. I hear five "Ayes," no "Nays." I would say "Nay." There were no "Nays," so the motion passed unanimously. Yeah, so this—we need another motion. Now the Staff report has all the exhibit and all the conditions of approval and everything, so the next motion will be on the resolution itself. So, anybody want to entertain a motion for the resolution, Staff Resolution 393-B?
Ms. Dunwell	Do we move to a vote or do we move to approve?
Chair Nada	No—the motion to approve.
Ms. Dunwell	To approve.
Chair Nada	And then we're going to vote on that.
Ms. Dunwell	Okay, okay. I motion to approve DRB Resolution No. 393-B.
Chair Nada	And second?
Ms. Hendrix	Second.
Chair Nada	Okay, so the motion to approve Resolution No. 393-B, the Villebois Village Center mixed-use development with the Staff recommendation and the amended Staff report has been moved and seconded. Any discussions?
Ms. Hendrix	I'll just start since I haven't spoken up or had any questions. I do want to thank the community members for sharing tonight, and I hear you, and I understand the impact that the parking lot is going to have. And, I'm also just trying to keep in mind just like what is in the purview of our Board. And, the application meets the code and the review criteria and then additionally, like, the Applicant was

	<p>amenable to the changes that we asked for after hearing public comment from the September meeting, and that included like...right, the diagonal parking to two parallel spots. They're widening the alley. We've got the reserved parking, the lowered vine fence for visibility, and adding that like, piazza, little spot for the benches because we heard that that was a used space before. So, I just—I appreciate the Applicant and what the community members have said. And I'm just saying this, I guess, to explain why I'll be voting the way I will be, so thanks.</p>
Chair Nada	<p>Thanks, Nicole. Any other discussions or points you like to make from any other member of the Development Review Board?</p>
Ms. Dunwell	<p>I would also like to echo what Nicole just stated. I appreciate and thank all the members of the community, all of my fellow citizens in Wilsonville for the time that they've taken and the emotion and the caring for the ongoing growth and visibility of that important corner within the Villebois neighborhood.</p>
Chair Nada	<p>Okay, thanks, Katie. Any other comments? Go ahead.</p>
Mr. Horn	<p>Yeah, I would also echo what Nicole said. You know, we very much appreciate the testimony of our neighbors and understand the emotion, you know, around what's being built in the Villebois community. Very much appreciate the Applicant's changes that they have made to try to mitigate issues with the parking lot. And, as was pointed out by City Staff, the role of the DRB is to make sure that the Applicant is building per the Code. And, I'll stop there.</p>
Chair Nada	<p>Okay, thanks, Michael. Jason, any comments or anybody else, any comments? Okay, so I have one last remark which is kind of similar to Nicole. So, the reason at least I voted to keep the public record open is to get a chance—another chance to look at the Code, examine the evidence, maybe listen to more people, check the Code, check also the role of DRB. I've been there in this role for quite some time, but every now and then, especially when we don't have a lot of meetings where a lot of people show up, so it's good to know what the role of the DNB is. The role of the DRB is strictly making sure that the application meets the Code. The Applicant, thank—I want to thank the Applicant for being flexible. And also, we tried to work with the Applicants, to work with the residents to make sure to find a compromise, but the Applicant has no obligation to do so, if the application is according to the Code. We are legally bound to what's in the Code. We cannot force the Applicant to honor any requirement that was not part of the Code or the Master Plan at the time of the application was submitted. I personally have a lot of [inaudible 01:36:06] stuff, [inaudible] parking and traffic and all this kind of stuff, but DRB [inaudible 01:36:16] venue—not a venue where you can talk—we can talk about it, but this is not the venue to make change in those aspects. There's other proper channels, and the Staff can elaborate if anybody is interested, but DRB is not the venue here. And this application, based on our understanding and based on the Staff, based on my studies and what I've read and looked at is according to the Code and according to the Master Plan. And I'd like to thank everybody for taking the time to come to testify today. I really appreciate your testimony. So, thanks so much, and</p>



	yeah. And with this, I think it's time for the vote, unless anybody has any other comments that you'd like to make from the Development Review Board members. Okay with this, I think it's time to vote, so let me make sure I say it right. So, voting for Motion 393-B, Villebois Village Center Mixed-Use Development, taking the Staff—yeah, recommendation as in the amended Staff report. All of those in favor, say “Aye.”
Ms. Hendrix	Aye.
Mr. Horn	Aye.
Ms. Dunwell	Aye.
Mr. Abernathy	Aye.
Chair Nada	All opposed, say “Nay.” Okay, I think we got five “Ayes,” so the motion passes. The resolution is passed. Thank you.
Mr. Pauly	Can we—I think we didn't get it correct in our record who seconded the motion to approve the Staff report. Would [inaudible 1:37:51]—
Mr. Horn	I will second. I will second.
Mr. Pauly	That was Michael—okay.
Chair Nada	So, which—is this the first motion or the second motion?
Mr. Pauly	First motion.
Chair Nada	Do you have to go do the whole thing again or just this motion—? Okay, so—
Mr. Pauly	So, we just needed to verify—
Chair Nada	Okay, so we're going to go through the first motion again, so—
Ms. White	Chair Nada? We just needed to recap who seconded the motion. We didn't catch who it was.
Chair Nada	Sorry. Okay.
Mr. Pauly	So, we're good. You can—
Chair Nada	Okay, so again, back to the Resolution 393-B, the motion carries 5-0.

[Verbatim section ends 01:38:31]

**Chair Nada** read the rules of appeal into the record.

Respectfully submitted,

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