

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

Development Review Board – Panel B

Verbatim Excerpt—

**Resolution No. 393 Villebois Village Center Mixed Use Development
September 27, 2021 6:30 PM**

I. Call to Order

Chair **Samy Nada** called the meeting to order at 6:31 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, and Katie Dunwell.**
Michael Horn was absent.

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

VI. Public Hearing:

A. Resolution No. 393. 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 Zone Map Amendment from Public Facility (PF) to Village (V) and adopting findings and conditions approving 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: Ms. Luxhoj

Case Files:

DB21-0008	Zone Map Amendment (PDP 12 C Lot 76, Bldgs A, B)
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)

The DRB action on the Zone Map Amendment is a recommendation to the City Council.

Chair Nada called the public hearing to order at 6:39 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.

Cindy Luxhoj	Bear with me for a second here. All right, can you see the presentation?
Unknown	[12:09] Yes.
Ms. Luxhoj	<p>All right. Good evening, Chair Nada and members of the Development Review Board. My name is Cindy Luxhoj, Associate Planner, and I am here tonight to present for your review 11 requests for the Villebois Village Center Mixed-Use Project. This is the final phase of Villebois to come before the DRB. It includes three mixed-use buildings and a supplemental parking area around the Piazza in the Village Center. Case file numbers are DB21-0008, -0010 through -0016, and -0022 through -0024. As required by Statute, I would announce that the criteria applicable to the application are stated. Can you hear me better? Starting on Page 2 of the Staff Report, which has been entered into the record. Copies of the report are available on the counter at the side of the room and on the City's website.</p> <p>The project includes three Lots within the Villebois Village Center. This slide shows the location of the subject sites. (Slide 2) Buildings A and B are proposed northeast and northwest of the Piazza on Lot 76, Building C is on Lot 73, and the surface parking area is on Lot 12 to the southwest. Key streets in the Village Center include SW Barber St, Villebois Dr, Campanile Ln, and Royal Scot Ln.</p> <p>As with most proposals before the DRB, there are a number of component applications listed here. These include a Zone Map Amendment, a Specific Area Plan Central amendment, Preliminary Development Plans and modifications, Final Development Plans, and Type C Tree Plans. I will briefly go through these one by one later in my presentation. First, I would like to provide information about noticing for the project, as well as some background and history of how we got to where we are today in Villebois and for this project.</p> <p>Proper noticing was followed for the application. The notice included clarifying background information about the project, and outlined adaptations for the hearing process and providing testimony that were adopted by the City in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. The City received several public comments on the proposal, copies of which are included in the D exhibits. Concerns raised included parking, traffic, safety, intensification of use and added residential units, converting landscaped area at SW Villebois Dr and Barber St to parking, and removal of a previously preserved scarlet oak tree, which is Tree # 333.</p>

Concerns are addressed under discussion topics in the Staff report, as well as throughout my presentation tonight. Staff notes that following publication of the Staff report, additional comments were received, many in support of the proposed project. These additional comments were provided to the DRB this afternoon in advance of the hearing.

Now, I would like to spend a few minutes providing some background about the planning and review process that is designed specifically for Villebois. Villebois is located in the area surrounding the former state-owned Dammasch State Hospital complex originally constructed between 1958 and 1961 and vacated in July 1995. Shortly after it was vacated, a master planning effort was launched, which resulted in a plan to establish an urban village on the site and surrounding properties. As shown on this slide (Slide 5), these planning efforts led to the 2003 adoption of a concept plan for Villebois, and subsequently the Villebois Village Master Plan, which was most recently amended in 2013. The Master Plan adoption included zoning Code language guiding how development is reviewed and defining what flexibility there is from the Master Plan as development occurs. Based on the Master Plan, four Specific Area Plans, or SAPs, were approved, including South, East, Central, and North. The SAP approval included books guiding the details of the architecture and community elements, such as street trees and site furnishings. All proposed development has a Preliminary Development Plan, or PDP, and a Final Development Plan or FDP. The PDP is equivalent to a traditional subdivision review. Looking at the layout, streets and other functional components of development. The FDP is the detailed review of buildings, parks and open space and other amenities and features. The review before you today addresses amending SAP Central and adopting PDPs and FDPs for Lots 12, 73, and 76 in the Village Center. SAP Central, where the subject lots are located, is highlighted in yellow on this slide. (Slide 6) The red star identifies the Piazza at the center of Villebois. SAP Central consists of 55.2 acres within the central portion of Villebois. It was adopted in 2006 and includes 42 acres within and 13.2 acres outside the Village Center boundary. The current application affects 2.02 acres, of the 42 acres within the Village Center boundary surrounding the central Piazza on the north, east and west sides.

On this slide, the boundary of SAP Central is in black, and the Village Center boundary within SAP Central, is a light gray dashed line. (Slide 7) As on the previous slide, the red star indicates the Piazza. The figure also shows the range of land uses envisioned for SAP Central in the Villebois Village Master Plan. The uses in the Master Plan are designed to create a vibrant, mixed-use Village Center at the heart of the Villebois community comprised of residential, office, retail and other related and employment uses. The Village Center is designed to include higher density residential housing, mixed-use housing, opportunities for office, commercial, light industrial and civic uses, easy access multi-modal transportation opportunities, and parks and greenway features. It is intended as a central hub of activities, services, and transportation serving the larger

Villebois community, and to provide multi-modal transportation opportunities that facilitate pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and automobile access, connecting residents to shopping services, recreation, and homes.

This illustration focuses on the center of the Village Center, with the Piazza, again, indicated with the red star. (Slide 8) The medium blue surrounding the Piazza as designated in the Villebois Village Master Plan is mixed-use condos and that is roughly the location of the mixed-use Buildings A, B, and C, and the parking area on Lots 12, 73, and 76 of the current application. Staff notes that although the area surrounding the Piazza is designated as mixed-use condos, the Village Zone is clearly flexible with whether the units are for sale units that the resident owns, or for lease units that the resident rents, such as the apartments that are proposed in the current application. Further, the Villebois Village Master Plan defines land uses in the aggregate, with specialty condos, mixed-use condos, urban apartments, village apartments, neighborhood apartments, row houses, and small detached houses comprising one land use group, and does not distinguish whether the residential units within those land uses are owned or rented by the resident.

The current application proposes a mixed-use development consisting of three buildings and a surface parking area surrounding the central Piazza in the Village Center on three sides. This composite site plan shows Buildings A and B located on Lot 76, northeast and northwest of the Piazza, and Building C located on Lot 73, southwest of the Piazza. The parking area is proposed on Lot 12, also southwest of the Piazza, to serve the residents, visitors, and employees of the development. Renderings of the proposed buildings show Buildings A and C on the top left, and Building B on the right. The Landscape Plan for the parking area is included at the bottom.

I would like to note that after publication of the Staff report, the Applicant submitted revised ground floor plans for the proposed buildings based on City Staff's discussion points and conditions of approval. I will provide more detail about those proposed changes later in my presentation.

As mentioned earlier, there are a number of component applications before the DRB tonight. The first of these is a Zone Map amendment for PDP 12C Lot 76, where Buildings A and B are proposed in the current application. This is request DB21-0008. The area of the Zone Map amendment includes approximately 1.19 acres in the two sites of Lot 76 and 0.22 acre of public right-of-way (ROW) that connects them, for a total of about 1.4 acres. As shown by this shaded area and the figure on this slide (Slide 10), the request is to change the zoning for Lot 76 from Public Facility (PF) to Village (V). As the former site of the Dammasch State Hospital, land in the Village Center kept the PF zoning from this previous use until a Preliminary Development Plan is proposed for the property. The rest of the project area for the current application was rezoned from PF to V in 2006 and 2007, when PDPs were approved for development of those lots. The current PDP request is the first one submitted for Lot 76, hence the request to change the zoning from PF to V. This is consistent with the Residential-Village designation

on the Comprehensive Plan Map as well as with the zoning of the rest of Villebois. Approval of the zone change enables development of the property to include two mixed-use buildings as proposed in the concurrent PDP and FDP applications.

One component of SAP Central is the Village Center Architectural Standards, or VCAS. The purpose of the VCAS is to ensure that development within the Village Center boundary will be consistent with the Villebois Village Concept Plan and Master Plan as well as with the Design Principles and Design Standards in the Village Zone. Within the VCAS are several addresses, each of which is a special overlay zone that highlights a unique area in the development, providing additional information for the definition of architectural character. One of the six addresses in the Village Center is the Plaza Address. All buildings proposed in the current application must adhere to the VCAS for the Plaza Address, since they all front on the Piazza and its surrounding streets. The Applicant is requesting a SAP Central Amendment to refine the VCAS to implement the proposed development. This is request DB21-0010, and applies to Lot 73 and 76, the sites of Buildings A, B, and C. (Slide 11)

The proposed SAP Central Amendment would change provisions of the Plaza Address to modify exterior building material standards related to façade materials and percentage calculations. To further explain, the current list of approved façade materials includes brick, stone, cast stone, stucco or plaster, poured-in-place concrete or pre-cast concrete veneer, and metal panel systems. The proposed modification adds, under Stucco or Plaster, the phrase, "including stucco boards composed of fiber cement reveal panels." The proposed modification also reduces the percentage from 75% to 30% of the façade of each building required to be finished with one or more of the listed materials. As explained by the Applicant in their narrative, "The proposed revisions allow more design flexibility for the façade designs and allow the proposed project to react to the current construction market conditions without sacrificing the integrity of the finished product. A prescriptive minimum of 75% façade coverage from a small list of finished materials significantly impacts the design opportunities for a façade design, especially when pursuing a contemporary design aesthetic as proposed with this project. The price point of this small list of finished materials is significantly higher than the additional approved exterior finished materials, such as fiber cement lap siding, thereby forcing a higher construction cost without taking into account the overall design aesthetic. The proposed revisions to Plaza Address do not remove or revise the materials list; rather, the proposed revisions allow more flexibility for achieving the approved materials in a cost effective manner." (Slide 12)

Staff agrees with the Applicant that the proposed changes provide design flexibility to accentuate the ground floor of each building, providing architectural consistency along the central Plaza. As shown in these illustrations, the materials define each building's base and distinguish it from the painted fiber cement lap siding above that is the primary finished material for private

housing at the remainder of each building. The result, when one includes the already constructed Domaine at Villebois, is four unique façade designs that wrap the central Plaza with complimentary finished materials and color palettes. The brick veneer, storefront windows, and steel canopies all reinforce the ground level streetscape, to make the Plaza a vibrant, pedestrian-friendly experience. No other changes to the VCAS for the Plaza Address are proposed in the current application. (Slide 13)

Since SAP Central was approved in 2006, separate PDPs, as well as some modifications of original approvals, have been approved within the SAP. No previous Preliminary Development Plan has been proposed for PDP 12C Lot 76. Therefore, the request for this PDP, which is DB21-0011, does not include a modification. The proposal for Lot 76 is to construct the two mixed-use Buildings A and B to include 94 apartments. Approval of that PDP by the DRB is contingent on City Council approval of the Zone Map Amendment. PDPs for 2C Lot 73 and 1C Lot 12 have been previously approved. Therefore, the current application includes requests for modifications of those PDPs. The requests are DB21-0014 and DB21-0022 and include the following:

- For Lot 12, modification proposes to eliminate the conceptual range of 8 to 12 mixed-use condo units, previously envisioned, and the three-unit residential development approved in 2018, to provide a surface parking area to serve the residents, employees, and visitors of the mixed-use development. This results in fewer units, or less density, and more parking than originally envisioned for this immediate area. I will provide some additional context about Lot 12 in the subsequent slide.
- Modification of Lot 73 proposes to increase the number of mixed-use condos from the conceptual range of 24 to 30 units to provide 49 apartment units in Building C.

The table on this slide (Slide 15) reflects the final and current approved unit counts in all other PDP approvals and modifications in SAP Central. The original SAP Central approved 1,010 units with a potential 10% increase or decrease over time. With approval of the proposed PDP modification to Lots 12 and 73, the density in SAP Central will be 986 units resulting in a less than 10% change to the unit counts in SAP Central. This continues to meet the density requirement across Villebois. The proposal also results in a total of 2,568 residential units within Villebois, which meets the refinement criteria.

Since public comment on the current application has focused on development of a surface parking area on Lot 12, I thought it would be helpful to provide some background to the DRB about the property. Lot 12 is outlined in red on this slide showing the proposed parking area configuration. (Slide 16) When SAP Central was approved in 2006, it called for 8 to 12 mixed-use condo units on the subject site taking access from shared alleyways. I would like to note that the property was never planned for park or open space. The current improved landscape on the site stems from the site's past use as a temporary sales office and information center for the Village Center. Often these types of sales offices are heavily

landscaped, even if just temporarily, to create a market-friendly aesthetic. The modular building used as the sales office, information center was removed some time ago, but the improved landscaping has remained. Based on public comment, it is apparent that the length of time the temporary landscaping has been in place has created a perception that the landscaping is the long-term approved use of the property.

- In 2018, development plans came forward and were approved for this site. The 2018 approval was for a three-unit residential development, including one mixed-use unit and associated improvements. However, the developer chose not to construct the approved units. The proposed Lot 12 modification eliminates all the residential and mixed-use building on the property in favor of providing additional parking to serve nearby development. All changes to the number of units are within the refinement thresholds identified in the V zoning text. The proposed parking area on Lot 12 will not take access directly from SW Villebois Dr or Barber St, but rather through an existing alley. The existing alley is partially on Lot 12 and partially on Tracts G and H of the plat of Villebois Village Center, which was recorded in 2007. Per Note 4 of the plat, Lot 12 has an access easement over Tracts G and H. The three unit development approved by the City in 2018 included access, via the same alley, and parking added within the alley on that portion of Lot L2. This application proposes the same access and the same addition of parking in the Lot 12 portion of the alley as was previously approved.

Traffic impacts for the proposed project as proposed in the PDPs for Lots 12, 73, and 76, have long been included in the planning and construction of transportation infrastructure to serve Villebois. (Slide 17) The number and density of units and trips have been anticipated and planned for in master planning and subsequent development proposals over the past couple decades, and the current proposal is consistent with the projections.

- In May 2019, the City's traffic consultant, DKS, analyzed the residential trip generation of three buildings with 145 apartments proposed on Lot 73 and 76 as compared to residential trip generation estimates for all of SAP Central calculated in a 2013 Traffic Impact Study. The residential trip generation for the entire SAP Central, with the three proposed apartment buildings, was found to result in a lower trip generation than previous trip estimates for the SAP. Therefore, no significant traffic impact was anticipated due to Buildings A, B, and C.
- In June 2021, the analysis was revised to reflect modified site plans for Buildings A, B, and C, showing 11 ground floor residential units that could be converted to approximately 7,300 sq ft of retail space in the future. This analysis concluded that the proposed modifications to the buildings would result in a net increase of 22 p.m. peak hour trips, 10 in and 12 out after, conversion of residential to retail. However, it was found that the change would not cause the residential trip counts to exceed those previously

analyzed and the total residential trips for SAP Central would be 578, which is less than the 594 trips that were analyzed in the 2013 TIS.

- Also in June 2021, the City's traffic consultants revised the residential trip generation analysis for Lot 12. This site was approved in 2018 for three row homes, with one of the units containing 711 sq ft of commercial office space on the ground floor. However, the current application proposes a 24-space surface parking area to provide the supplemental parking for the mixed-use development. The revised analysis estimates that the parking area will generate 12 p.m. peak hour trips, 10 in and 7 out, [37:35] of the parking spaces in the lot. However, because parking does not, of itself, generate trips, all of the trips are assumed to be existing trips associated with the rest of the project.

Villebois has specific parking standards listed in the V zone for the proposed uses. The Applicant has worked with the City to follow the standards. With mixed-use development such as is proposed, the parking demand is more intense than many typical developments in Wilsonville. This location has long been planned for mixed-use development with parking standards established with the plan in mind. The City has carefully reviewed the parking proposal and, as explained in detail in the findings and outlined in the table on this slide, found minimum parking standards are met or exceeded. In summary, 167 vehicle parking spaces are required prior to the allowed offset for excess bicycle parking and motorcycle parking spaces provided, or 149 spaces are required with the offset. The proposal includes 183 off- and on-street spaces, exceeding the requirement by 16 to 34 spaces. (Slide 18)

The area around the Piazza at Villebois is the very core of the community calling for the tallest buildings and the most intense uses. The description of the Village Center in the Villebois village master plan describes the higher density development around the Piazza as multi-family and mixed-uses development such as ground level retail or office and flex-space uses, with office or multi-family residential units above. The flex space is defined in the Master Plan glossary as "ground floor units of a multi-family or mixed-use building that can be converted to office, retail, or residential uses." Other language in the Master Plan describing this core area includes Policy 5 under Village Center which says that "The core area of the Village Center shall provide for mixed-use residential, retail, and employment areas that may include office uses and live/work housing opportunities." This Master Plan language defines that the buildings around the Piazza should have ground floor commercial type space, but in the list of what the space may entail includes retail, office, flex space, and live/work. In addition, the Master Plan prescribes a building around the Piazza provide a mailroom for the Village Center. The Master Plan does not prescribe the mix of these different ground floor uses. However, a basic notion of mixed-use development is that the ground floor is non-residential or live/work uses.

- In the proposal before the DRB, the Applicant includes the following uses on the ground floor of Buildings, A, B, and C: Common area amenity for

	<p>apartment residents; live/work units facing the Piazza; a leasing office, 2,460 sq ft of retail space; a mail center with over 900 mailboxes; and flex space residential units for potential retail conversion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of these uses qualify under the non-residential or live/work spaces identified in the master plan to occupy the ground floor of mixed-use buildings. However, as stated in the staff report and findings, City staff does not support the ground floor units designed to accommodate future conversion for retail as flex space in Buildings B and C. These units do not have exterior entrances, limiting the flexibility to transform the spaces. Any tenant improvements to convert to retail would be substantial. No evidence exists that it is foreseeable for the market demand for retail to be so much greater than for residential so as to trigger completion of future tenant improvements that would convert the spaces to retail or office. The combination of financial burden of any future conversions combined with the lack of anticipated market demand creates substantial hurdles that do not allow these units to be reasonably considered flex space. • To address this concern, Conditions of Approval PDC 2 and PDC 3 of the Staff report, as summarized on this slide (Slide 19), require the spaces to be converted to live/work units with exterior entrances and storefront treatments, including entry canopies, so that the ground floor is office, retail, or live/work. The conditions further state that the Applicant may refine the location and mix of uses so long as other SAP specified conditions are met. <p>After publication of the Staff report, the Applicant submitted revised ground floor plans for the proposed buildings based on City staff's discussion points and the conditions of approval outlined on the previous slide. As explained by the Applicant, the updated plans reflect considerations made to locate retail space at the highly visible corner of SW Villebois Dr and Barber St and places the postal center closer to its current location, at the corner of SW Royal Scot Ln and Villebois Dr. The submitted materials were provided to DRB and posted on the project page on the City's website on September 20, 2021, when they were received from the Applicant. The materials consist of a memorandum, supporting site plan, and building summary table that detail the proposed changes, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relocate and enlarge the retail space in Building C from the center of the building to a prominent corner with an additional 760 sq ft of space; • Relocate the postal center from Building C to Building A; • Relocate the community room in Building A from the northwest corner to the southern corner; • Relocate the fitness center from the southern corner to the northwest corner of Building A. • Distinctly identify ground floor flex retail/residential spaces in Buildings A, B and C; • One less apartment, from 11 flex spaces to 10, resulting in an overall unit count of 142 rather than 143 apartments.
--	---

The Applicant, during their presentation tonight, will provide more detail about the proposed revision. The updated plan does not alter demonstrated compliance with applicable Development Standards, the VCAS, or Community Elements Book requirements. No modifications to the circulation, utility, grading, or landscape plans for Buildings, A, B or C are proposed. The modified site plan does not impact or alter the Zone Map Amendment, SAP Amendment, or Type C Tree Removal applications for development of Buildings A and B on Lot 76 or Building C on Lot 73. And, the modified site plan does not impact or alter the PDP, FDP or Type C Tree Removal applications for the surface parking area on Lot 12. (Slide 20)

Staff notes that the postal center, when it was in Building C in the plan set submitted by the Applicant, had a restroom interior to the space. The relocated postal center, as shown in the revised ground floor plan on this slide, does not have a restroom interior to or accessible from the space. The Parks Programming Matrix in the Villebois Village Master Plan, which is Case File number DB12-0057, includes a Condition of Approval PDB 2, which specifies that at least one restroom shall be placed in a ground floor location with access to the general public from the postal center. To comply with this condition, staff recommends that Condition of Approval PDC 4 be added to Request C as follows: "In the final configuration of the ground floor, pursuant to the Park's Programming Matrix in the Villebois Village Master Plan and Condition of Approval PDB 2, of Case File Number DB12-0057, at least one restroom shall be placed in a ground floor location with access to the general public from the postal center." (Slide 21)

Submitted FDP requests for the proposed project include DB21-0012, -0015, and -0023. Approval of this FDP for Lot 76 by the DRB is contingent on City Council approval of the Zone Map Amendment. The FDPs provide details of architecture, landscaping, lighting, signage, and residential amenities consistent with the requirements of the SAP Central Community Elements Book and VCAS. [47:51 VCAS?] The submitted FDPs meet all requirements of the applicable standards, or will with conditions of approval.

I'd like to highlight a couple points related to the FDPs including landscaping and screening of the proposed surface parking area on Lot 12 and mixed solid waste and recyclables storage in the proposed buildings.

With respect to landscaping and screening of the proposed surface parking area on Lot 12, the SAP Central Plan and Villebois Village Master Plan do not indicate any required community fencing within the subject site. The VCAS indicate that fencing is optional in the Plaza address, and, where provided, should be consistent with the architecture. The Applicant is proposing 6-ft high vine support fence, consisting of welded wire mesh fencing with cedar posts around the entirety of the surface parking area, except at breaks for pedestrian and vehicle access points. As described by the Applicant, Star Jasmine, a blooming broad-leaf evergreen, is proposed to vegetate the fence and provide a visual barrier between the parking area and surrounding properties. A sample image of

the vegetated vine is provided on this slide, as well as the proposed landscape plan for the subject site. (Slide 23)

With respect to solid waste and recyclables storage in Buildings A, B, and C, the storage requirement for the mixed-use development is based on the number of residential uses and retail square footage. The trash storage rooms, as proposed in Building A, B, and C, will serve both the residential and retail uses on the site. The Applicant states that the required storage space was calculated assuming storage height of 4 ft for solid waste/recyclables and no vertical or stacked storage that was proposed. Although the Applicant further states that the buildings provide adequate storage space for solid waste and recyclables, as noted in the compliance letters provided by Republic Services in the submitted materials, the actual calculation is not included in their narrative or findings. Therefore, Staff is unable to determine whether the standard is met. Staff recommends Condition of Approval PDD 5 be added to Request D as follows, "The Applicant shall demonstrate that the solid waste and mixed recyclable storage rooms in Buildings A, B, and C meet the requirements of Section 4.179(.06), which specify that multi-unit residential buildings containing more than 10 residential units shall provide a minimum storage area of 50 sq ft plus an additional 5 sq ft per unit, for each unit above 10, plus an additional 10 sq ft per 1,000 sq ft of gross floor area of retail use in each building."

Request for Type C Tree Plan review by the DRB includes DB21-0013, -0016 and -0024. Approval of the PDP 12C Lot 76 Type C Tree Plan, DB21-0013, is contingent on City Council approval of the Zone Map Amendment. There is a combined total of 12 trees on the sites of the proposed project. In addition, trees in areas adjacent to the Lots, as well as street trees, could be affected by construction. Of the 12 on-site trees, Lot 73 has six, including one London plane, one red maple, and one Oregon white oak, and two Austrian pines. The Oregon white oak is in poor condition with dead and broken branches, crown decay, and top dieback. On Lot 76 there are four trees, including two pin oaks, one identified as Important, but with blackberries surrounding the trunk that limited the Arborist's assessment. And two scarlet oaks, both in poor condition. The two trees on Lot 12 include one red maple and one scarlet oak. Staff notes that Tree #333, the scarlet oak, has long been designated for retention as an Important tree. This tree is not part of the City's Heritage Tree program. Previous unbuilt approvals for the site preserved the subject tree. However, the tree sustained substantial damage during the February 2021 ice storm. According to the Arborist report, the storm damage led to loss of two very large scaffold branches and broken leaders along the smaller branches. The property owner discussed requesting removal separately, but elected to include the removal request in the current application. The City acknowledges recent damage to the previously Important tree has impacted its long-term viability and supports the Applicant's request to remove the tree regardless of what development occurs on the site. All 12 on-site trees are proposed for removal due to conditions and unavoidable

	<p>construction impacts. All trees adjacent to the sites and street tree will be retained and protected during construction.</p> <p>In conclusion, based on the Findings of Fact and information included in the Staff report and information received from a duly advertised public hearing, Staff recommends that DRB Panel B:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add Condition of Approval PDC 4, as I previously stated, but I will restate, "In the final configuration of the ground floor pursuant to the Park's 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 in a ground floor location with access to the general public from the postal center." • And also add Condition of Approval PDD 5, as previously stated, "The Applicant shall demonstrate that the solid waste and mixed recyclable storage room in Buildings A, B and C meet the requirements of Section 4.179(.06), which specify that multi-unit residential buildings containing more than 10 residential units shall provide a minimum storage area of 50 sq ft plus an additional 5 sq ft per unit, for each unit above 10, plus an additional 10 sq ft per 1,000 sq ft of gross floor area of retail use in each building."; • Recommend approval to the City Council of the requested Zone Map Amendment DB21-008; • Approve with conditions contingent on City Council approval of the Zone Map Amendment, the following for 12C Lot 76: the PDP, DB21-0011, the FDP, DB21-0012, and Type C Tree Plan, DB21-0013; • And approve with conditions: the requested SAP Central amendment, DB21-0010, PDP modifications 2C Lot 73 and 1C Lot 12, which are DB21-0014 and -0022; the FDPs for those lots, which are DB21-0015 and -0023, and the Type C Tree Plan, DB21-0016 and -0024. <p>That concludes my presentation tonight. Thank you very much, and I would be happy to answer any questions that you might have.</p>
Dan Pauly, Planning Mgr.	I would add, we also have Engineering Staff and our traffic consultant on the line if you have any questions.
Chair Nada	So, does any member of the Development Review Board have any questions?
Mr. Pauly	Well, I did want to make one additional correction.
Chair Nada	Go ahead.
Mr. Pauly	That Cindy, I just remembered that she did not mention, so I will go ahead and mention is, on the Staff report, it talks about a meeting with the Mayor that was actually pointed out that that was before she was elected, so when she was actually a candidate. So, it was not actually in a formal role as Mayor that she met with—having any discussion about this project.
Chair Nada	Thank you. Good. Thanks. Okay. Does any member of the Development Review Board have any question for Cindy or the Staff?

Jason Abernathy	Yeah, I have quite a few. Well, first off, I know that parking is a big step here and I want to—you know, I believe when you look at the map/math [57:29] and everything coming out of it, and I am looking at the package. Number one, the Lot 12, is—I'm reading that right, is that only 25 spaces that Lot 12 is going to give that area?
Ms. Luxhoj	It is 24 on-site spaces, and then there are additional four on-street; so off-street is 24 and there is an additional four on-street.
Mr. Abernathy	Okay. So with the Lot 12, [Inaudible 00:59:05] so with the vegetation wall there as spring comes, that's going to look great. As it goes down, who is responsible for maintaining that, for the vegetation as we go into the fall, into the winter months, that vegetation is going to be gone. So, who is responsible for that and what is the game plan for that? Because to me, that is a temporary solution to the parking area for what they are wanting.
Ms. Luxhoj	So, the vegetation they are proposing is evergreen.
Mr. Abernathy	Okay.
Ms. Luxhoj	So it will not lose its leaves. It will, you know, just flower once a year and those will go away, but it will still be green on those screens throughout the year as an evergreen plant.
Mr. Abernathy	Okay.
Ms. Luxhoj	The maintenance of them, I believe, would be the management, is that [inaudible 59:05] to you?
Mr. Pauly	Maybe the Applicant can clarify who is going to be the eventual owner of that, but it would either be the Homeowner's Association or the private owner of the public [inaudible 59:15]
Ms. Luxhoj	Yeah.
Mr. Abernathy	Thank you. Next, if you look at the, so 94 units, and look at the 100 and, I believe, 163 units total combine— or 187. [inaudible include time stamps] If my math is right, we're still sticking with the Oregon rule of about 1.7 spots per unit. And that is something that—this is the near and dear part to me because in 2014, I became a cross to [59:37] City council board to start the residential parking zone permit because what 1.7 units does to the—it puts a burden. Say again, Dan?
Mr. Pauly	Yeah, I just wanted to clarify that I know different members have different opinions about parking policy. We are not making parking policy or expressing our preference on parking policy tonight. We are applying the standards that are in the Code.
Mr. Abernathy	Okay. So, I will bookmark that one for a little bit. With the traffic analysis, and that is the one thing I want to ask for, is the traffic analysis, it seems the numbers—did those traffic analysis put in a consideration for the lack of traffic we do have right now due to COVID work from home situations and during—it was in June, so you have a lot less school, and, with COVID also, you have a lot less school traffic going through that neighborhood. I am just looking at ingress and egress out of the area also when it came to the huge fire we had there a couple years ago in that same area. So that will be my last question on that.

Chair Nada	Yeah.
Mr. Pauly	Sure. I can take that Cindy or maybe Scott can add to it, but another part of the traffic on this one is that the traffic had long been anticipated. So, this isn't the first time the traffic has been analyzed for this area. So, I mean, through the master planning process back in the early 2000s, and as we've updated kind of the traffic data as Villebois is built out, there was always—we knew what this area was planned for and the level of density, so that has always been included in the assumption of future traffic and street planning.
Mr. Abernathy	Okay, great. Thanks.
Chair Nada	Any other questions?
Katie Dunwell	Yeah, this is Katie. I have a few questions also. On parking, if the parking lot were not developed as the 24 parking spots, would the Buildings A, B, and C still have met the parking requirements for the development, or is the addition of those 24 additional parking spots a requirement in order to meet the parking needs per the Master Plan?
Ms. Luxhoj	No. So they are required to have 167 spaces. Short answer to your question is they would still meet it even without the surface parking area.
Ms. Dunwell	-Okay.
Ms. Luxhoj	Longer answer, if you want that, is that they are able to take a reduction for the number of bicycle parking spaces that they require, so because they provide so many in excess of what the minimum requirement is. So that change would reduce the number that's required to 149 from 167, and they're providing 183. They meet it regardless of whether they have that surface parking.
Ms. Dunwell	Next question is, within that parking, is that public parking? Will it be a mix of public and reserve parking? Has the developer given any intent on how that parking will be used? Specifically, because one of the access areas is through what is considered on the plan a private alley.
Ms. Luxhoj	Except that that lot has cross access easement over portions of the alley, which was approved with that previous development. So, the previous condo that was going to be provided—or built there—also had the same access easements across the alley. The access to that building was going to be from the alley.
Ms. Dunwell	Understood. I guess, more directly, my question would be, as it was originally planned with the condo unit, would that have had a requirement for 24 parking spots? No, I would assume. What would have been the requirement for parking spots for the condo?
Ms. Luxhoj	I am not sure, but I think that the Applicant could speak more to that. And I think that they do intend to give some more detail about that lot in particular.
Ms. Dunwell	Great. Thank you.
Chair Nada	Any other questions?
Nicole Hendrix	This is Nicole. Hi, most of my questions I think are for the Applicant, but I did have a question about the 2013 Master Plan process and like, the amendments for that related to the land uses. Did that go through like a community outreach

	process, and that kind of indicated whether community members were interested in that mixed-use or parking area?
Ms. Luxhoj	Can you speak to that, Dan?
Mr. Pauly	Yeah, sure. So, I managed that 2013 update. So that 2013 update had nothing to do with the Village Center; that was the last time it was updated, but it did not touch the Village Center.
Ms. Hendrix	Okay.
Mr. Pauly	I think the last time there was a significant update to the Village Center was at or around the original master planning in the early mid-2000s. So, each of those processes did go through a full legislative process, which included public outreach, there was quite a bit of public input, I know, on the 2013 update, and that was before my day, the rest of those updates, between 2003 and 2013, all had full public review processes.
Ms. Hendrix	Okay.
Mr. Pauly	So, there has not been really any—and, judging by the fact that most of the land uses for the Village Center were adopted by DRB in like 2006, 2007 nothing substantial has changed around the Village Center, as I understand it since like 2003, 2005.
Ms. Hendrix	Thank you
Chair Nada	Okay. So I have few questions. So my first question is, what is a live/work space? What is this? What does this mean?
Ms. Luxhoj	So, a live/work space would be a space that has exterior access to like a storefront kind of, and a person might use the first floor or the main part where you come first into the space as a small office, a meeting space, or they could use it for other things and kind of, it would be for a business of some sort. And then, a lot of times there is a loft or there is some way of separating the rest of the living area from where the person is actually living, but they are living and working out of their apartment.
Chair Nada	Okay. So, my second question has to do with the zone changing from PF to V, something maybe I do not understand, even though I have been through a lot of those developments where, why does it have to be this way? Why wasn't it just V to start with, if the master plan was to have it condo or building a specific way, why does it have to be designated PF, and then it has to go through the [inaudible 1:08:54] process to V? What is the rationale behind that? And how many—yeah, okay, after this question, I have another follow up question.
Mr. Pauly	You know, the short answer to, well, maybe not too short, but really that's the way it has always been done in Wilsonville, is one simple way to answer it. That is not particular to the Village Zone, but we really certainly have not rezoned any kind of vacant land. The land remains either in a holding or the prior zone pre-development until the time it is developed. And that is intentional so that, you know, it comes in that we understand how everything interrelates, and we are getting a full view of it, of what is going on there when we actually do the rezoning. That tends to be more meaningful. Other places where there may be

	some more options for zoning, but in this case, there is only one option and it is all consistent with the Master Plan, so it is less meaningful, but it kind of follows that pattern that we use everywhere in the city.
Chair Nada	Thanks, Dan. And my follow up question to this is, do you recall when was the last time a PF zone has been converted to V. When was the last time that happened?
Mr. Pauly	The last approval on the Village Center, which would have been...
Ms. Luxhoj	2006, 2007?
Mr. Pauly	No. Oh, probably the Monte Blanc town houses, which was 2016, 2017? So like where there's construction right now that went through a similar process that wasn't part of the Dammasch Campus, so that one had County zoning on it, but it also was rezoned to V when that neighborhood that is currently under construction on the north end. [Inaudible 1:10:55] it's been rezoned to be V.
Chair Nada	Which year was it?
Mr. Pauly	[Inaudible 01:10:57] prior zoning was.
Chair Nada	I just missed which year the rezoning happened, the last one.
Mr. Pauly	The last one, where it wasn't PF before that was in 2018, I think. The last one was actually public facility in the Village Center. I'd have to look at it. Well, it was 2016 or 2017, somewhere in there.
Chair Nada	Okay. So, the reason I am asking is, there were a few applications that got approved and, and even though there were vacant lands, and then converted, but I was just wondering if this is the standard practice that the City goes through. I remember seeing some changes like this that a PF to V was not part of it. It was just like different zoning, or some of those zoning already had—was already set up as V, like a part of the master plan.
Mr. Pauly	That is a great question. So, typically that's where it was maybe a single parcel that was being brought in. And, for example, like where Building C is, it was a phase development, so they rezoned the whole parcel at that time, but they had planned a phase and one of those phases was never built essentially. So that leaves it vacant for this application at this time.
Chair Nada	Okay. So now, I have got a few questions about the parking. First is, do we have any formal studies, like we do study for traffic and we use it to see if whatever new development is following or is going to shock the current traffic criteria that we have for the city? Do you have anything similar for parking for the City of Wilsonville? [1:11:48]
Mr. Pauly	So, typically we don't do parking studies. For this particular area in the Village Center, the data was late 1990s, early 2020. There was data collected. It was done on a Saturday afternoon, kind of during peak parking time, as well as a weekday evening to kind of see what percentage of on-street parking and other parking in the Village Center were actually being used. That data was collected and put into some draft documents, but it was never like, published in a final document.
Chair Nada	Okay. So, what I am trying to get to here is, the parking situation in Villebois, I don't live there, but I have a lot of friends who live there and I drive by all the

	time, so I do not know if what I am seeing right now is what was planned. Like, when this study was conducted, how far was it from what was expected within that Code? Was it like a line, because unless you can share the number with us and show us if it is possible, if it is handy, if you can share this information. But I just want to get us a figure of like how far off are we, or are we on track of what the business and what the Code suggest? [13:20]
Scott Mansur	Yeah, I'm Scott Mansur with DKS Associates. Dan, do you want me to take a cut at responding?
Mr. Pauly	Sure, go ahead, Scott.
Mr. Mansur	Okay. So, on behalf of the Community Development Director, Chris Neamtzu, we did some initial parking study back in 2019. And we looked at kind of what the parking evaluation was on a Saturday midday, which is typically kind of a parks, retail, residential peak, and then we all so looked at a weekday evening peak period. And we also did some forecasting for the development that is before you now. And I guess, I'd say the summary of that study is there is adequate parking in the Villebois Village. When you get to the core and the general area where this building is, most of the parking is occupied. So, if you were going to look for a parking stall, you might have to walk a couple blocks, but in the Village itself, there's plenty of parking. However, like I said, in this area, most of the on-street parking and the parking in the vicinity of these buildings was in the 80% to 100% occupied. So, does that help?
Chair Nada	Yeah, it does. So, if I get—if I read the number correctly, the part of this proposal here, or when it comes to parking, is 48 on-street parking, which is, as I can see right now, all this on-street parking, unless new, on-street parking will be added by the development. When I drove there and this is not by any way scientific or anything, just me driving there, I did not see 48. I think 40 is the number, or 45, I forgot. I did not see 48, 45 parking spots available. So again, this is not scientific just a random few times. So, that is why I was looking for scientific data that tells me how far off. So do we have the 40— I know what the Code says, and I am not here to discuss what the Code is. I am not questioning this, but what I want to ask is, do we have an office enough on-street parking spaces right now, 45 empty spots? Or whatever the study was conducted. [1:15:25]
Mr. Abernathy	Hey, Samy, can I ask to add to that? Because that is what I was trying to get through, too. I do not care about the Code right now, but what I hear—you said you did a parking analysis, but there is no retail there now to really justify an analysis of that, because you only have one or two retail spots that are there. If we put in a whole bunch of retail spots in the mixed units, is that area going to be able to handle that with the people living there and not inconvenience the people living there and the people that are attending the retail area from outside of Villebois?
Mr. Mansur	I guess it is a little bit challenging to answer that question. And Dan, I get, you have looked at the parking study as well, as far as what is assumed in each of the buildings, and I guess is what the assumptions that we had related to retail

	space and office space and units, is that all pretty consistent with the current application?
Mr. Pauly	Yeah, it's fairly—and I haven't looked at it in great detail in terms of how it compares; but again, I would caution, and Barbara, feel free to add your two cents to this, is that this is not really evidence we can consider here because it is about policy and it is about offering future operations, right? If we were to deny an application based on some unpublished study or casual observations, that would not be defensible. So really, you know, I'm saying we need to look at the current standards and that is the measuring stick that under the law that we're measuring this against. And I just want to reiterate that.
Chair Nada	So just clarify. So basically if I get it right, what you are saying is even though if you know 100% that the new development will cause a problem, parking wise, if you know, a 100%, and I am not saying that we know this here. I am not saying that, but I just want to clarify the last comment you made then. That even if you know 100% this is going to cause a problem, we cannot deny it based on that there's no parking? We cannot say, even though we know it is going to be a problem, parking wise, we cannot deny it and say it's because of parking. Am I getting this right or no?
Mr. Pauly	Right. So, the short answer I would say is, yes, that's correct. Under State law, it's needed housing and there's clear objective criteria that we have to apply to it.
Chair Nada	Okay. So last questions, maybe I think Jason or somebody asked this question, who is going to own the parking lot, the new parking space? Is it going to be the City or it is going to be private with the HOA?
Mr. Pauly	Well, and I think when it comes to on-street parking, right, there is the concept of usable and accessible. But the way the Code is written is it kind of gives that adjacent—so one way to think about it—it gives that adjacent development first preference to that on-street parking. So, even if it's used currently, and it makes sense, that if residents in that neighboring building have been using that maybe for years, because it was more convenient, as more residents come in, those new residents are entitled to that spot under the Code. Right? Though we are not metering it or anything in that sense, but essentially that allowance where they're entitled to use that on-street parking under the Code as parking pushes some of that existing use elsewhere.
Chair Nada	Of course. Again, my observation, this is not the scientific by any means. That was why I was hoping for an up-to-date parking study, but yeah, people who park there right now, yeah—based on the number of parking, I do not see a lot of other places where they can park, at least you can actually walk maybe three or four blocks. But anyway, this is again, not scientific, I am just basing on my observation, and I was hoping to find a study, like an up-to-date study and I was hoping, and maybe something that we can talk about later on, that the City Council actually, and this is not a policy thing, but exactly like the traffic studies, we should do something like this based on what we can say okay or not. So, anyway, moving on. So my last question was, who is going to own the parking

	lot? Is it going to be owned by the City or by the HOA? Who is going to own it? Who is going to be responsible for maintaining it?
Ms. Luxhoj	It would be privately owned.
Chair Nada	Privately owned. Okay. So, I have no further questions. Does any other member? Any member, anybody want to have any other question for the staff before we move on to the Applicant's presentation? Okay. With this, will the Applicant please come to the podium, with the microphone or commence your presentation when unmuted in Zoom. State your name and address and present any testimony you would like to present to the Development Review Board.
Stacey Connery	Good evening, can you hear us? Okay...
Chair Nada	Yes.
Ms. Connery	Can you guys still hear us?
Ms. Dunwell	Yes.
Mr. Pauly	Yes.
Ms. Connery	Okay, I am sorry. We're having a little technical difficulty here. If you can bear with us for a moment.
Rudy Kadlub	Seems to be in the air tonight.
Chair Nada	And so, while we are waiting for the Applicant for the presentation, I just want to remind everybody who wishes to testify to just look at the chat right now. Shelley just sent a link about filling out the testimony card, so please do so if you wish to testify. Thank you. Would do you guys like to have a little break till you get this whole technical issue taken care of?
Unknown [01:25:07]	Yes, that would be great.
Chair Nada	Can I have a motion for about a 10-minute break?
Ms. Connery	Thank you so much.
Chair Nada	Can I have a motion?
Ms. Dunwell	I have a motion for a 10 minute break.
Mr. Abernathy	I second that motion.
Chair Nada	So a motion to take a break for 10 minutes has been moved and seconded. All those in favor?
All	Aye.
Chair Nada	Okay. So, we are going to reconvene at 8:05, in 10 minutes from now.
	<i>Recessed at 7:56 pm and reconvened at 8:05 pm.</i>
Chair Nada	Yep. So is the Applicant ready with a presentation?
Rudy Kadlub	Chair Nada, are we ready to go?
Chair Nada	Yes, we are ready for you.
Rudy Kadlub	Okay. Chair Nada and members of the Design Review Board, my name is Rudy Kadlub, I am the President of Costa Pacific Communities and master planner of Villebois; address is 9420, SE Lawnfield Rd in Clackamas. And before my team begins presenting our application this evening, because I do not believe any of

the current members of this panel were serving at the inception, I'd like to give you a brief history of Villebois and the process.

- Back in the late 1980s, when the State of Oregon closed its hospital on the site, and then in the mid-1990s, it sought to repurpose the 250,000 sq ft building into a women's prison on the site. The city and the surrounding neighborhoods had a different idea and a different vision for the property and commissioned the study, which became known as the Dammasch Area Transportation Efficiency Land Use Plan—it's a mouthful and it's called DATELUP. This plan laid down the framework for a new urban village designed to correct the jobs/housing imbalance that was existing in Wilsonville at the time. The State and the City teamed to find a more suitable location for the needed prison and to solve the then City's water shortage problem by creating a state-of-the-art treatment facility to provide water for the city's anticipated growth. With the building moratorium lifted, the State and the City instituted a nationwide search for a developer to execute the DATELUP plan. And in 2001, our company, Costa Pacific was selected to be that developer and negotiated the purchase of the property from the State of Oregon.
- In 2002, Costa Pacific started the intense planning of what would become Villebois. Beginning in the fall of 2002, Costa Pacific began hosting a series of six communitywide meetings, which were attended by hundreds of citizens, both at the Boones Ferry Elementary School and at the former hospital itself. In this iterative process, which took place over 18 months, we listened to the wishes of the community and created with them the framework that would eventually become the largest non-resort master plan in Oregon. In late 2003, a joint application was submitted for the concept plan and master plan by the City and Costa Pacific. So the City was actually a part of the application, the Applicant, and I believe it was in 2004, after dozens of public meetings, the concept plan and the master plan were approved. And eventually in 2006, zoning amendments, the first two specific area plans (SAP), preliminary development plan, and final development plans for the first neighborhoods were all unanimously approved by the DRB, Planning Commission and City council with virtually no opposition by the citizens. And that was because they had such a hand in creating the plan itself. Since that time, no fewer than 12 preliminary development plans and 18 final development plans have been applied for and approved within the SAP Central alone. All of which were in conformance with the approved Master Plan. In addition, SAP South, East, and North have been approved and today, nearly 6,000 people call Villebois home. In 2010, Villebois was named America's Best Master Planned Community by the National Association of Home Builders.
- The application before you tonight has been in the works since 2018. In the spring of 2019, we hosted a community meeting at the water treatment facility attended by 50 plus Villebois residents. And in the summer of 2020, we visited virtually, I mean that literally and figuratively, with all of the SAP

	<p>Central HOAs to share the plan and listen to their feedback. That feedback included concerns for the lack of retail, increased traffic, lack of enough parking, and density. In a moment, our team of award-winning engineers and architects will share with you how this application addresses those concerns and complies with the nearly two decade’s old Master Plan. I want to commend the City planning staff for its thorough review of the application, and we accept their findings, recommendations, and conditions of approval, and we urge you to approve the plan as submitted. Now I would like to introduce Stacy Connery of Pacific Community Design, whose company has been involved with the planning of Villebois since the outset.</p>
<p>Ms. Connery</p>	<p>Thank you, Rudy. Let’s see. Bear with me just a moment here. I will share the screen and hopefully we will have success with it this time. There we go. Can everyone see the PowerPoint? Thank you. And thank you for being so patient with us earlier. We did not quite expect to start off with shenanigans, but here we are and happy to go forward here. My name is Stacy Connery. I am with Pacific Community Design. My address is 12564, SW Main Street in Tigard, 97223. Why is this not advancing? Yeah. Okay. Move the picture, so hopefully, everyone can see the full slide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Let’s see, our first slide here is showing an aerial photograph of Villebois. The boundary of Villebois is shown in red and, similar to Cindy’s presentation, we wanted to emphasize the Piazza, which is considered to be the core or the heart of Villebois. We have this graphic showing the location of the Piazza within Villebois, which is identifying the existing building around the Piazza, which is known as the Domaine and our proposed Buildings, A, B, and C, and the parking area here. We wanted to draw attention to this because the original vision within Villebois is that the Piazza will serve as a public room for the community. And the idea of the public outdoor room is that there are buildings on all four sides of that room that serve as walls to create this community feeling of like a third space or a third room for people to spend their time. I also wanted to note at this stage, too that one of the major concepts with the Villebois Master Plan is that this is multimodal community that is designed to serve pedestrians, bicyclists, as well as vehicles, but the primary emphasis is on having walkable streets. That is why so much of the parking is behind the homes and is accessed via alleys. • This slide is showing the land use plan for the Villebois Master Plan. And, as noted in Cindy’s presentation, all of the Villebois does receive a Village zone as development applications are approved, and the last remaining pieces in the Villebois to receive the Village zone, are Buildings, A and B. The Village Code that accompanies the zone of Village allows for refinements to this Master Plan and allows refinements to go up or down by 10%. As Cindy mentioned, our site carries the mixed-use land use category, which anticipates commercial on ground floor level of buildings with residential, several stories above.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This slide is focusing in on SAP Central. So we wanted to bring to your attention that within SAP Central, the original planned density target for that area was 1,010 dwelling units, with the refinements allowed via Code, that density could have gone up by 10% or down by 10%. So there is potential—it could have increased by 100 units over time, but that’s not what has taken place. Within SAP Central, the blocks were actually each identified, each land use category was identified with a range of units that was planned to be located within that area, and our map here is identifying Buildings A, B, C, and the parking area. And the original SAP density ranges are shown at the table at the top. (Slide 4) Together, they total 41 to 144 units. The proposed project proposes units on sites A, B, and C, but not where the parking area is proposed for a total of 142 dwelling units proposed. This results in 985 dwelling units in total in SAP Central, which is a 2.5% decrease in density from the original planning effort. And of note here, the street systems and parking did anticipate this level of density and at the end of the day, we’re actually ending up with 2.5% less density than was originally planned for. • This slide is beginning to introduce the architecture around the Piazza. And again, the Domaine is existing. We have a graphic shown here and then Buildings, A, B, and C, will complete the walls around the Piazza, and we are proposing a parking area in this location. I’m going to now switch seats with Sam Sanderson, who is the architect and he will walk you through some of the architectural information and the floor plans. Just use this to toggle.
Sam Sanderson	<p>Good evening, everyone. I am Sam Sanderson at C2K Architecture, and I’m here to quickly discuss the building design for our proposed buildings. As you can see, we are proposing three, four-story buildings, which essentially match the height of the existing Domaine apartments building. On this aerial site image, the true north is facing up, and the Domaine apartments building is in the lower right-hand corner.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On this architectural site plan image, true north has been rotated 45 degrees, so that Building B is at the top of the screen, which is project north. The existing Domaine apartments building is at the bottom of the screen. At the east side of the Piazza is Building A and to the north is Building B. Building A to the east is 36 apartment units, and Building B has 54 apartment units. Building A has a large postal center for Villebois on the ground floor, along with a public restroom, and that is shown in green on the screen. Other common spaces such as community rooms are shown in blue on the screen, all fronting the Piazza. Building B has a retail space at the street corner shown in green and the lobby and leasing spaces that are also facing the Piazza and are shown in blue. Building A, the ground floor is shown in the middle of the screen and the typical upper floor plan is on the right. The upper floor plans are all residential units. The building façade is shown on the left, which will have a light brick veneer at the buildings corners with dark fiber cement lap siding and fiber cement reveal panels with an accent color. Building B’s ground floor shown in the middle of the screen, and the

	<p>flex retail space is shown in dark orange, are apartment units that are structurally designed to easily be retrofit into retail spaces or serve as live/work units. The upper floor plans are at the bottom of the screen, the typical upper floor plans are residential units. At level four, there is an amenity deck at the street corner, with an adjacent interior amenity space. The building's façade is shown at the top of the screen, which will have a dark brick veneer at the building space with light colored fiber cement lap siding in dark fiber cement reveal panels. Building C is at the west side of the Piazza. Building C has 52 apartment units. Building C has a retail space at the street corner shown in green. The lobby spaces are facing the Piazza shown in blue. The flex retail spaces are shown in dark orange and our apartment units that are structurally designed to be easily retrofit in the retail spaces or serve as live/work units. The ground floor is not [1:41:05] shown in the middle of the screen, and the typical upper floor plans are shown on the right. The upper floor plans are all residential units. The building's façade is shown on the left, which will have a medium tone brick veneer at the building's corners with a dark fiber cement lap siding at the middle floors and the light colored fiber cement, board and batten panels at the two building corners. And the roof is sloped at these two bookends of the building.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While we are discussing the floor plans, as previously discussed, there is a Condition of Approval PDD 5 regarding the trash room size. And what I would just say to that is our design team sized these trash rooms in discussions with the waste management company. And part of our discussions in right-sizing these trash rooms was discussing the frequencies of trash pickup. And so we'll, you know, comply with this requirement for trash sizing. What we would request is that the condition of approval identify that the frequencies of trash pickup can play a factor in right-sizing this trash room, which is how we have designed it to date. And with that, I will hand it back to Stacy, and she will discuss the trash [inaudible 1:42:27] and the parking.
Ms. Connery	<p>Thank you, Sam. Okay. This graphic was designed to try to articulate how parking is being provided for this project. The yellow areas identified are off-street parking areas with the number spaces provided within those parking areas shown in red. The blue areas you see shown along the streets identify adjacent on-street parking areas that have been anticipated for use for the development of these sites. The Code requires 149 parking spaces, 183 are provided, 138 of those provided are off-street spaces and 45 are on-street parking spaces. This results in the project exceeding the parking lot requirement by 22.8%.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This graphic focuses in on the parking area that is proposed on Lot 12. And just to reiterate, these are 28 parking spaces that are being provided to serve the users of the proposed buildings that are part of this project. So, they will be for use of residents, tenants, and people who would shop at the

	<p>commercial uses in these buildings. The parking area will be signed to that effect and the parking area will be owned and managed by the operating company for the mixed-use buildings. They will all be managed together. Let's see. So, 24 off-street parking spaces are shown for on-street here. And as Cindy did note, the parking area is not considered to generate traffic in and of itself because it is in association with the buildings that are proposed as part of this project. And so, the trips that would be occurring as part of the residential/commercial components will occur regardless of whether or not this parking area is there. Just for some context of what was previously considered for this site, as Cindy mentioned, there is a prior approval that is not going forward at this time, that would have allowed two, detached row homes and mixed-use row home to be constructed on the property. That plan included 18 proposed parking spaces, six within garages, eight off-street parking spaces in the alley. That plan included these four alley parking spaces and included some four alley parking spaces in this location and also included the four on-street parking spaces shown here.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The property owner has chosen not to go forward with developing residential or commercial uses on the site and decided instead to propose this parking area in response to concerns that we have heard from the existing residents regarding parking. And by providing this parking area, we think it will help to address some of those concerns. The other thing to consider is the SAP Central plan did identify 8 to 12 mixed-use condos on this site. If a development had gone forward implementing what the SAP central and the Master Plan contemplated for this, there could have potentially been 24 parking spaces with that mixed-use condo project.• This graphic shows the Landscape Plan for the parking area and includes the perspective from the street intersection of what the parking area would look like with the vine fencing that is proposed to surround it. This image shows what that vegetation would look like when it is flowering. And in the seasons, where it is not flowering, it would still be an evergreen cover that would clearly screen the parking area.• And, this next graphic is zooming in onto those four diagonal spaces that are accessed via the alley, showing how vehicles would be parked within those spaces. Actually, it is notable that there is a grade change between the lot and the alley, the adjacent home next to it sits up higher than the alley, and there is currently a bit of a mountain area there. So when these parking spaces are constructed, they will actually be at a slightly lower surface level than the existing home that is adjacent to it, and there will be low retaining walls built to help define the parking spaces and to address the grade differential. So, headlights or the front of these cars will be into a low wall with a vegetation screening. And there is an existing solid wood fence along the property line. And also just to point out context, this is where those four diagonal spaces are located, which happens to be right next to some head-in parking that is already existing along that alley.
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Let's see this slide. We just wanted to end on a similar vein to where we started this presentation with the images of the four buildings that will surround the Piazza that will provide the walls for the Piazza. This is a picture of the Piazza. Currently, I am standing on the same street as the Domaine looking across. And what you see here is basically a vacant space on the opposite side of the Piazza. And the intention from the very beginning is to give walls to this outdoor room and create this like vibrant, active space for everyone in the community of Villebois to enjoy. Let's see. I think we are at the end of our presentation, and we are happy to answer any questions and I thank you for giving us this time.
Chair Nada	Okay. Thanks, Stacy and everyone. So, normally at the time we normally ask the Development Review Board members to ask the Applicant, but I was just wondering if you can just hold this off a little bit and because it is getting late and I want to make sure to give our attendees—all the citizens a chance to provide their testimony before it is too late. And then, after the testimonies are over, you can have the Applicant back, if you have any rebuttal, and at the same time, they can answer any of our questions as well.
Stacy Connery	Thank you.

Chair Nada	<p>No problem. So with this, Shelley, if you could just—so I’m going to go ahead with reading the manuscript about what you guys should do, if you want to testify, but please look at what is in the screen right now. And if you can use the raise hand feature in the Zoom, so I know who wants to speak, and I am going to go by the alphabetical order that I can see on my list of attendees here so please raise your hand, and if you do not know how to do so, just go ahead and do that. Look at what is on the screen. If you are calling, just press *9, and this will be like a hand raise. With that being said, I am just going to go ahead and go through the manuscript for how the testimony is and how everything should be like. So before I call the testimony—um—okay, is there any member of the audience on the Zoom who wishes to testify, who has not already indicated whether they wish to testify? If so, please let us know by sending a message to the recorder via share Zoom also you can call a phone number (503) 570-1536. That’s another way to ensure more participants have an opportunity to testify and are not prevented to do so by technical issues. I will confer individually if each participant whether they do not wish to testify, they wish to testify and have already indicated so to the recorder, either prior or during the meeting they have submitted testimonies or will submit testimonies by email or wish to have read into the record. Do you wish to testify but have not yet indicated so, to submit any testimony by email during the hearing, use the following email: planning@ci.wilsonville.or.us. Please note a written comment of testimony received after the public hearing has closed cannot be considered. So make sure to send your testimony right now, if you want to send it. As you are giving an opportunity to testify, either in person or via the Zoom call, please, state your name and address, or state that your address is as provided in your testimony card, and present any testimony you would like to present to the Development Review Board. Please do your best to speak loudly and clearly, directly into the microphone so other participants are sure to hear your comment. After each participant, I will ask the Board if they have any questions. So, before we commence hearing the testimonies, please make sure to raise your hand because I only see one person.</p>
Mr. Pauly	<p>Chair Nada, I do have one card here in Council Chambers to testify as well. So I don't know if you want to start with the in-person, then go through the online [inaudible 1:54:29]</p>
Chair Nada	<p>Sure, we can do that, but just before we start doing that, I just want to make sure that because I can only—on the online, I can only see one person with a raised hand and I'm planning to use this as an indication if you want to testify. So, please use the raise hand feature, and if you have any trouble doing that, please indicate that in the chat or follow the instruction. Yes, Raise your hand regardless. I'm going to use this raise hand just so I can know the list to go to [inaudible 1:54:35]. But again, if you did not, I will try—I am just using this as a way to order it. I will try to make sure that everybody here who wants to testify will testify. This just will make the job easier for me and for everyone. And also, please—so we going be limiting the testimony to three minutes. I'll try to remind</p>

	<p>you when you are two minutes in. We appreciate you being to the point and precise. We have few people here, either in the Council room or online, and what I've noticed from previous experiences is when we have a lot of people on and you have a lot of points to say some of the point gets lost. So, please be precise and be short. So just go and just try to say the points that really matter to you, so we can write it down and we move on to the next testimony and go on [inaudible 1:55:32] done. So please just stick to the three minutes. I hope we don't have to cut anybody off, so please take only three minutes or way less if you can. Just state your points and move on and if you haven't—if somebody before you stated the same point you have stated, you can simply just say, "I agree" or "I concur with that testimony and I have the same point." This will save us time and also make sure that no point will get lost. So with this being said, let's just go ahead. Dan, I do not see the participant at the Council Chamber. I do not have to see him; you guys don't have to turn on your cameras. But with that, let's just start with the first testimony. Please state your name and address or say, "as stated in the record" and Shelley can restart the timer as soon as you start to speak.</p>
Ms. White	We have a video we've moved to the camera. [1:56:25]
Steve Abrew	I'm sorry. I was wondering if I can get a picture from the presentation.
Ms. Luxhoj	Of Lot 12?
Ms. White	We can pull it up.
Mr. Abrew	Yes.
Chair Nada	<p>And one last request I have for any of the testimony that will be given today. If you guys can just mention, if you have been invited or attended any of the meetings that the Applicant has held to communicate the changes with the public. So, just indicate yes or no, it will be great, if you can. You don't have to do it, but this will kind of helped me to know what sort of communication had happened. Okay, with this, I'll give you the floor.</p>
Mr. Abrew	<p>Hello. My name is Stevie Abrew. My address is 11410 SW Barber St. My wife and I and family have lived in Villebois for 15 years, so been there for some time. So on this diagram here, I just wanted to provide some information. You can see it's a very busy area, Barber St. In fact, I live in the second unit in from the top, [inaudible 1:56:42] there's a building of eight units. Those are the Seville row homes. So, the front of my home is on busy Barber St and the rear of my home is on this private drive. So, maybe you can see that second unit down, as I back out of my garage—we do park two cars in our garage. When I back out that is going to be challenging to turn. This change, in terms of having this parking structure is going to move traffic in a single direction, where up to this point it has been either direction. But because of the angled parking, it's going to require everyone to [inaudible 1:58:43] Of course, trash trucks and delivery trucks spend a lot of time on that back alley. Right across from my unit, as well, you can see there's three units, three homes. Those three homes have children that play on the road and in fact that entire area is their playground at this point. So I'm concerned a little bit about the safety happening; a lot of density in terms of traffic through</p>

	<p>this area. On the left side, on the top, there's a Carbello condominium, so that individual is going to have a few questions. Anyway, my question just in general is, what happens if those parking spaces are not there? Because the Piazza is supposed to be [inaudible 1:59:53] Villebois. And, you know, I took off—I walked across the Piazza and kind of looked back just to get a view of what it might look like with a 6-ft fence, basically. And it was not quite as aesthetically pleasing as the rest of area in terms of wonderful houses, and [inaudible 2:00:22] tall trees. So this is kind of unprecedented, in terms of having a structure like this. Thank you.</p>
Chair Nada	<p>Okay. So, I am going to go in the order that I see here. I only see one, two, three, four, five and [inaudible 2:00:45] has a raised hand. I'm not sure if anybody else, oh, now I am seeing more. Okay, so I'm just going to go ahead and call—I have the list here. I think it's order—I don't know—whatever order that I have, I'm just going to go ahead and start with the first person. Please, after you are done with your testimony, again, stick to the three minutes and after you are done could you please un-raise your hand, so I know to move to the next. So, the first testimony, here is from Garrett. So Garret please, go ahead.</p>
Garet Prior	<p>Oh. Hi everyone, can you hear me? Yeah, my name is Garet Prior, address is in the record. I just live a few blocks off of where the Villebois center is at and just would request tonight that you stick to the plan and support our center. We need all types of housing for all kinds of people in this community. We need housing for middle-class and work force homes, near jobs, schools, and transit. We're in the middle of a climate and a housing crisis now. So every piece of land. Every ounce of land and how we use it should really be scrutinized and thought about. And so, I really want to thank City Staff and you all for taking the time to really methodically work through a very, you know, as we saw even today, a very dense presentation and going over each one of these elements, The Villebois area was—I know, some of my neighbors that are in fear about parking, safety, and traffic, but this neighborhood was really a plan to accommodate that through, if we had more people living in our center, there is a concept called crime prevention through environmental design. It actually makes an area safer when there's more eyes on the street. And so, if we would have this development in place at the time of the Villebois fire, maybe somebody would have saw people going into the building or people messing around there; that could have made our neighborhood safer. I know there's a lot of concerns about parking. I think it's going to be hard to ever quantify. I think there's ample parking within the neighborhood to accommodate it. I think partly some of, some of us put too much stuff in our garages and so that fills up the parking space we should be using for our car. I think that to accommodate this new development, I have talked with other neighbors as well, we are easily able to walk, just a little—a few feet further, a little bit to accommodate new neighbors and housing needs that we really need here. I think with that, I will just finally say I'm also Co-chair of the Wilsonville Alliance for Inclusive Community and this development was called for in the Equitable Housing Strategic Plan. We are in favor of the Equitable Housing Strategic Plan, again, to meet the racial and income equity gaps that we have in</p>

	<p>our community. This piece of property is a very key element of that. So again, I would, I would ask you to prove that, because this development will make our neighborhoods safer.</p> <p>So, in final–in conclusion, this is really our choice, uh, that we have tonight. We stick to the longstanding plan for housing for all types and all kinds of people in our center, or we restrict it through denying this to be more expensive and exclusive in our community. So help Wilsonville build upon our inclusive past by furthering it and approving this tonight. Thank you.</p>
Chair Nada	<p>[Inaudible 2:04:08] and thank you for sticking to a time. Is it Michelle next? Michelle, go ahead.</p>
Michelle Sandlin	<p>Hi, can you hear me now? Hi. Okay, I'm going to go fast. My name is Michelle Sandlin and I live at 29008 SW Villebois Dr. Tonight, I am representing the objection letter that was submitted to the City on September 17th, signed by 40 Villebois homeowners that are all affected by the parking lot. That is what our main objection is. We are concerned the proposed parking lot will have serious impact on our standard of living and particularly the value of our properties. Our main points in that letter were detrimental impact on residential immunities. This is out of character with the committee. The Master Plan says that it is intended to be a pedestrian-friendly walk into the Village Center. This will eliminate open green space in the Village Center and add more blacktop. The congestion has already been mentioned. We think that's the most egregious part of this plan of putting a parking lot in the center, which is basically in a private narrow driveway, which has already been mentioned. The safety and security risks we highlighted in our appeal–our objection letter and also the young children that play in this area, which is happens on a daily basis. But one thing I will mention about the protection of the trees is the Friends Of Trees Organization that we consulted during this process, as well as other conservation groups, stated that the biggest concern they had was putting a parking lot in the middle of a Village Center where you already have an abundance of cement and that was a significant health concern and creates a heat dome. We are also very concerned about the ground stability with completely paving over that space. We will have water runoff issue for all of us that live directly around it. We are concerned about the–you mentioned about the appearance and maintenance, but that's already an issue and a problem. We just see that being exacerbated, particularly if it's a private party that's going to own the parking lot. The serious cramming; it's already high density. It's already been mentioned, particularly backing out of our garages we are very concerned about. The loss of privacy and it is worth noting here that none of the HOAs listed in this objection letter were consulted about the Applicant's proposal except the Villebois Village Master Association, which is controlled by the Applicant. It's hard for us that are directly impacted by this, not to see that as anything but intentional. The homeowners who signed this letter purchased their property having been given a copy of the Master Plan, we put our good faith in what was stated in that document as a quality place to live, raise our families and retire. The main attraction for many of us is that it was</p>

	pedestrian focused. You could walk to the Village Center and it was a very green lifestyle. Approval of a parking lot in the middle of the center seems like a betrayal of good faith to us. I do have a couple of questions. Do you want me to hold those until later?
Chair Nada	Yeah, you actually—you should say them now, because we do not have—yeah. Just quickly say them because you only have 20 seconds.
Ms. Sandlin	At the minimum—if the minimum parking threshold is met, why is the parking lot necessary? And, we want to state that it's been reported to us as the homeowners from multiple reports that this is already a done deal, that this hearing is just a formality and we would like to know, is that true?
Chair Nada	Yeah. Thank you. Thanks, Michelle. We will definitely get these answered by the Applicant, Staff and the Board. So, thanks for sticking with the time. Next is Tracy, go ahead.
Tracy Gilday	Can you hear me?
Chair Nada	Yes, we can. Go ahead.
Ms. Gilday	I agree with a lot of things that were just said. I wanted to reiterate that, well, first of all, I am Tracy Gilday and I live at 1341 Stonehaven Dr in West Linn. I do have a rental property, which is on—sorry, I have my notes here, 11507 SW Toulouse St. So it is one of those three apartments that you guys are looking next to the parking lot. I currently have a rental where they have two kids that ride their bikes down that alleyway all the time. I know that there are kids in the parking—or in the house right next to where you want to put the four slanted parking stalls. There is no waterline even installed currently in that location; not really sure how you are going to be able to do—you're going to have to install waterline to be able to put parking there. Currently, the homeowner on the end of there is using his own water to make it look nice and not so rundown and depleted; to make that area look decent. That alleyway too, is pretty narrow, and so backing cars in and out, in addition to adding all of those cars in the parking lot, coming in and out that alleyway, is just going to really create a lot more congestion. And earlier, you guys were saying that Lot 12 was not necessarily based on the density, the current density, so I think that it's going to start to devalue the homes in the area when the whole point was to increase the value of the homes. And so, making these changes I think will decrease the values of our property instead of increase it. And especially if it is not necessary; I do not know why we cannot make it into a green space. And then let's see, that's pretty much it. Maybe you can answer the last person's question on, is this already a done deal?
Chair Nada	After all the testimony, we're going to have the Applicant, Staff, and also we will answer any questions. So is this, are you done? Is this it?
Ms. Gilday	Yes. I'm sorry, one more thing, will this increase our homeowners' fees because currently they have not been given over to the homeowners yet. And so, this place has been in development for years and none of us really have a say yet. So like she said, the homeowners, it goes back to the developer and we are not a lot—

	you know, we don't really have a say yet. So I'm wondering, when is that going to happen?
Chair Nada	Thanks Tracy. Thanks so much. Thank you. So, Duncan next.
Duncan T Sandlin	Yes, can you hear me?
Chair Nada	Yep, I can.
Duncan T Sandlin	All right, thank you very much. So, my name is Duncan Tyrell Sandlin. I live at 29008 SW Villebois Dr. I've been working with the Villebois petition with Michelle and no, so far none of us have been invited to any meetings held by the Applicant as you asked. If any of the homeowners listening want to email us for more information about what we're doing, it's Villeboispetition@hotmail.com. So I just want to address the council as long as, as well as the homeowners about the parking lot situation. I was asked as a financial person just to go over the financial concerns that were briefly mentioned in the petition, but haven't been addressed yet here. We do ascertain that the creation of a parking lot will more than certainly depreciate the value of the surrounding homes. This also includes a reduction in the growth factor for the value of the homes over time, which will decrease the return on investment for homeowners to a significant amount of money and that will be due to a decrease in demand because people would rather live next to a park or green space than a parking lot. Because of this, it is a big concern since people's homes are usually their largest asset in their financial portfolio. Because of this, and I want the home owners to be aware of this as well, our petition has spoken with a land use attorney. He has informed us that he is willing to help anybody, but they can redress loss of grievances or loss of value due to the alteration of the covenant, the covenant being the Master Plan in this case. After reviewing the Master Plan, the Master Plan does not allow for a parking lot as a standard alone feature. It does allow for mixed-use housing and condos and things like that, but it does not allow for a parking lot. So any alteration to that covenant, which these people all purchased their homes under, would be legally actionable to redress the grievance of loss and the value of their homes going forward. And of course, liability of these things does fall partially on the party that alters the conditions of the covenant being the Master Plan in this case. So for summation for the homeowners who will more than certainly suffer some financial loss due the creation of a parking lot, a legal action is available. If you want information, please email us at villeboispetition@hotmail.com. Also to address Councilwoman Dunwell's question earlier, there was some confusion about, the rezoning or the approval of the condos being built here and they said it was a three-person condo—your council person said that at the City Hall Council Chamber—if that is consistent with the housing around it, that would be a maximum of six parking spaces in that area. Hope that answers your question. Thank you very much.
Chair Nada	Thank you. Thanks for sticking to the time. Next, I have here, Sheri. Go ahead.
Sheri Walton	Yes, can you hear me?

Chair Nada	Yes, we can.
Ms. Walton	<p>My name is Sheri Walton. I live at 11507 SW Toulouse Street. I am one of the three homeowners in the private driveway alley that you guys are talking about. I have not been given any prior notifications on development or anything prior to this current meeting we are talking about the whole time I've lived here, which is four and a half years. I agree with everything Michelle Sandlin has said and what Duncan was talking about. I worry about our property value as Duncan mentioned, nobody wants to live betw—my house is literally right behind an apartment complex, and then you have the street and then the parking that you're looking for Lot 12, which I do not want to happen. As mentioned before, we do have kids that play out there. I am concerned about safety for a couple of different reasons. You all have probably know about the big fires we had here, which my house was affected by the fire. We did have a hole that went through our roof. You saw how we had over what, 12 fire trucks that were affected by it. Lots of cars blew up from it by adding a parking lot. It prohibits more availability for those fire safety people to come through our house. The traffic here is already busy with the way we currently live. And by adding more space to parking, it will not only determine how we come into the alley, but it affects how we are able to get in and out of our garage, which is a huge problem if that is changed. I do also feel there is going to add more crime to the area. I know someone mentioned about depending on numbers or whatever, but we have car break-ins on a regular basis here. And that just brings more people to my location by having more accessible cars to be there, which I do not want crime, obviously nobody does, but that just puts more crime into my, my neighborhood and that is a huge concern for me. So those are my issues: property values, safety for kids, the firetrucks being able to have accessibility, the busy traffic, the crime, the way we pull in and then again we have not been—none of us have been given information to support these changes in the Master Plan. And as Duncan mentioned prior to tonight, we had no say. It sounded like in the meeting, a lot of us—people said the public were invited. We weren't. And a part of that is some of these developments, none of us lived here. So those are my, my concerns. And like Tracy said, we had no say because the HOA does not have—the developer has the control. We don't, and that is very frustrating for us who live here; who is going to be affected by it. Thank you.</p>
Chair Nada	Okay. Thanks, Sheri. Thanks for sticking to your time and thank you for the summary you've done. I really like that. Thank you. So, next is Elaine.
Elaine Smith-Koop	Hi, this is Elaine. Can you hear me?
Chair Nada	Yes, I can. Go ahead.
Ms. Smith-Koop	My name's Elaine Smith-Koop. My address is on my testimony sign-up card, but I live basically on the corner of Valencia Dr and SW Costa Cir West. I'm concerned about parking and that's been addressed considerably. So, I'm going to discuss my higher concern, which is safety of pedestrians. Right now, even without the new development, I feel pedestrians are not safe. I walk regularly

	<p>and even at the four-way stop sign at the corner of Barber and SW Costa Cir West, I have almost been run over. I have been walking into the intersection and cars do not stop there and I have had to dodge cars. And so now I just stop. I stop 20-ft back from the intersection when I'm walking. If a car is approaching the intersection, I wait till they pass, I don't—the drivers just don't stop there. They roll through the four-way stop sign. Drivers also do not stop at the stop sign that is right next to my house, which is, the corner of Valencia and SW Costa Cir West. I sit out there in the morning with my tea or in the evening, in the summer when it is gorgeous and I watch the sunset, and I am amazed at how many traffic violations I see. There is no patrol. There are no patrol cars. There is no enforcement of traffic laws in our neighborhood. There is no marked crosswalk across the street from the corner of my house, to the park across the street, which has the access—the paved entryway into the park. There should be a marked crosswalk there. I cannot tell you how many dozens of people with their young children in strollers or holding hands or walking the dogs cross the street right there. And it is already dangerous for them. And to have the added traffic from this new development is only going to increase the safety hazard for those people and their children. I just would request that there be some, perhaps a reduced speed limit to 20 miles per hour in the entire neighborhood surrounding the Piazza and a couple blocks out from the Piazza, especially across from the park. Maybe speed bumps. I just would request that there be some kind of additional traffic safety features added because there are already hazards and the hazards are only going to increase to pedestrians as a result of additional traffic. Thank you very much.</p>
Chair Nada	Thanks, Elaine. Thanks for sticking to the time. And next is, K Swan. Go ahead.
Kevin Swan	Can you hear me?
Chair Nada	Yes, I can.
Mr. Swan	<p>Okay. My name is Kevin Swan, the address is on the testimony card of record. I do support the Villebois Village Center, and the proposals to complete the Master Plan for the central area. And I think it is crucial to see the completion of this Master Plan in context of the overall community and what it adds and how it completes the community. You know, currently we have vacant land that has no proper use currently, no beneficial use, and really does not provide any value to homeowners. Full disclosure, we recently sold our home in Villebois, but had always hoped—had always hoped to see completion of the Village Center and had bought into the community kind of in reliance that that would be a crucial community center for my family and my three kids. And, you know, that did not happen. And so for additional friends and family, I want to see that happen. I think it is crucial. I also find it interesting that some speakers out of one side complain about parking, but on the other then complain about the fact they do not want a parking lot. And I understand that is not an ideal neighbor to have is a parking lot, but I think for the overall good of the community, it's a necessary evil, and frankly, I perceive it as being done to help alleviate some of the impact that added residency could have in this central area. So, I think that is crucial to</p>

	<p>have, while it may be inconvenient or unfortunate for those immediately living adjacent to the parking lot, Master Plans are of public record and I know that it is not everybody day job to go through public records or real property records, but I certainly looked at it before I bought our first house in Villebois. And, you know, to the extent I could deduce what was in it, I wanted to make sure certain areas of the community that we were purchasing next to were actually designated as to what we were being told. And, while those can adjust and change, a parking lot or a higher density residential facility is a substantial change in use, meaning a surprise as some of the existing residents who have chosen to live in the highest density center of the community. I think it is crucial that we also allow for housing diversity here. I mean, there is no way I could have afforded our first home in Villebois if it cost what it does today. And I think a lot of people are being excluded from the community on that basis, so we need to provide a better housing mix for those of less means.</p>
Chair Nada	Thanks Kevin. So, Marsha, Marsha Davis. Go ahead. Unmute yourself, or—
Marsha Davis	There you go. Can you hear me now? I apologize.
Chair Nada	Yes, no problem at all.
Ms. Davis	<p>My name is Masha Davis. I live at 29010 SW Villebois Dr, which is in the building immediately adjacent to the proposed parking lot. And I just have a couple of questions. And the first is, if the minimum parking threshold has already been met by the parking spaces planned on lots designated in this proposal, A, B and C, why is this extra parking lot necessary? If someone could answer that question for me or is it necessary, and if it is not necessary, then why or why are we even talking about it? My second question is, why does access to this parking lot—proposed parking lot, have to be from the alley where children play and is already congested. Why couldn't it be accessed from the street? Has anyone asked that question? I only have one other comment, if you will please. I am concerned about whoever is going to manage this parking lot afterwards. In our experience, those of us who live immediately adjacent to and surrounding the Piazza, there is no parking rule enforcement anywhere in this entire village. There are a lot of parking—so-called parking restrictions, but there is absolutely no enforcement. And I'm concerned that if another parking lot is built, that problem will just be exacerbated. Thank you very much.</p>
Chair Nada	<p>Thank you, Marsha for being very brief and to the point. I have all the questions listed here and when it is time for the Staff or the Board and the Applicant to respond, I will make sure that all these questions will get answered. So with that being said, I do not see any other raised hand in the list of entities. So, I will give another 30 seconds or so, if anybody else wishes to testify that who has not done so yet please raise your hand. Of course, I don't see the Council chambers, so I do not know if anybody is there. I am going to list a phone number just in case if anybody has trouble raising their hands or speaking or whatever, the phone number is 503 570 1536. The number one more time is 503 570 1536. If you wish to testify have not done so yet please call this number and let us know. And with that, Dan is there anybody else in the City Council Hall who wishes to testify?</p>

Mr. Pauly	There currently is not, Chair Nada
Chair Nada	Okay. Thanks, Dan. Shelley is there anybody else that filled out a testimony card that we have not listened to their testimony yet?
Ms. White	I have testimony cards from other people, but none that have indicated via the hand raise feature. And, I just wanted to say for the audience, I have enabled the chat, so if you are having issues, now would be a good time to send a chat. It will go to myself and all of the panelists so that we can see that you would like to speak, and it will let me know to unmute you.
Chair Nada	Okay. I am going to give about the 20 to 30 seconds. And after that, I will ask—I do not know if I should start with Staff or the Applicant to answer some of the questions or rebuttals, if you have any rebuttal for the testimonies that you have heard.
Mr. Pauly	I would suggest if the Board has any questions to any of the public that you get those answered first, so the Applicant has a chance to rebut any additional testimony they give in response to your questions.
Chair Nada	Okay. Does any other member of the Development Review Board have any question to anybody who provided a testimony? If so, just provide the name that you want to ask and what the question is.
Ms. Hendrix	No.
Chair Nada	Yeah, so we don't have any questions from the members here. Okay, sorry I missed that, is the Staff were going to go ahead and start responding or the Applicant?
Mr. Pauly	The rebuttal, I think, would be the appropriate thing to do next, immediately following public testimony. And then, you can go ask questions about their—
Chair Nada	Sorry Dan, I missed that last part. Sorry.
Mr. Pauly	So, I would suggest we go ahead and the typical next step would be any rebuttal from the Applicant.
Chair Nada	Okay. If I can have the Applicant back and first, I am going to have him—if you have any rebuttal and after they are done, if the Development Review Board members have any questions that we decided to hold on off earlier to the Applicant, that will be the time to, but first, if I can have the Staff have the Applicant back to respond to—or do you have any rebuttals, and then answer our questions if we have any, so you guys can go ahead.
Ms. Connery	Thank you. We appreciate all the testimony that has been provided tonight. We are happy to see that there is so much interest in this project. We do feel like this project will complete a community. It just one of the last components to be constructed in the Village Center, and the construction of these buildings around the Piazza will help to address some of the concerns that residents are currently experiencing with crime and speeding. The presence of the buildings, the presence of something filling the space along those streets affects people's behavior and it will have an impact on the traffic flow, vehicular and pedestrians; it should enhance the safety along those pedestrian corridors along the streets. It should have the effect of slowing traffic speeds and making people a lot more

	<p>aware that they are entering a pedestrian dominated area. It helps to define that space as something that is intended to be active and have people walking around much more frequently. Regarding the parking area that is proposed, that is part of the overall mixed-use project. It is not a change in anything that was master planned for that area. It is part of the mixed-use project that is occurring around the Piazza, and we have been working on this project, as Rudy mentioned, for the last three years or so. And, over the course of time, there have been a lot of conversations happening with different resident groups in the project that may not have reached the people who are here to testifying tonight. But we have had a lot of ongoing conversations with people who live in the community. And one of the concerns that we heard early on, was concerned about there being sufficient parking. And so, what the Applicant decided to do was to add parking in the Lot 12 location in association with the mixed-use buildings to try to address the concerns that we had heard early on. So, this is something that we've offered and he's forgoing potential development of that site to try to address the concerns that we've heard from the community. Let's see, in regards to the actual design construction of that parking area, as we get into the civil design phase, we will be addressing the details of how irrigation is provided to the landscape areas and how stormwater is provided.</p> <p>Part of Villebois is that there are rainwater facilities that are planned with the parking areas to treat the stormwater runoff and to integrate it into the larger system. So it is part of the infrastructure system that is planned, and it will be constructed along with the parking area to address both of those items, the irrigation for the landscaping and stormwater management.</p> <p>And let's see, I am happy to check into any questions that the Board members may have.</p>
Ms. Dunwell	Well, I would like to actually – this Katie, I'd like to go back to one of Marsha's questions regarding the access to the parking from why is it not built and designed with access from the street as opposed to access from the private area.
Ms. Connery	Okay. Do you mind if I show the PowerPoint again, and go to the relevant slide?
Chair Nada	Go ahead.
Ms. Connery	<p>The access to the parking area is proposed off of the alley. If it—a well, let me start with Barber. We cannot take access off of Barber St because it is a higher classification road and the parking area is on a corner, so it just would not be a safe situation to take access up from Barber. There are also street trees provided in this location. Access off of Villebois Dr, which is also a collector road, which limits vehicular access points off of that classification of roadway. It would also impact on street parking that is provided, and as you can see from this graphic here, there is diagonal parking provided on the opposite side of Villebois Dr, and then there is parallel parking on this side. So, taking access off of Villebois Dr would remove some of the on-street parking. I do believe we'd face some challenges with the Engineering department of trying to provide an access point here. Access to Lot 12 has always intended to be off of the alley, and it just so happens with this proposal, instead of developing a mixed-use condo building,</p>

	we are proposing a parking area that's in association with mixed-use buildings that are surrounding the Piazza. To us, it made sense that we would still utilize the access off the alley that has always been intended to serve the use that is on Lot 12.
Chair Nada	Okay. So, I'm going to try to go ahead and mention or list all the questions that we got from the testimony before the member can ask questions to make sure that at least we got those covered. Some of the questions I'll ask could best be answered by the Staff, so please go ahead and do so. The next question I have here, regarding the same slide we have here, somebody, one of the citizens mentioned something about having a one-way street and two-way street. Are there any planned changes to the in and out of this alley, in terms of the direction?
Ms. Connery	No. The alley is a two-way alley, so people can travel both directions. There is no change in the direction occurring. The diagonal spaces will most likely result in people backing out and had heading a certain direction, instead of like, people who back out of their garage currently have the choice to go either direction. But that is not changing the function of the alley. It's still two-way traffic.
Chair Nada	Okay. Another question was who is going to—I think this question was answered before, but who is going to manage the parking or enforce the parking rules?
Ms. Connery	The parking area, since it is in association with the mixed-use buildings, it will be owned and operated and managed by the management company for the mixed-use buildings.
Chair Nada	Okay. So another question was asked, will this increase HOA fees. I don't know who can answer this question.
Ms. Connery	Will this increase HOA fees? No.
Mr. Kadlub	It's difficult to determine, but we are actually adding 148 more dwelling units to the master association, all of which will be contributing to the HOA. So, it's possible that the dues may even go down because we are adding 148 more. It could be the same, but the budget hasn't been worked out with that, but extensively we have got more people paying for the maintenance of the alley. Right now that alley is maintained by the homes that you see in this slide that are on the alley, but the owner of the mixed-use project will be contributing to the maintenance of that alley as well. And I might add, if we were to access, which is questionable whether we could do so legally based on the designation on Villebois Dr, accessing the parking lot from Villebois Dr, that sidewalk along Villebois Dr is a heavily-used pedestrian access to and from the Village Center and the postal area. So, you create a safety conflict with cars entering in and out of that parking area, crossing the pedestrian path.
Chair Nada	Thank you. And there is a question that was asked multiple times and I think it was answered, part of Stacey's response, which is if the new spaces are not required, why are we having it? So, I'm not going answer for you, but I think you already have the answer. So can you please answer this question again? If the new parking is not required within the Code, why are we having it?

Ms. Connery	We are providing it based on some of the early conversations that were happening with community members, with people who live in the community. As I said a little bit earlier, we've been working on this project since 2018 and have had ongoing conversations with residents out there. We were repeatedly hearing concerns about there being adequate parking, and the developer did decide to give up developing a mixed-use building on this site in lieu of trying to address the parking concerns that we heard and providing a parking area.
Chair Nada	Okay, thank you. So, I think I went through almost all the questions except for one question, which is, is this meeting just for show? I'm going to answer it later. So, I hope I did not miss any questions. So please, DRB members, if I missed any questions that the citizen has provided testimony, please go ahead and ask the Staff or the Applicant. Now, it's time if you want to go ahead and ask any question to the Staff—oh, sorry, to the Applicant. So, you guys have any questions for the Applicant?
Ms. Hendrix	I do, I have some questions. Thank you. For the parking lot, specifically around just some safety features that are considered, I don't know if--I think you mentioned just having more people in the area kind of helps with safety—or specifically, I remember just the public comment talking about like, crime. But are there any more kind of safety components to having the parking lot in terms of like lighting? Especially because the walls are nice to have that privacy, but also it kind of like is a double-edged sword, I guess, because it is privacy for the homeowners, but also privacy for just like crime related issues. So, can you speak more to that?
Ms. Connery	Okay. Can you see the arrow that I have got on the screen? Okay. There are some openings along this frontage on Villebois Dr between the vine fencing that will be provided for pedestrian access. So, it won't be a solid wall. There will be these view corridors where pedestrian access can occur to the parking area, into the parking area. So, there will be some eyes on the street into the parking area from this location. And, there is existing street lighting on both Villebois Dr and Barber St, which we'll analyze as part of the civil design process to be sure that the parking lot is adequately lit. And if needed, we can add additional lighting to the parking lot that would be designed in consideration of surrounding residents there, too.
Ms. Hendrix	Thank you for that. And, then I was also wondering, I guess maybe you kind of answered it since there is kind of some visibility from Villebois Dr, but is there going to be any signage for like, visitors, to say that there is parking, or how are people supposed to know if it is kind of like, covered? But, if it's visible, then it just kind of looks like maybe from the walls, it might not be.
Ms. Connery	Well, that is something that we will work through with the final design. There is intent to sign the parking area that it's intended to be for use of visitors and residents to the mixed-use buildings, so it will be in association with those buildings and likely there will be some kind of signage and wayfinding associated with the commercial entities to help orient people to know that this parking is here.

Ms. Hendrix	<p>And then, I guess kind of the bigger question is the conversation around if the parking lot is necessary, if you meet the minimum parking requirements without it and it seems like there was flexibility from the developer beforehand based on community conversations of the need for parking. But I am curious, do you know if there would be flexibility or consideration about changing that again, and if you know, previously condos, is that something that—I don't know, I'm just curious if there's flexibility there based on what we have heard tonight.</p>
Mr. Kadlub	<p>Well, I have to say that the testimony given in opposition to the parking tonight is understandably from the people who live adjacent to it. But, I can tell you we have had overwhelming testimony and previous meetings, public meetings, from other areas within the Villebois Village Center to the north and to the east of the Piazza. Concerns about not enough parking and a lot of that stems from the fact that, you know, every home in Villebois and every home in SAP Central has designated off-street parking. Whether it's off-street parking, one-garage or two-garage, depending on the size of the home. Part of the problem stems from the fact that not everyone uses their off-street parking in their garage to park their cars. And so, we end up with people parking where it is convenient. Parking in front of their home, parking on the street. And we end up with a lot of people concerned about the fact that there is not enough parking and we've had people from the homes along north on Barber St and then moving east along Campanili and on Villebois Dr, all the development in there, people are concerned about the fact that there is not enough parking and that this project would exacerbate the lack of parking around the Piazza. And in response to that we have taken out of the inventory instead of creating 8 to 12, two-bedroom condos on this site, which would generate at least 24 parking stalls, and all of that traffic would come off of the alley, We've decreased the intensity of the development there. And yes, it's a parking area, but I can say, the testimony that you have heard tonight is from the people adjacent. If you don't have that parking and we continue to exacerbate the lack of on-street parking throughout the rest of Village Center, you are going to hear a lot of unhappy citizens as well. So, we felt this was the best opportunity to help alleviate some of the long-term parking problems in Villebois.</p>
Ms. Dunwell	<p>Quick question, Mr. Kadlub, you mentioned the 8 to 12 condominiums, how would have the parking hypothetically been allowed for in that type of development, as opposed to just moving them all to street parking. So, if you put the eight to twelve condos in the space that's now Lot 12, would you have had parking assigned to those that would have been in a lot, and you are saying how many spaces would that be?</p>
Ms. Connery	<p>Well, if we took the higher end of that range of 12 mixed-use condos, so 12 residences and likely, some commercial space on the ground floor, you would be looking at a multi-story building to accommodate those uses probably a four-story building at a minimum. The building would have been located towards the street. Most of these buildings are located right at the property line or very close to the property line. So it's something that would have fronted Villebois Dr, and potentially wrapped around and fronted on Barber St; a multi-story building, and</p>

	then likely, you would have parking within this area behind it and these four diagonal spaces would also have been utilized for that.
Ms. Dunwell	You answered my question, thank you.
Mr. Abernathy	Yeah, I had a question real quick. Going back to the parking lot, looking at SW Palermo and the private alley, do we know the width of that street? Talking about two lane—I used to live in Villebois before I lived where I do now, I moved out of Villebois, but with the alleyways, I understand the purpose of that was going to be this. That would have been 12 dedicated cars to that—or 24 dedicated cars to that building, if you want went on the higher end. Now you have the potential of 24 cars plus people trying to find parking, so they’re going to travel that area, too. Is it safe? Would you right now say it’s safe with trash cans there on a Thursday morning, people backing out of these units on both sides, the private alley on Palermo...is it safe with that much more traffic? Especially on a typical afternoon, people trying to find parking that are now living in the new buildings, is it safe for people to transit that area? Is there a walking area back there, so people can walk to in front of their car that is parked in the angled parking? I have a—there are a lot of safety concerns I see with this, and according to IRC that I am kind of scared of when it comes to putting more traffic in an alleyway. So, would you say right now this is a hundred percent safe? All things added to it, trash cans and all that stuff.
Mr. Kadlub	There’s no more parking, no more trips being generated from this parking lot than it would otherwise be in fact, it is probably less than what otherwise would be built there if there were residential homes there. The parking—the alley is a 20 ft right-of-way and a 16 ft paved surface— 18 ft paved surface, 22 ft right –of-way.
Mr. Abernathy	So, it’s 22 all together on both sides.
Mr. Kadlub	It’s 18 ft wide.
Mr. Abernathy	18 ft wide.
Mr. Kadlub	Yeah, so its 9-ft travel lanes.
Mr. Abernathy	So, adding in trash cans and stuff like that, we’re taking away—we’re down to 15. Trash is picked up from those units from the rear. I think that’s what—I’m listening to testimony, so I’m just playing devil's advocate here.
Mr. Kadlub	Yeah, well, we aren’t adding any more trash cans. It’s the same number of trash cans that are there now.
Mr. Abernathy	So, cars backing out of that do you see a potential with people transiting through that area because there—
Mr. Kadlub	It’s a lot easier to navigate a diagonal parking stall in and out than it is to come straight back out of a garage.
Mr. Abernathy	I can agree with that.
Mr. Kadlub	You have a better view, so those are a lot less dangerous than the perpendicular stalls that you have just to the south of that. You see all those parked there now

	and we have not had any incidents that I am aware of in the 10 years that it's been there.
Mr. Abernathy	So question for Dan. Dan, is there a way they could have asked for a waiver to have accesses to this parking lot from Barber and/or Villebois; if we'd have done a waiver for that versus having to use this alleyway?
Mr. Pauly	Yeah, we have engineers on as well. If the road's already built, I don't know where you would take it. I mean, from Barber, you have the tree, you have the improvements, you have putting it—it's just, I don't see a space there.
Mr. Mansur	Dan, this Scott from DKS. I was just going to add, I would agree with what the Applicant and their findings—again, Scott Mansur with DKS. We are the City's traffic engineering consultant. But in this case, it's about trade-offs, and I understand your concern about the backing on the alley and pedestrians, but also the trade-offs you would be dealing with by providing access to Villebois Dr or Barber is the conflict points, and these are—we want—this is a multimodal downtown area, and that's one of the reasons the design was for access off of the alleys and not providing additional conflict points. We want to create for driver behavior expectations of where driveways are going to be and not have driveways all over the place where you are going to have conflicts with bikes and pedestrians. One of the findings in the traffic study was to also provide a pedestrian connection to the public street system, so that you are not having all these pedestrians from the cars walking down the alley. And so that was one of the intents of that analysis. And adding the additional parking area for the traffic loading on this alley is within, kind of the design assumptions for typical peak hour and daily traffic levels. I could find plenty of other examples of similar traffic loadings on this type of facility on a two-way alley.
Ms. Dunwell	Scott, this is Katie. I have a question for you regarding the parking itself. I know that I am hearing that part of the reasoning and logic behind putting the parking in place as it is, is because we have mixed-use in the new construction. If these were actually reserved spots that would be committed to an apartment dweller or rather than in and out traffic throughout the day, does that significantly reduce the number of trips in and out and the amount of traffic flow on a daily basis?
Mr. Mansur	Yeah, that's a great question. And for typical reserve spaces that are for say, office use or residential uses, those types of spaces have about a third of the turnover of trips than a public lot where people are just coming and looking for spaces as they be coming down that alley. So, if these are reserved spaces, you are probably going to see about a third of the number of trips that are going to want to come in and out of this parking lot for typical use. Does that answer your question?
Ms. Dunwell	Yes, it does. So, that would bring a follow question for Mr. Kadlub is, has it been considered that these could be reserved spaces and then the retail or mixed-use spaces could be behind the building adjacent on Villebois.
Ms. Connery	Okay, I can answer that for Rudy. We were actually just talking about that as the conversation was occurring and that is something that we can do. We can work

	with the management company of the mixed-use to be sure that these spaces are reserved for specific units. Any other questions?
Ms. Hendrix	I have questions that are not parking related if that is okay. A couple of questions just about the site plan and specifically, just the mail room and like the location of it. Was security considered? Because I know there is just—you know, I see a lot about mailboxes getting opened and things getting stolen, so I was just curious about security considerations for the mailroom.
Sam Sanderson	Hello, Sam Sanderson, here. Good question. We do have that issue with some other projects recently. I do not know if it is just kind of a new trend. But, what we have been doing to ensure, kind of security, has been increasing security from a door hardware point of view for entering into those spaces. Sometimes we have added security in the form of security cameras and things within those spaces. And then, as these mail centers have been developed more recently, we have Amazon Hub and other automated parcel lockers that keep those larger boxes safe and secure. So, it's something I've been seeing on a lot of projects recently, and we'll definitely address it as we move forward with the project. But at the end of the day, the people who go into that space should have proper access you know, should have kind of access control into that space. And even though it's a public space, we'll have to look into how to make it a secure public space, if that answers the question.
Ms. Hendrix	Yeah. Yeah, it does. Thank you. And then I guess this question might also be for you. We're talking about multi-modal, which is really exciting, and I think I saw, yeah, there is like a bike room. But I do not remember seeing in the Staff report, how many bikes spots, or I guess, like, secured bike parking will be made available throughout the three buildings.
Mr. Sanderson	We have bike parking in all the buildings, so it is throughout, and it's per the requirements of the zoning. The exact counts, I do not know that I have them off the top of my head, but I know I see bike parking. You know, there are these requirements, and we are meeting them, 234 total spaces.
Ms. Hendrix	Nice. Okay, cool. And then one more question about flex spaces. Are they—so the intention is to start those as apartments or are you going to see when the time comes, if there is that retail demand to start with retail or—?
Mr. Sanderson	Well, I think the Staff report is framing those spaces. The request is that they would be, if they are to be residential upfront, then that they be live/work spaces with their own entrances and canopies. So, that's the strategy that we're going to take for any residential units that are fronting the Piazza, which at this time are on Buildings B and C that are facing the Piazza. Those units would then comply with the Staff condition that they be live/work.
Ms. Hendrix	Okay. That's all the questions from me. Thank you.
Mr. Pauly	Chair Nada, if I may, let's do a time check here. We're about 20 minutes till 10 pm, so we should be mindful of what we want to do. I mean, it's obviously up to the Board, of course. You can go ahead and power through if you want, but it is acceptable to, if you have further—if you foresee a lot of further questions and

	<p>conversation, you can go ahead and continue the hearing. If you do do that another thing you may consider is that the zoning change component does need to go to City Council and is scheduled for City Council; haven't heard a lot of conversation or controversy on that one. So, there would be the option to pull that out separately and forward that recommendation to City Council, and hold everything else until the next hearing for a final decision as well. So, there's kind of those three options: power through, see if we get there tonight; Option B would just hold the whole thing until your next meeting in October; third option would divide the zone or any other components you feel you are ready to make a decision on without much further discussion tonight, and hold the remainder until your October meeting.</p>
Chair Nada	<p>Okay. So I am not sure if any other member of the Development Review Board has any questions for the Staff or for the Applicant. I just have a couple of questions, and then after that, we're going to go with the voting and [3:03:08] discussion among ourselves. So I just say, we just go ahead and then hopefully it is not going to take so much time. And if any of the discussion went a little bit over what I think it should go, then maybe you can go to one of those options. So with this, does any member of the Development Review Board still have any questions for the Staff or for the [inaudible 3:03:32] So, hearing none, I have couple, few questions; not related to the parking or the thing is just general questions about how many meetings have you guys conducted to discuss the coming changes. How many meetings have you conducted and was who and when was that?</p>
Ms. Connery	<p>Okay, well, I will start with when we were initially considering this project back in 2018, we had a community meeting or neighborhood meeting where we invited everybody that lived in the Village Center to come to a neighborhood meeting. And then, things kind of went on hiatus for a little bit, and then Rudy was having some meetings with the HOAs.</p>
Mr. Kadlub	<p>Yeah, I have met with the boards of the other HOAs. Besides the Village Center HOA, there is a number of—and I can't think of—the Calais, and a number of others in the Village Center itself. We have not turned over the Belmont Village Center HOA yet. But we do have a transitional advisory committee and the last two transitional advisory committee meetings in June and July or July and August, I believe, none of the advisory committee folks showed up to hear about this. So, it was not for lack of effort, but last summer I did meet with, I believe four other HOAs in the Village Center and to listen to their thoughts in the biggest concerns that those HOAs had was the lack of parking.</p>
Chair Nada	<p>Okay. So, did you actually meet with any of the resident—or the HOA groups that you met with were they like builders or where they the actual residents because I have got some [inaudible 3:05:35]</p>
Mr. Kadlub	<p>The residents are board members.</p>
Chair Nada	<p>[Inaudible 3:05:40] Okay, so how was the communication? Like, how do you communicate it: Like, the first meeting, the community meeting, how was the communication?</p>

Rudy	They were Zoom meetings. They were last summer [inaudible 3:05:47]
Chair Nada	I mean, like in order—how did the people get to [inaudible 3:05:52] Did you send them letters or email or how was the—I'm talking about the first one, the community meeting that Stacey mentioned.
Ms. Connery	The very first community meeting was in, I believe, the spring of 2018. And it was an in-person meeting. Notices were mailed to all property owners within the Village Center, and I don't recall whether or not we posted signs. I don't remember that part of it, but that's usually what we do as part of a neighborhood meeting procedure is posting signs on the property to identify the date and the location of the meeting. We did share with the Facebook group that was out—that's operating with whoever was in charge of it at that point in time. So, it was shared via social media. We met at the water treatment facility, and the meeting was actually very well attended. We had a lot of people, we were standing room only.
Chair Nada	And what was the feedback you got from that meeting?
Ms. Connery	They were very concerned about parking.
Chair Nada	Okay, and so, this is in 2018, correct?
Ms. Connery	2018.
Chair Nada	2018, okay.
Ms. Connery	2019—
Chair Nada	Okay. Do you remember which month?
Mr. Kadlub	I can tell you, I don't remember the date, but it was exactly five days before the arson occurred in the Village Center. It was on a Monday night, and then Saturday night, somebody set fire to the building.
Chair Nada	Okay, thanks. So, I just have one question for Staff, Barbara or Dan. So a question that was repeated like, is this meeting just a formality? Is this meeting just formality and yeah, so I wish if you guys can answer this question, do you have anything?
Mr. Pauly	So, it's not a formality. I'd say, some of the component applications, there's not a lot of options on. I think some of the correspondence, some of the posts you may have seen, is around the zone change itself for Lot 76. Really, I mean, it's a menu of one option. [Inaudible 3:08:08] is a precedent that has been done, you know—I don't know—dozens of times during the implementation of the Villebois Village Master Plan. So, some people may—just the lack of options there in some ways that functionally, though it was not intended functionally, it almost does seem like a formality because it is kind of going through the steps, that formal step that's kind of already—had a lot of history and support behind it. In terms of the actual design, particularly around like the SAP amendment. This Board well knows we're not creating new policy or anything, but still, the application and making decisions around that is still up in the air and this Board, they know, still has power to vote that up or down based on review of that criteria. That said there's been a lot of history, you know, as has been stated in testimony. I mean there's been talk about this for as long as there's been talk about Villebois. So from

	<p>that point, there's a more robust history and record for this project than typical. It goes back to all the legislative history from the years of Villebois planning to kind of assumptions of the number of units as this was a thought out Master Plan. I mean, there's always been this assumption of, kind of these multi-use buildings with this range of units at this location and all of the infrastructure, traffic, etc., planning that's occurred over the last couple of decades. So, in terms of the allowed use, it's clear, it's an allowed use, but the another thing I would state in all of these, there are certain things that are clear and objective that it's pretty clear when you look in this Staff report that yes, it's black and white, that yes, it meets it/no it doesn't. There are other things that are more discretionary around design that you know, is still stuff that the Board is looking at. So in that sense, there is still a lot of decisions. There are still things up in the air. But on other things, it's really double-checking Staff and then analysis that's been done to make sure something hasn't been missed.</p>
Chair Nada	<p>Okay, thanks, Dan. So with this, I'm going to ask for last time, do any Board member have any additional questions for Staff, Applicant, and other members of the audience? And hearing and seeing none, the next is what, if any, discussion any Board member wish to have to help ensure they gathered all the information they needed to make a decision? I know this is different from the discussion we will have to deliberate on once a motion is made. Discussion at this point should focus on just making sure that we are ensuring that we understand the fact and clarify a particular point; gathered all the data, rather than ensuring conclusion, which we'll do in a few minutes. So any other information or stuff that you guys think we want to know? Yeah, hearing none. So next is opportunity for Board member to discuss any proposal to add, to move and modify conditions of approval. So, we've heard the conditions of approval, so then now's the time if you, any of the Board members, want to discuss the proposal to add or remove any of the conditions of approval. The opportunity allows discussion among the Board or with Staff as we'll allow the Applicant an opportunity to respond. So do you guys want to discuss any other conditions you want to add or remove? Hearing none, hearing no further discussion, I am prepared to close the hearing confirming there's no additional discussion at this point. So, I declare the public hearing closed at 9:52 pm. Now, it's time for the Board to entertain a motion. If a Board member wants to add a new condition, remove a condition, modify a condition, it should be included in the motion. If the motion is seconded, the Chair must call for a vote. If the motion is not seconded, another motion may be made. One's a motion seconded, and it must be voted before another alternative motion can be made. So, do I have a motion on the application?</p>
Ms. Hendrix	<p>I apologize. I do have a question, I think, for Staff about the motion. Do we include that correction you mentioned in the Staff report about Julie Fitzgerald meeting—like, do I need to say that in the motion or is that just a kind of for our FYI?</p>
Mr. Pauly	<p>Yeah, that's a correction for the record, so word your motion with the correction noted by Staff or language similar to that would be appropriate</p>

Ms. Hendrix	Okay. I'm going to give it a go. I think it'll be pretty simple. I move to approve Resolution 393, a resolution recommending approval of a Zone Map Amendment from Public Facility to Village to City Council, and approve with conditions outlined by Staff, a SAP Central amendment, the Preliminary Development Plan and Plan Modifications, Final Development Plans and Type C Tree Plans for a mixed-use development located in Villebois Village Center with the corrections noted by Staff at the beginning of the meeting.
Chair Nada	Do I have a second?
Mr. Pauly	Does that include the added conditions?
Chair Nada	Yeah, it included added conditions.
Ms. Hendrix	Did it? Are you referring to the conditions like recommended during the presentation?
Barbara Jacobson	[3:14:42] Yeah, or as recommended.
Mr. Pauly	Yeah, and the Staff report as recommended with additional conditions.
Ms. Hendrix	Okay. So I'll revise to say, "...and the Staff report included with the recommendations—the conditions noted by Staff. " I don't think I said that right.
Chair Nada	That's okay. You don't have to repeat all that again. No, It's not your fault. I feel like you've actually bought a pretty good. So, any seconds?
Mr. Abernathy	I think Paula has her hand up real quick before we go on.
Chair Nada	It was about the conditions. So, do I have a second?
Mr. Abernathy	I will second.
Chair Nada	Okay, the motion is moved and seconded. Let's see. Okay. I should repeat the motion, I'll have to find that out, I don't know if I should do that. Okay. Yeah. The motion to approve Resolution 393, Villebois Village Venter mixed-use development with an amendment zone map, and all the condition as listed in the Staff report and all the corrections made by the Staff. I'm sure I missed a lot of stuff because I did not [inaudible 3:16:08] So, any discussion on that motion? Do you have any discussion before we make the vote?
Ms. Dunwell	I do have a question.
Chair Nada	Go ahead.
Ms. Dunwell	So, are we approving the overall, across the board, overall, all of the—
Chair Nada	This is a motion. The is a motion we discuss [inaudible 3:16:26]
Ms. Dunwell	Okay.
Ms. Hendrix	Well, I'll just start by saying, I appreciate Board member Dunwell's comment about the reserved parking. Because I feel like hearing that that would potentially reduce a lot of the trips in that area would be great because clearly that's a concern. So, I feel like that was a meet halfway kind of solution, so I really appreciate that and I hope that that happens if this gets approved.
Ms. Dunwell	Can we require that as a condition?

Chair Nada	<p>Then we'd have to have another motion, I guess, in this case. Barbara can correct me. Any other discussion? Hearing none, I have two main concerns with this application. So, the first one is actually this whole parking scenario, of course. The fact that you don't have a way, and I know this is a policy issue, to actually survey and see what parking we have now. For me, this is, yeah—and we just like follow the Code and just keep adding more parking, more parking. It's really hard for me to say this, and again, I did drive close to the site multiple times, a lot of friends live there, and it is always busy with cars. [3:17:50] I know that, it was mentioned a few times that people use a—that parking is easy. They can come park in their driveway. Yeah, that's all nice and good, but again, this is not scientific. I wish I was hoping for a more recent scientific parking study. I know this is not part of the city and stuff; it should be parked. And I think any of the citizens who attended here, they should go to the City Council and press this. We have a traffic study. We should have a parking study. We started to have a parking problem in this community and we should have to stay ahead of it by making sure that this is the case. The second concern that I have is the lack of communication between the Applicant and the citizens. When, the first meeting that had everyone was to 2018, it's—maybe—of course, it's a long time ago, maybe they don't recall all the information, but to me, I think that the Applicant didn't—yeah, I think he could have just pushed a little bit more, try to reach out to more people, instead of just talking with the HOAs. When I have next door neighbors saying that they've never got any communication, this has concerned me. This is basically the point that I wanted to make. And with this, unless anybody else has anything to say, I think I'm ready to call the vote.</p>
Mr. Abernathy	<p>Hey Sammy, before you go, I want to put it into the Board packet, too that I agree with what you said about we don't have a formal way of looking at these important things that apparently, as the Applicant has put out several times that the community members are looking at parking solutions, and we haven't come up with a way to really identify those things as a city. I think that's something we're missing out on. I do still have my objections. I still, as living in Villebois at one time, having an alleyway, all that stuff, and this is a personal thought process, I still don't get a warm and fuzzy feeling about the safety of that alleyway and the actions that will be there. That is going to be my objection to this. Listening to the folks that came out and talked tonight. I believe they have a great concern. They're not—they love, just like me, I love that we're moving forward with the Villebois Village. I believe that's a great project. I believe it takes care of housing concerns, livability, all the things that we're looking for. However, there is a big stop on this one little area. And, I just want to acknowledge that we hear you, the folks that came out tonight and talked, or at least, I did. And thank you to everybody that's here and worked on this because I believe it's a step forward in finishing Villebois.</p>
Chair Nada	<p>It's a lot of work for the Staff, the Applicant, everybody. And thanks for all the citizens who attended today and spent the night with us here. So, really</p>

	appreciate everybody coming here today. This is how the government works. So thanks for being part of it.
Ms. Dunwell	Yeah, Jason and Samy also, and Nicole, I would also like to echo Samy and Jason's concerns. I think that we have not necessarily received a full outline, although we—I understand that the individuals who are near the Village Center, within the Village Center, were notified of a meeting. If that is the case with the number of objections and surprise about the parking lot that it would have been helpful if there would have been more visibility to the solution to the general statement of “there's not enough parking” that the proposed solution would be to build a surface parking lot, that would be changing somewhat of the complexion of the area without more citizen input. So, I'm in agreement with both of you. Thank you.
Ms. Hendrix	Maybe you guys can clarify for me as like a discussion, because I always get—well, I struggle with the fact that like, our role is to focus on, does it meet the Code? Are there certain design requirements that we can look at and potentially like make recommendations on? And so, when it comes to like, community input about—I don't know, I guess I'm just wondering, are we able to incorporate that into the vote when it's ultimately about, like, does it meet the Code or not? And, maybe this is a Staff question, sorry.
Chair Nada	It's more of a Staff question, I guess. I'm not sure if [inaudible 3:22:41]
Ms. Hendrix	Right. True.
Chair Nada	I don't know legally if it's coming up. But, my understanding of it is this whole denying the application is different than like asking for more information; that's just two different—denying an application that's a complete—that's something different than—but trying to kind of push it back, maybe have more discussion, maybe the Applicant will make some changes or have the City Council decide some of the stuff. This is something I, as far as my knowledge, can be done. But, I might be wrong, so...
Mr. Abernathy	Chairman Nada, can we walk this back? I guess the question—walk this back and go, “let's just vote on the change of zoning right now” and maybe we need to relook at this parking Lot 12 part.
Chair Nada	I think we can do whatever we want to do, but for now we have to just vote on this motion, and then we can provide any other motions. Personally, I think, because I look at the parking of the whole thing of the same thing, so approving part and little room the other, [3:23:53] yeah, I think it's all dependent. Part of the parking here is alleviated by parking spots here, so I think there's a little interconnectivity between both of them. So, I'm not sure. Maybe you can vote for this, but for now we have to vote on that, and then we can propose another motion, as soon as we vote on this one, if it doesn't pass. Unless you guys have further discussion, any points you want to make? Hearing no further discussion, I will call the question, all in favor, say Aye. All opposed, say Nay.

Multiple voices	Nay.
	So I got 4 Nay. It's 0 to 4, so the motion fails. So Barbara and Dan, what are our options again? So, you mentioned something earlier, Dan, something about waiting for the next meeting. And, we can have a list of recommendations for the Applicant and the City, too. I don't know if this is something that we can do or, what do you guys think?
Mr. Pauly	So, a couple of things to consider. If you do want to further consider aspects of it, you certainly can do that. If you're comfortable moving forward with the zone change, you could divide it. If you do continue it, and you want further public input, you would want to reopen the hearing as well as part of your motion.
Chair Nada	Like, today?
Ms. Jacobson	Well, [inaudible 3:25:25] better to do this [inaudible]. So, I guess the first question is, so you had a motion and second and you voted and it went down. Does somebody wanted to make another motion on what you want to do tonight? Do you want to make a motion to—
Chair Nada	Okay, anybody want to make a motion?
Ms. Jacobson	—the zoning portion and pass it on, or do you want to make a motion to reopen and continue the entire public hearing?
Mr. Abernathy	So I would like to make the motion to approve the zoning change from, what was it, PF to V? I believe that's how it reads.
Ms. Hendrix	I second that motion. [No vote]
Mr. Abernathy	So that can, yeah, so that can be brought to the City Council for approval.
Mr. Pauly	I want it to be clear. There's all sorts the motions—I mean, it is wide open or, you've already made a motion, you could just leave it where it is. It's really up to you.
Chair Nada	Sorry, I don't understand that part.
Mr. Pauly	I mean, you could just consider it denied, if you want, too, at this point, because you voted down a motion. Well, I guess then you'd have to make a motion to [inaudible 3:26:38], right, Barbara? If they did want to deny the whole project?
Miranda Bateschell	Correct.
Ms. Jacobson	Well, they just did.
Mr. Pauly	Well, no, they voted down a motion to not approve it. [3:26:45]
Chair Nada	Yeah.
Ms. Bateschell	—As stated—sorry, Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, City of Wilsonville. I just wanted to come up and clarify that you have several options in front of you. Your option on motions is not just limited to separating out the zone change; by all means that is one option. You voted down, or you did not vote in favor of adopting it tonight with the motion that you made that included all of the Staff added conditions and corrections. You could also make a motion that would consider all of those applications again, with an additional condition. You could,

	you know, look at additional changes that you're discussing and have different motions on the application at hand. If you were to deny it, that would have to be its own motion as well. So you have—I just wanted to make sure that was clear, it wasn't just one path that you could take or not this evening. Just because you did not vote at this time on that specific motion, there are a lot of different options in front of you in terms of what motions you may want to make.
Chair Nada	Okay. And there was an option that was pointed out by Dan, like about 20 minutes ago, about we can say, keep the hearing open until like, the next meeting or something like this, or push it to the City Council. So, can you please tell me about those two different options? Are they still valid?
Mr. Pauly	So, the two other options that I mentioned earlier, which again, as Miranda points out, are not your only options, were to get to just continue the whole thing to your meeting, which would be October 25 th , would be your next meeting. The other option I mentioned would be to go ahead and move forward with the Zone Map Amendment, so the Council can take their action on that. That's a recommendation to Council, and then everything else could be held to that 25th meeting, as well. So, that's a couple of the options that have run through my head, but there are other options as well.
Chair Nada	Okay, thanks, Dan. So with this, anybody who wants to entertain any motion.
Mr. Abernathy	So, Dan, I would like to go back. I would like to make a motion to approve the amendment to the Zone Map, so it can be placed in front of City Council at the next City Council meeting.
Ms. Dunwell	I second that.
Chair Nada	A motion has been moved. The motion to approve the Zone change from PF to V has been moved and seconded. Any discussion? Okay. With this, I'm going to put the motion to a vote. All those in favor, say, Aye.
Multiple voices	Aye.
Chair Nada	All those against say, Nay. Actually, I'm going to say Nay. So, the motion carries 3 to 1 ; it passes. Okay, so, do we have to do anything else?
Mr. Pauly	[Inaudible 3:30:03] for you to sign Chair Nada. I do want to mention that any failure to make a decision one way or the other, we are up against the 120 days. The Applicant would need to agree to extend 120 days. So do you have that exact date handy?
Ms. White	Not in front of me, I'm sorry.
Chair Nada	So, Dan are you talking about approving the application? Not the zone change?
Shelley White	I'm looking at the Staff report here. This is Shelley White, Administrative Assistant. On Page 20 of the Staff report, it says, "Planning deemed the application complete on June 25, 2021. The City must render a final decision for the request, including any appeals by October 23, 2021."
Chair Nada	I assume you don't have the time for another meeting? So we have to decide before the next meeting?

Mr. Pauly	So, a couple of options here. You could see if the Applicant is open to extending that timeline, or you can also move to have a special meeting.
Chair Nada	Okay. Can we ask this question right now or does it—how can we communicate this information, formally?
Mr. Pauly	Staff will confirm to see if they are open to that. If you want to give us just a minute to see if that option is on the table.
Ms. Bateschell	Can they get on at this point?
Chair Nada	I know it's late. Another thing we can do, if we can't reach them right now, I don't know if it's okay with everybody, but we can have a special meeting. If we have to hold [inaudible 3:32:24] and we can say no.
Mr. Abernathy	They said we need to make a motion for it Samy, maybe we can make a motion to do it on the 20th of October?
Chair Nada	Yeah, but I'm wanting to hear from the Applicant because if the Applicant can waive it, it will give us more time, because actually I want to give the Applicant time to communicate some of the information. I want to give them time, right? But if they say no, then we can have a special meeting and we'll have to go again.
Mr. Pauly	Could we have a brief recess, Chair Nada?
Chair Nada	Sure. Sure. Do I have a motion to, like, five minutes is fine?
Mr. Pauly	Five minutes will be fine.
Chair Nada	Okay, do I have a motion to take a break for five minutes?
Ms. Hendrix	I move to have a five-minute break.
Mr. Abernathy	Second.
Chair Nada	Okay, motion to take five-minute break has been moved and seconded. Yeah, we're going to go on a five-minute break. Let's meet at 10:20 pm, see you guys in eight minutes.
	<i>Recessed at 10:12 pm and reconvened at 10:22 pm.</i>
Ms. Bateschell	People are wandering back into the room and we should be back here in another minute or two.
Chair Nada	Okay, is everyone back?
Mr. Pauly	Yeah, we're back. So, Staff would suggest that you reopen the hearing temporarily to get the Applicant's response in terms of 120 days, etc. If you're open to that, the next step would be to make a motion as such.
Chair Nada	I missed that part. so the Applicant has said yes or no to the delaying the—?
Mr. Pauly	Well, they would like to speak about it themselves.
Chair Nada	Oh, okay. So you mean like letting them speak, a motion to let them speak?
Ms. Jacobson	Yeah, and because the hearing was—you've closed the public hearing. If you're going to reopen or if you're going to delay your decision, you've got to reopen it anyway, get their authority to do so. And then, we need to discuss, are you reopening it for additional testimony or are you just reopening it to give yourself time to give more consideration to what's been presented and deliberate at the next meeting, which is what I would recommend you, rather than open it up for additional testimony, but that's your call.

Chair Nada	Okay. So, I like that. So, just to clarify, so we can have a motion to reopen the hearing for more information or hearing back from—so does this mean that they have to respond right now to our request of pushing back the due date?
Ms. Jacobson	So, the first thing you would be doing would be reopening the public hearing if you want to ask for additional time from the Applicant.
Chair Nada	Okay. So when you open the public hearing, can you just open it like general, like opening it the first time, or can I have it for a specific purpose? So the question I'm asking is should I be—will I have to open—listen to all the citizens testimonies again?
Mr. Pauly	No, you just reopen it. Essentially, if you reopen it, you're sitting where you were before you closed it, right?
Chair Nada	Okay. I got what you—okay. Anybody want to have a motion to reopen the public hearing?
Ms. Hendrix	Sure. I move to reopen the public hearing to hear the Applicant's response to the 120 days' extension request.
Mr. Abernathy	I second that.
Chair Nada	Okay, the motion to reopen the hearing for Resolution No 393 to hear the Applicant's response has been moved and seconded. Any discussion? Hearing no further discussion, I'll just put it to a vote. So, all those in favor, say Aye.
Multiple voices	Aye
Chair Nada	Yeah. So the motion carries 4 to 0. So, this application is back open again. At that time, we're going to get back to the point does the Applicant have any information or any additional data or communication that they would like to communicate to the Board?
Mr. Kadlub	Well, we don't have any additional information to offer to you. We are willing to extend another 30 days. I'd let you consider this in lieu of your concerns about safety forego the four diagonal parking stalls in the alley, if that makes a difference. But, I don't know if that is something that you want to address this evening. Or should we, you know, we can go back and try to gather more information, but we are willing to extend another 30 days.
Chair Nada	Okay. So thanks for that. We appreciate it. Personally, I've just rather give you guys more time, so if you can reach out to people, to neighbors and just see—please hear them out. And, also something, I don't know how feasible it is to be done, and this from the Staff, by obtaining any kind of formal way of just giving us the parking conditions right now at the Village. So, I'm not sure if this is even feasible, or is it okay to request to ask, but I'd like to have this piece of information. And also, as I said, from the Applicant, I really hope that by next hearing, you guys manage to have some communication with close by neighbors or something. I know this kind of stuff could take time. So just, yeah, I hope that you can just try to do that. So any other discussions?

Ms. Bateschell	Chair Nada can you clarify for me what it is that you're hoping that Staff brings back?
Chair Nada	A formal parking study or any parking study by a professional that shows the parking situation at the Village. Like, can it take 45 on-street parking? Do we have a space? And, of course, by this, I mean, like if people actually park where they're supposed to park. So that's why I need a formal professional parking study to that area. If something like this is possible.
Ms. Bateschell	So, we have the parking study that was done two years ago, prior to COVID that we are able to share.
Chair Nada	Yes. This will be good, too. If the—
Ms. Bateschell	We could do that. I'm not sure the relevance of that in the decision making process.
Mr. Pauly	I mean, we can't add criteria.
Ms. Bateschell	The Development Code requires us—essentially, parking rates are driven by national parking studies that generate an ITE trip generation rate associated with different land use types. That information is then what drives parking ratios that are in our Development Code. And so those are the requirements. That's also what all the traffic modeling is based on. That's about all of the long-range planning with based on when we initially planned Villebois. So the Villebois Village Master Plan considered the number of households and looked at the trips that would be associated with those; that is the consideration of parking as well. That's why certain housing types can take advantage of on-street parking while others cannot, and why different parking ratios are established for each. So, while we could provide a parking study that is not necessarily going to inform the overall criteria and decision-making for this. I don't know if Scott Mansur from DKS would like to add anything, if I'm allowed to ask him to add anything; merely because, I'm a planner.
Mr. Mansur	Just to clarify Miranda, what did you want me to cover on?
Ms. Bateschell	I guess, like I covered the criteria in terms of planning, what we allow in the Development Code, but I don't know if there's anything you wanted to add based on the parking study or the relationship between parking and ITE and your traffic analysis.
Mr. Mansur	So, I guess just related to the parking study, I think I shared earlier, and we did evaluate all of the parking within the Villebois Village and there is available parking for this development. There's no concerns with available parking supply being provided with the proposed—the Applicant study, or with the Applicant's proposed development, including their parking count. Like I said, there's—in the general area where this development is, there is a lack of convenient parking, being able to park right in front of your development or your house. But if you're willing to walk within a few blocks, there is available parking. And I think that was the key finding we did. I did take a look and basically the development that we looked in that parking study was in—very consistent with what's being

	proposed in this development. So if your question is, is there adequate parking within the Village with this application? The answer is yes.
Chair Nada	Is there's any problem sharing this information with us? I know—I'm not going to say, "Okay, this says this, we're not going to say no." [3:43:11] Barbara was clearly stating that we cannot just use this as a base for denial of the application. But if there's any, I just want to look at this. If it's something that is okay for us to look at, it's not going to violate any city rules or anything like that.
Mr. Pauly	We have to talk to the Community Development Director and see if we can get it to a point because there are a lot of drafts in that memo, right now. But, we'll see if there's a component that we can share.
Chair Nada	That's great. The other note I'd like to have is for the Applicant, we hope you will get a chance to speak to some of the neighbors and just, yeah, see if there's something like what you propose right now for the four parking spots—I really like it. So if you can—maybe when you talk to them, you will find some other changes that you can make. And that's why it so much of making sure that the communication with the neighbors should be recent, not two years ago when most of the people might've already moved out. So with this, are there any other questions?
Mr. Pauly	I would add on that point, we've been through this before. I forget if it was this Board or another board, where we asked them, I mean, that's not a review criterion. They could propose something without talking a word to the neighbors. I mean, that's not a great practice, but you know, we can't use that as a basis of a decision.
Chair Nada	Which, I totally understand this. Go ahead, Dan, sorry.
Mr. Pauly	[Inaudible 3:44:36] Yeah, and you know, it is only a month, so it takes time to get word out and we've seen Applicants try to talk to people and get things organized a month before and experience shows, it's tough to do. [Inaudible 3:45:00] to that extent, and it's not the kind of stuff I'd recommend pursuing. I mean, certainly we encourage ongoing conversations as any projects approved would move forward. But to get meaningful impact with outreach and input and back and forth done in a month is a short timeline.
Chair Nada	Yeah, I completely understand that. That why it's a request for me. I hope it's possible, but what the Applicant has just—yeah, this whole four spots, this could be sufficient or maybe they ask for like, yeah. So if it's possible, do it. I know that we cannot just use this as a base to deny the application. I know that.
Mr. Kadlub	So, if we're going to reach back out to the neighbors, I could contact all the people who spoke tonight, but they're only the ones that live within 50 yards of this proposed parking lot. But if we're going to go back, to be fair to everyone, we need to talk to the other 700 or so people who live in the Village Center that need that additional parking. And, that is going to be very difficult to do the next 30 days.

Chair Nada	Yeah, I understand your concern. And, I also understand that you are not under obligation that if you sell something that you have to exactly follow up to say, but I just want to encourage the communication. This is my point.
Mr. Abernathy	We're looking at this for the next 30 days, or looking up to the 25 th right now. I'll do—thank you for the execution of throwing out, maybe taking those four out. It's a good time for us to walk back out or go out and look at that and see what that would make and, you know, make us feel a little better about that area. I think there are a lot of concerns there on that. And, I think that's where we're all stuck at on the parking, that one parking lot, right? I think everybody went into this that this was going to be a home run. Rudy, question for you, when we looked at the master plan from 2006, or back in 2003, is the retail space the same amount of retail space that you were going to build a long time ago if this would've went forward years ago, or is there additional retail space in this plan?
Mr. Kadlub	It's an excellent question, and one that ought to be addressed. It's a question that I'm glad you asked. Back in the early master planning in the vision was for much more retail than is currently envisioned. Back in 2002, the real estate market was such that you could build anything and people would come in and buy it. We had great visions and great excitement, as did the City about having this vibrant Piazza area with shops and restaurants and people living above and overlooking the Piazza and such. The reality is, in the last decade or decade and a half, retail has begun to shrink as online shopping has increased. And even more so during the pandemic, if you didn't know how to buy on Amazon before that, you probably know how to do it now; you can get your groceries and everything else. So, there's more and more pressure on the sticks and bricks retail space. So, what is envisioned now is somewhat less retail than was originally planned. It's just the realities of the marketplace today.
Mr. Abernathy	Thank you.
Chair Nada	Thank you. Any other questions?
Ms. Jacobson	The next step is your Applicant has agreed to give you the extension of time, so you have two choices now; you can either close the public hearing again and go back. Think of other motions that you might want to make, or you can continue to your next meeting, give you more time to deliberate or think among yourselves, and think about what you've heard tonight. If you want to go look at the site again, you can certainly do that. That's one thing you can do, or the other thing you can do is continue the hearing, and leave it open for more testimony, if you feel you need more testimony from one side or the other, or both. If you feel like you've heard the testimony you need, but you just need more time to process and to [inaudible 3:49:59] look at the site, then you can continue, but close the record to public testimony. Or the other option, again, you can continue and leave the record open for additional public testimony. Those are your choices. Do you understand those three choices?
Chair Nada	Yes. Paula, do you want to add anything?

Paula Pinyerd	Yes. Just as far as, I guess tying this with a bow, we just want to make sure that we get audibly on the record, entering Exhibit A3. I believe Cindy already mentioned Exhibits D10 through D24, which were the additional comments. And then, we had a D25 come in right at the last minute that was emailed out during the meeting because someone had responded to public comment via email. So, I think if I understand it, and Barbara can correct me, but if we need all of this, so it's in these minutes, you know, we have it on the record.
Ms. Jacobson	Yeah, that's very good, a very good point. I didn't know that anything had come in, but if it came in during the public hearing that should all be considered and the Board would then have time to look at it if you don't [inaudible 3:51:10] need to look at it before you vote.
Chair Nada	Okay. So, can we have a discussion with this among the Board members, about which route we will take. So, if you can have a discussion, what do you guys want?
Mr. Abernathy	Maybe we can bridge this gap with the Applicant and us, and, you know, like he said, it's going to be hard to get a lot of people to go in there. Maybe we keep this open and allow more public testimony to come in; maybe for a 90 seconds versus a three-minute; a 90-second testimony. Because maybe we can hear some of the—the thing that we didn't hear were a lot of people saying, yes, this parking's going to be awesome! We heard the opposite of that. The Applicant, the City, everybody's saying, "Hey, we want this." We didn't hear that tonight. I kind of want to hear that from some folks, too. And, that's why I think we should maybe leave it open and do a 90 second; and, you know, it kind of bridges the gap where if they can get some folks, if the City can get some folks to come out and talk on behalf of this, I think we can get a little bit better indication and maybe it will open it up to some forums of folks talking out there.
Mr. Kadlub	It's always harder to get people to come out that are in favor of something, but the people that are against it—
Chair Nada	But they can write letters, and I think all of us will read all the letters too, so there's a lot of ways to communicate to this panel.
Ms. Dunwell	One more thing, Mr. Kadlub, I know that you all were discussing the same point that I was mentioning about potentially take that space and making it just reserved, as opposed to open to retail. My understanding from Scott is that it reduces the traffic in and out by two thirds. So, would you be open to seriously entertaining that for us to take into consideration?
Mr. Kadlub	Yes, absolutely. Absolutely. There's no retail near that space, and it's all across streets, so we could limit it to just the residential use there.
Chair Nada	So Nicole, do you have any comments or anything?
Ms. Hendrix	I agree with continuing the hearing and hearing more public testimony.
Chair Nada	I agree with that, too. So, Barbara, what is the proper way to do that? Should we close the public hearing now and have a motion to continue next time? Or how should it go? What is the proper way to do that? If we want to continue the hearing open to next time to hear more testimonies.

Ms. Jacobson	Well, your public hearing is open now. If you're done talking for tonight, then you would entertain a motion to continue the hearing and leaving the hearing open for additional public testimony.
Chair Nada	So, can I have a motion to keep the public hearing open and then—
Ms. Jacobson	To continue the hearing and keep the public record open for further public testimony at your next date certain meeting of— [3:54:25]
Mr. Abernathy	October 25 th . So, I will make the motion to extend the meeting and to continue the meeting on October 25 [inaudible 3:54: 45] and leave public hearing open until we close it during the October 25th meeting.
Ms. Hendrix	Second.
Chair Nada	The motion to keep the public hearing open and allow for public testimony to the next meeting of October 25th has been moved and seconded. All those in favor— any discussion? No discussion. All those in favor, say, Aye.
Multiple voices	Aye.
Chair Nada	I'm going to say, Nay. The motion carries 4 to 0. It passes. [3:55:15] Okay, and do I have to read this whole appeal thing at the end or—
Ms. Jacobson	No, the public hearing is still open.

Respectfully submitted,

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