

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

Approved
April 13, 2015

**Development Review Board – Panel A
Minutes–February 9, 2015 6:30 PM**

I. Call to Order

Chair Mary Fierros Bower called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

II. Chair’s Remarks

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

III. Roll Call

Present for roll call were: Mary Fierros Bower, Lenka Keith, Ronald Heberlein, James Frinell, and City Council Liaison Julie Fitzgerald. Kristin Akervall was absent.

Staff present: Blaise Edmonds, Barbara Jacobson, and Daniel Pauly

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

V. City Council Liaison Report

Councilor Fitzgerald welcomed the new DRB Panel A members and that *The Boones Ferry Messenger* had a lot of great details about the City Council’s actions. She reported:

- On February 2, 2015, Council heard an in depth presentation by City Staff on the Asset Management Plan, which looked at all of the City’s commonly used assets, everything from stop signs to storm drains, to assess their operation, replacement needs, and how best to manage them so the City would not be caught off guard. It would take a few more years to get everything on the schedule, but as data was added, the Plan would become a really efficient way of keeping the facilities necessary for a safe and functioning city, like streets, working well without waiting too long and then spending more than necessary to keep them in functioning order.
 - The Plan’s information would be of use when planning budgets, such as in the Wastewater Collection System Master Plan to determine major expenses and how to best fund those going forward.
- The Budget Committee comprised of five city councilors and five additional members would hold its first meeting on February 12, 2015 when the Committee would hear an overview of the process.
- The Leadership Academy started by the city manager this year was underway and really seemed to be going well.

VI. Consent Agenda:

A. Approval of minutes of January 13, 2015 DRB Panel A meeting

Approval of the January 13, 2015 DRB Panel A meeting minutes were postponed to next month due to the lack of a quorum.

VII. Public Hearing:

A. Resolution No. 294. Ridder House Offices Conditional Use Permit: KJD Properties - Owner. The applicant is requesting approval of a conditional use permit for a home business. The subject property is located on at 10050 SW Wilsonville Road on Tax Lot 1100 of Section 23B, T3S, R1W, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Blaise Edmonds

This item was continued to this date and time certain at the January 13, 2015 DRB Panel A meeting.

Chair Fierros Bower called the public hearing to order at 6:37 p.m. and read the conduct of hearing format into the record. Chair Fierros Bower, Lenka Keith and Ronald Heberlein 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.

Mr. Edmonds presented the Staff report via PowerPoint, briefly reviewing the site's history and noting the project's location and surrounding features, with these key comments:

- The conditional use permit, first heard by the Development Review Board (DRB) on December 8, 2014 and then continued to January, and now to the February DRB meeting, was to occupy one of the older homes in Wilsonville that was a Montessori preschool for more than 30 years. The applicant, KJD Properties, had several companies including Wilsonville Concrete Products, Bernert Nursery, and Marine Industrial Construction. The Applicant owned the 80 to 90 acres surrounding this piece of property, including the sand and gravel concrete plant at the south end next to Willamette River.
 - The proposed conditional use was for a home office business, as opposed to a home occupation, because the employees would not reside in the house; therefore, Staff could not define the use as a home occupation under the definition in the Code.
 - Testimony by the Applicant indicated that no exterior modifications would be made to the house, and that parking would be added to the south end of the house.
- Issues were raised about access control as the Applicant proposed closing the existing driveway at Wilsonville Rd and creating a new driveway to the south on property that they or other companies or partners control to take access off Industrial Way.
- Some issues were triggered by the PF condition requiring a gate to be installed at the entrance of the existing driveway. The city engineer determined that with the change of use, now would be the time to close off that access for safety reasons because it did not meet access separation requirements between other driveways along Wilsonville Rd, an arterial street.
 - The discussion evolved into questions about the driveway's location. Testimony presented by Shari Young, spokesperson for several property owners of the property east of the site, noted that closing that access would potentially close off driveway access to their properties.
 - The DRB wanted to see stronger evidence to reflect that the driveway was actually on the Applicant's and not the adjacent property. In the last two months, the Applicant had a registered surveyor conduct a survey that confirmed the driveway was entirely on the subject property and not straddling the two properties which would result in the access being closed off. (Exhibit B5)
- The DRB also sought comment from Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue (TVF&R), and Exhibit C4 included comments from Captain Jason Arn stating that adequate emergency access would exist from the south. If there was a suppressed fire along Wilsonville Rd, they could do that too to get access to the house. TVF&R could provide emergency services and fire suppression to the house.
- Those were the two key issues that were holding back any decision on the conditional use permit. He believed the Applicant had successfully provided his burden of proof and Staff supported approving the application for the conditional use.

Chair Fierros Bower asked how the information about the driveway on Slide 5 was derived.

Mr. Edmonds responded the diagram was a survey the Applicant conducted. The information was also shown in the title report, which was validated by the survey as seen in Exhibit B5.

Ronald Heberlein noted the top side of the survey indicated approximately 2 feet of clearance from the edge of the property to the paved driveway. This clearance went down to zero about a third of the way up the drive, and then, down at the bottom per the measurement taken from the depiction, it looked like the edge of the paved driveway was on the east side.

Mr. Edmonds explained the pavement was shown a bit on the adjacent property. Typically, a driveway was not a private or public street, but a driveway to a house. No Code requirements existed for driveways or the width of a driveway. Residential driveways could be as wide as a double-car garage to a single-car garage. He suggested considering whether adequate pavement existed to serve this property if there was a fire access through a locked gate to this property from Wilsonville Rd. It appeared that most of that driveway access was on the Applicant's property. The adjacent owner could remove the additional two feet of pavement on their property if they liked. The test was to show that predominantly the driveway was on the subject property.

Chair Fierros Bower called for any additional testimony from the Applicant.

Dave Bernert, PO Box 37, Wilsonville, OR, thanked the City for the efforts in going through the due diligence associated with this conditional use permit and offered to answer any questions.

Chair Fierros Bower thanked Mr. Bernert for going back and gathering the information requested. She called for public testimony in favor of, opposed, and neutral to the application.

Shari Young, stated she was representing Silverleaf Farms, which had a half interest in the property east of the subject site. She thanked City Staff for their efforts to work with her through the questions the adjacent owners had and thanked Mr. Bernert for his cooperation and help.

- She explained that historically, the driveway had been used by both properties. There was clear evidence, even before City, that both the property to the east, which used to have a house on it, and the subject property, were using that access onto the public highway. Closing that driveway would have consequences for the property owners to the east. Fortunately, the parties had resolved the issue at this point as relevant and with regard to concerns about future development, a right-hand turn heading east would be addressed when and if all of the properties got to eventual development.
- As requested by the Board, the property owners had worked out a written easement so that properties to the east, which also own a piece of Wilsonville Rod historically and had a right to come out there, would have the right to access onto Industrial Way. Part of the issue had been that many of these things were not historically granted because they were already part of the way laws were, so now these easements needed to be written out. She knew of several other properties would be landlocked if not allowed to use their historic accesses.
- The property owners were pleased how things worked out and would have recorded easements in the future. In addition to the private ownership on Industrial Way, the private road to the east, there was also a public easement, and documentation existed that the property owners had a right to use that, just like the rest of the public, for these properties. It was extremely important to property value that access not be lost, and she appreciated that was not happening at this point.

Mr. Edmonds entered into the record Exhibit A4, the revised Condition PF3 submitted by Development Engineer Manager Steve Adams. He read Condition PF3, correcting the date of the Transportation System Plan to state, "~~2103~~ 2013".

Ms. Young added that, in working with the Applicant, it also helped to clarify that those two lots would have a direct east access, and not have to go south, east, and then north for access.

Chair Fierros Bower confirmed the Applicant had no rebuttal and closed the public hearing at 6:55 pm.

Lenka Keith moved to amend the Staff report by adding Exhibit A4 as corrected and adopt Resolution No. 294. Ronald Heberlein seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Chair Fierros Bower read the rules of appeal into the record.

B. Resolution No. 297. Seville Row Homes: RCS – Villebois Investments, LLC – Owner.

The applicant is requesting approval of a Final Development Plan (FDP) for the Seville Row Homes. The site includes Tax Lots 11800 - 12500 of Section 15DB, T3S-R1W, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Daniel Pauly.

Case File: DB14-0068 – Final Development Plan

Chair Fierros Bower called the public hearing to order at 6:57 p.m. and read the conduct of hearing format into the record. Chair Fierros Bower, Lenka Keith and James Frinell 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.

Daniel Pauly, Associate Planner, announced that the criteria applicable to the application were stated on Page 2 of the Staff report, which was entered into the record. Copies of the report were made available to the side of the room.

Mr. Pauly presented the Staff report via PowerPoint, briefly reviewing the Villebois Planning Process and noting the site's location and surrounding product types, with these key additional comments:

- Review of the proposed Final Development Plan (FDP) only included the architecture and landscaping for seven row homes on Barber St in Villebois. Items such as number of units, whether attached or detached, traffic, parking, etc. had all been reviewed and approved previously.
- The City originally approved the Seville row homes for this site in 2006 as an eight-unit building mirroring that built across the street. At that time, the standards required row houses in the Villebois Village Center to be attached. In 2009, the DRB approved a modification of the standards allowing row houses in many areas of the Village Center to be detached into sets of individual units. Detached row houses have since been built in the Village Center, including the row homes southeast of the subject site. In 2014, the DRB approved the appropriate application to allow the previously approved eight attached row homes to be revised to seven detached row homes and those plots had been recorded. At that time, the Applicant elected to defer the FDP to the future, which was the reason for tonight's review.
- The Village Center Architectural Standards (VCAS) was used to review an FDP for buildings in the Villebois Village Center. The VCAS had two main sections.
 - The first regarded general standards that applied to buildings throughout the Village Center, which were indicated in highlighted in yellow and outlined in black on Slide 6.
 - The second section included standards specific to certain address overlays that create a variety of specific and distinct outdoor rooms. A total of six address overlays existed in the Village Center that covered the buildings along the cross-hatch streets and plazas on Slide 7. The Barber Street Address Overlay, the subject of tonight's review, was circled in yellow.
- He read an excerpt from the VCAS shown on Slide 8, describing the Barber Street Address, noting it was an important corridor to the Plaza. He emphasized the Barber Street Address would mark a distinct location with a consistent strategy of massing façade design and materials within the Village Center.
- He briefly described key architectural elements shown on Slide 9 which pictured two blocks that had been developed in the Barber Street Address. He noted the address did not require a certain architectural style to create the desired consistency.

- Proposed were row homes in the American Modern architectural style and the homes' design had been reviewed and confirmed by Steve Coyle, a consulting architect for the city who reviewed the architecture of virtually all single-family homes throughout Villebois for consistency with the architectural style. Although the American Modern style had not been used as extensively in Villebois, as other allowed styles, like English Revival, French Revival, or American Modern Craftsman, especially in single-family homes, it was allowed and the Code emphasized a diversity of architecture in Villebois.
 - Renderings were displayed of the rear and side elevations of the proposed row homes which faced the parking area of the apartment complex and Ravenna Lp, respectively.
 - The proposed row homes had more of a shed and flat roof form rather than a hipped or gabled form. While buildings directly across the street or to the side had more hipped roof forms generally, there were precedents for flat or shed rooflines along Barber Street and in the surrounding apartment complex.
- The Barber Street Address Overlay encouraged three-story buildings and requested that roof forms in a series of row houses be similar in character. The proposed seven row homes would conform being three-stories high and having consistent roof lines.
- Materials were also extensively discussed in the VCAS and in the Barber Street Address, at least 15 percent of each building façade in the public view shed must be brick, stone, stucco, plaster, concrete veneer or metal panel systems. The Applicant proposed using brick, and those areas where brick would be used on the facades were highlighted in yellow on Slide 15. With doors and windows removed from the calculation, the Applicant met the 15 percent standard.
 - Other proposed materials included hardy plank or cement fiber-type products, such as the different siding styles shown, and all were acceptable materials in the VCAS. Additionally, all the components across the various row houses were encouraged to be similar in proportion and configuration, and the Applicant had kept that similar form to create a visual unit even though the homes were separate.
- Another major design element for the Barber Street Address was the requirement to have a stoop or porch. He reviewed the VCAS requirements regarding porches, noting the Applicant's proposed porches complied because they were oriented toward the street, had direct access to the main dwelling entry, were elevated at least 24 inches above grade, had guardrails, and complemented the porches or stoops of the set of row homes across from the site.
 - The porches shown in the drawings (Slide 16) were 25 inches.
 - As encouraged in the VCAS, the porches also had posts, and extended across the entire front façade on three of the four proposed homes. The brick vineyard on one of the designs going from top to bottom of the row home prevented the porch from fully extending across the building.
 - Porches in the Barber Street Address were also encouraged to be two-stories, and a number of the homes on that street had two-level porches. While the Applicant did not actually have two-story porches, the homes did have a second-floor living space extending over the porch, which created a similar massing as having the porch extend for two floors. He reiterated two story porches were encouraged and not required.
- The VCAS also detailed fencing, which included a requirement to be consistent with the architectural design. Therefore, the American Modern home would not have the typical fence seen with the English and French homes in Villebois. A more contemporary wooden fence was proposed. Setbacks from the fencing would be met by a condition of approval and all other standards fencing had been met. Slide 18 indicated the location of the fencing proposed between homes and along the side yard on Ravenna Lp in yellow.
- The Community Elements Book, another document used during FDP review, defined park furniture and landscaping materials, with landscaping materials being the current focus. In short, Staff's review found the proposed landscaping was professional designed using materials consistent with the Community Elements Book.

- From the correspondence from neighbors, there seemed to be some confusion about the 15 percent landscaping requirement. This requirement was a general standard applied to all development, yet these homes were allowed to have more than 85 percent lot coverage. It was really a question of scale, as Villebois was looked at as a broader neighborhood. SAP Central and all of Villebois had much more than 15 percent landscaping, so the park and landscaping requirements were met for the neighborhood, which was considered as part of the master planning process.
- The proposed project featured a narrow space between homes by design to create that kind of massing and each home, by easement, would have a passive and active side, allowing each of the interior homes to have full use of one of the side yard areas extending from their wall to their neighbor's wall.
- He corrected the footer of the Staff report to state, "~~Chateau Villebois and Carriage Homes~~ *Seville Row Homes Final Development Plan.*"
- He confirmed that all correspondence received prior to the publication of the Staff report had been included in the record and given exhibit numbers.

Chair Fierros Bower noted that the colored renderings of the elevations did not seem to align with the site plan shown previously with the floor plans. Seven units were shown with the outer units mirrored so they were looked symmetrical to each other. The second unit in on each side, as well as those flanking the center unit, did not look like they were mirrored. It did not look like the site plan and the doors were jiving with the external elevation. She liked the idea of having the units symmetrical on the ends, but the two units on each side of the center unit were not mirrored. She was trying to understand the logic from a design standpoint.

Mr. Pauly deferred to the Applicant, adding he would review the plans and address any additional concerns after the Applicant's testimony.

Chair Fierros Bower asked what materials were proposed for the guardrails on the porches.

Mr. Pauly understood that metal cable would be used.

- He noted the colored rendering on Slide 1 was a previous version, so it did not show all of the brick and the addition of columns on the bottom level, which was why he had focused on the black and white drawings through much of the presentation.
- He confirmed that color was part of the approval. Language in the conditions of approval noted that minor changes could be done administratively, but part of the scope of the Board's review would be paint color. The VCAS had specific standards about avoiding bright colors. Staff had provided a finding that none of the proposed colors were bright or particularly offensive.

Lenka Keith confirmed the distance between homes was about 6 feet and asked if there was enough room for the proposed vine maples.

Mr. Pauly confirmed vine maples were appropriate for a smaller space, noting they were an understory, multi-stemmed tree that grow in confined spaces natively.

Ms. Keith asked if people would be able to pass through.

Mr. Pauly replied the area between the homes was designed to be a native area. The homes were designed so that the main outdoor living space was the patio and the area immediately adjacent to it with landscaping and bushes added for aesthetic purposes.

Ms. Keith asked if the reason for detached, rather than attached, homes was to have a single-family, rather than condominium, ownership.

Mr. Pauly answered yes, adding that when the modification to allow for a detached product was approved in 2009, arguments had been made regarding typical concerns, such as the ease of financing, issues that arise with condo associations over time, and maintenance of the exteriors.

Chair Fierros Bower called for the Applicant's testimony.

Mark Stewart, 22582 SW Main Street, Sherwood, OR explained, in response to Chair Fierros Bower's question about the design, that the private outdoor space was aligned so everybody would get one, with an active side that would feature a patio and a passive side that was mostly a blank wall. The outdoor space determined whether or not the homes were mirrored.

- He confirmed the only row house that had a door to the left would be the one closest to the apartment complex.

James Frinell asked how the community was involved in determining the new design given that in 2006, the intent to mirror what was built on the south side of the street had changed.

Mr. Stewart responded that because this was the Applicant's first project in Villebois, they first familiarized themselves with the history, intent, and the rules. The Applicant spent a lot of time talking to Lee Iverson, who wrote the Architectural Pattern Book on what to do in Villebois and how to do it, as well as Rudy Kadlub, who master planned it.

- This site was really important because it was adjacent to both the big commercial building and the apartments, so having an urban lofty style there seemed better next to that big building rather than something European and cute. The Applicant tried to do both, but the styles required in that address were strict; the style had to be one or the other, which was why the American Architecture was chosen. The colors and materials were chosen to marry the street together and transition from the big commercial building right next door to the single-family and detached row houses next to it.
- He confirmed that no meetings were held with the residents, adding that no such process was available; instead the Applicant went to the developer and original master planner.

Ronald Heberlein asked what discussion drove choosing the Modern style instead of mirroring and choosing the French style that was across the street.

Mr. Stewart replied that primarily because the French style did not really provide a transition between all of the row homes built recently on that street. In 2006, those row homes were not on the list of things that would happen, but they were there now. These single-family row homes needed to transition into the architecture they were leaning up against, rather than force it into being French. If the buildings were attached all along the street like condos, as originally planned, the conversation would have been completely different.

Ms. Keith asked why there were small trees and shrubs between all the homes except for the first and second homes on the very left.

Mr. Stewart explained that at that point, there were two passive sides next to each other. The trees were intended to form an outdoor room that would be somewhat enclosed, being buffered by a tree a bit, but not open to the alley. There would not be any real logic to adding trees in that small space on the passive to passive sides.

Chair Fierros Bower called for public testimony in favor of, opposed, and neutral to the application.

Art Henderlong, President, Seville Row Homes Homeowners Association (HOA), 11386 SW Barber St, stated there was concern among some of the owners in his association that this project ignored the real look and feel of the Seville Row Homes; they had hoped to have a mirror image. While architecture was in the eye of the beholder, the residents loved what they had and believed the existing Seville Row Homes were a focal point at the heart of Villebois and they did not want to see that cheapened in any way. They believed their building was very unique and that it fit with what Villebois really was with the Seville Row Homes as the centerpiece.

Rudy Kadlub, President, Costa Pacific Communities, 11422 SW Barber St, Wilsonville, 97070, stated Costa Pacific was the master planner of Villebois and had worked closely with Mr. Steward for the last several months to develop the architecture for this application, as well as the next application on the agenda.

- One of the main tenets of Villebois was diversity, and he had been concerned for a while about a bit of homogeneity that had crept into Villebois as too much of the same thing was being repeated over and over again, so he welcomed this opportunity to do something a bit different.
 - The American Modern architecture was already being used around Portland. It was also popping up in older sections of some older cities in Europe, with very contemporary architecture adding to diversity and to the interest of the street scenes, in European towns and villages, as well as in American cities.
 - The proposed row homes would be adjacent to the Domain at Villebois, an existing mixed-use, urban building, and he believed that proximity made sense there. These row homes were also adjacent to the more urban look of the three-story, walk-up products with flat roofs right behind that. When the Domain was built, there were three roof forms, an urban or flat roof, a gable form, and a hipped roof. The closest to the proposed row homes was the urban form.
 - Costa Pacific believed the diversity added texture and interest to the street scene. The scale was truly a three-story, whereas the Sevilles across the street were a two-and-a-half story with the first level depressed a bit. These buildings would actually be a bit taller and having this scale adjacent to the four-story, mixed-use building was helpful.
 - Another concern was traffic speeds along Barber Street. There was no stop sign at the corner of Barber and Villebois, the closest intersection, but when the sides of a street were filled in, traffic tended to slow down. This street particularly, with three-story homes close to the street, would actually be a traffic-calming device. The street would become a tighter corridor as opposed to a street going through wide open areas with single-story buildings on it. The three-story design was an added benefit.
- He understood Mr. Henderlong's concerns that the architectural style did not mirror the Seville Row Homes across the street. Originally in Villebois, the intent was to build that same product, which was introduced in the spring of 2009. That luxury row home product was marketed in the high \$400,000s and low \$500,000s; however the homes could not be sold at that price due to the cost of the construction of that attached product and its features. Even if that product were built today, it would not garner those prices.
 - The proposed row homes, however, would all be over 2,000 square feet, similar in size to the individual row homes that existed today. The pricing for the new homes would be similar to the value of the current homes across the street.
 - As Mr. Henderlong indicated, architecture was art, and art was a matter of taste. He had met with a number of the Seville Row homeowners and talked about architecture being a personal preference. He assured them that he was comfortable with the direction of this product.
- He noted a similar product was proposed in the next application, but with an entirely different architecture to maintain the diversity. That particular style would also better fit the area where it would be located.

Chair Fierros Bower asked if the loft row house style had been considered elsewhere in Villebois. Using the product elsewhere to sort of unify the entire project would seem to justify having it here.

Mr. Kadlub replied no plans to do so exist at this time, but moving forward with the 550 units yet to be developed in the Village Center alone, he hoped for more diversity of product types. Today, this was the only application. He noted the buyer of Chateau Villebois, which had a more traditional style, had not moved forward to purchase the land, and it was unknown whether it would actually get built or not. Something would have to go there, perhaps it would be more contemporary, maybe more traditional, but he hoped to maintain the diversity and stay within the context of the VCAS for everything that was done.

Chair Fierros Bower asked if the HOA reviewed the design or had any input on the different products while planning the development and design phase.

Mr. Kadlub answered no, adding that the master association had not been turned over to the homeowners yet. Only about 30 homes had been sold in the Villebois Village Center out of 1,010, so the master developer still maintained the control of the architectural standards.

Chair Fierros Bower called for the Applicant's rebuttal.

Mr. Stewart believed that good questions were being asked, adding if there were just these seven homes in that whole place, people might wonder if they were offices. He has designed homes for 35 years and his company was known as one of the best design firms around. He prided himself on keeping his ear to the ground to hear what was coming. For the last three years at least, Modern architecture in subdivision settings had become louder and louder.

- In his office, there was always a tipping point where the custom design client and builder started asking for the same thing, which was a trend to him. In the last six months, more than one third of the custom homes they were asked to design by homeowners were modern with flat roofs, shed roofs, in that vein.
- This style could take a while to get used to if one was not used to it. Modern architecture could be kind of absurd-looking the first time it was seen, but it had its own charm and qualities when finished and did a magic thing in diversity, as Mr. Kadlub mentioned. Modern architecture was in Europe, downtown Portland, and really everywhere now.
 - One builder recently come in with 20-some small lots in Beaverton and told his firm they could do whatever they wanted. He designed the floor plan with three different fronts for each unit, a French European, a Craftsman, and a Modern home. The builder wanted to be cautious and do the Craftsman with a few European features. However, he also showed the designs to his realtor, wife, office manager, and sales and marketing team, all of whom chose the Modern homes because there was a demand for it.
 - He could almost certainly guarantee that the 500 plus remaining lots would have a lot more of the Modern architectural style. It was a funny time in Villebois. If this Modern architecture was not right next to the mixed-use building, it would be not right. The only way this style would work was at this historic time, right where it was proposed.

Mr. Henderlong stated that both he and his board trusted Mr. Kadlub's judgment.

Mr. Stewart added from the audience that he trusted Mr. Kadlub as well

Chair Fierros Bower closed the public hearing at 7:43 pm.

Lenka Keith moved to adopt Resolution No. 297 with the correction of the scrivener's error in the footer of the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Ronald Heberlein and passed unanimously.

Chair Fierros Bower read the rules of appeal into the record.

- C. Resolution No. 298. Carvalho Row Homes: RCS – Villebois Development, LLC – Owner.** The applicant is requesting approval of a Final Development Plan (FDP) for the Carvalho Row Homes. Three sites include Tax Lots 7800, 7900 and 8000 of Section 15DB, T3S-R1W, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Blaise Edmonds

Case File: DB14-0067 – Final Development Plan

Chair Fierros Bower called the public hearing to order at 7:46 p.m. and read the conduct of hearing format into the record. Chair Fierros Bower, Lenka Keith and James Frinell 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.

Blaise Edmonds, Manager of Current Planning, announced that the criteria applicable to the application were stated on page 3 of the Staff report, which was entered into the record. Copies of the report were made available to the side of the room.

The color and materials boards, included in the record within Exhibit B1, were circulated to the Board.

Mr. Edmonds presented the Staff report via PowerPoint, noting the location of the three project sites and surrounding product types, including the Modern temporary units the Board just reviewed for the Barber Street Address. Identical to that process, this Final Development Plan (FDP) review was to consider architectural, landscaping and fencing design. His key comments were as follows:

- In 2006, 33 condo units in six buildings were originally approved on the three subject parcels. Late last year, 18 detached, three-story, single-family plots for row houses were approved, similar to those for the Barber Street Address.
 - He indicated that portions of the site along Villebois Drive were fully landscaped with paver bricks and a well-designed entryway to Piazza Plaza in the heart of Villebois.
- The project was in the Linear Green Address. He read the description from the Village Center Architectural Standards (VCAS) as follows, “The Linear Green Address is a major pedestrian corridor linking the West Park Regional Trail and the Piazza. Its character is that of a pedestrian boulevard or promenade, a place where people can stroll, sit, interact under a canopy of tree lined streets and other unique landscape features as defined in the Community Elements Book will feature and enhance the linear greens, roads, and major social space.”
- He discussed a few photos of the existing site, (Slides 2 through 4) indicating a French style building built as part of the original condominium and the area with a sales trailer that would eventually be infilled with more condominiums or row houses. He also noted the enhanced Linear Green Park and existing Zerkova street trees.
- The small carriage homes behind the project site at Villebois Dr and Zurich St were approved last fall and currently under construction. The alley was shown in the aerial photo, and he noted that all of the row house type homes would include be alley loaded. Because the fronts of these carriage homes faced the backs of the subject Carvalho row houses, Staff is requiring enhanced elevations of the corners and rear facades of the Carvalho homes, which would typically include horizontal siding, window trim, and potentially some window grid type material.
 - All three parcels would have full, three-story row house units approximately 6.2 ft apart.
- The Applicant selected an American Arts and Crafts style architecture, which has been applied internationally, not just in the United States. This architectural style had pitched roofs, balconies in some units, as opposed to the Seville’s, and more traditional porches. The Linear Green Address

required a 16-inch elevation for porches, so not as high as the Barber Street Address. In fact, side courtyards could be at grade, as seen in the original French Carvalho unit across the street.

- Although the illustration showed more monotone colors, the color boards identified a variety of different shades of grays and neutral tones proposed. Different colors could be used on the front doors to individualize the homes.
- The VCAS encourages a different look for the Linear Green Address than the Barber Street Address in that the units should bookend the streets, and except for one existing French styled unit that was what the Applicant proposed. Eventually, these would be bookended to complement the Arts and Crafts architecture, similar to the officers' row houses at Fort Vancouver in Washington.
- He reviewed the key features of the proposed elevations as follows:
 - The Applicant proposed adding a boxwood hedge with a minimum 2-ft high steel fence in front of the hedge as required in the Linear Green Address. The fence would be powder coated.
 - Staff asked that more masonry be added to the front façade of the units, so the Applicant proposed kind of a wainscoting of masonry on the wall behind the porch railing and on the columns.
 - As discussed for the Barber Street Address, the units should have the same roofline and height.
- Regarding the active and passive sides, the crossover easement and recessed patio area would provide a bit more room providing 6.2 feet of outdoor living area on the active side between the units.
- He displayed the Landscape Plan submitted by the Applicant, noting that a condition of approval required the Applicant to use the landscape materials listed in the Community Elements Book, not those first submitted, many of which could not be found in the Community Elements Book.
 - Many of the street trees in the linear green, a columnar type Zelkova tree, had already been planted, except on the opposite side of the street where the Applicant would be required to plant Zelkovas for street trees. He noted that Black Tupelo would be planted within the rainwater swales as it was more acceptable for water than Zelkova trees.
- Staff recommended approval of the application.

Ronald Heberlein understood the enhanced rear elevations of the proposed units would front the carriage homes currently being developed.

Mr. Edmonds briefly described the 600 sq ft carriage units, the smallest in Villebois, noting that picture windows would face the rear façades of the proposed units. The Linear Green Address requires more enhanced elevations facing those units. Even though that side of the carriage homes was mostly garage doors, the windows had some enhanced detailing, so it did not appear to be the back of a house, which was why the enhanced elevations were being requested as a condition of approval.

- He confirmed that continuing the stone work along the back of the home to make it look more consistent with the front of the house had been discussed. He suggested asking the architect about wrapping the masonry rock on the end elevations around the corner of the corner lots.
- Another issue was the building frontage, which was discussed on Page 4 of 46 of the Staff report, along with the Applicant's reply. The Linear Green Address requires at least 65 percent on the corner lots, and in some instances the proposed frontages were 55 and 56 percent. The Applicant explained that the buildings were very carefully masked and horizontally banded to replace the intention of the Linear Green Address. Essentially, they wanted to keep the same width of the buildings. Having wider, larger buildings bulging out at the ends of the lots would disrupt the desired effect of a repetitive row house design.
 - He preferred more landscaping on the corners for vision clearance and to keep the rhythm of the same width of houses along the frontage. He recommended that the Applicant's analysis outweighed having wider units on the end lots. More landscaping was more desirable and would open up the street and provide more depth on the sides. Some development reviews in Villebois were quite involved given the balance of landscaping, architecture and various features. Architecture was not as scrutinized in other parts of the city, only in Villebois. The Master Plan

was well thought out and included check-off lists of development criteria. In this case, he believed that with the exception of the wider units on the end lots, all the development criteria had been met.

Chair Fierros Bower asked if an accent color was proposed for the garage door.

Mr. Edmonds suggested asking the Applicant about any accent color proposed for the garage door, but he believed the garage doors would be white or off-white given the Arts and Crafts architecture.

Mr. Heberlein added it would be nice to see color renderings of the rear facades.

Mr. Edmonds did not believe a color sequence was received for the garages doors, adding that would be a good question for the Applicant. He hoped the front doors and garage doors would not be the same color.

Chair Fierros Bower said it appeared the cobblestone was consistent, the same color throughout.

Mr. Edmonds believed it looked like the same application of the stone, which provided a nice unifying factor. He encouraged the Applicant to keep that thread of design.

Lenka Keith hoped the species proposed to go in between the buildings were shade plants because with three-story buildings, six feet apart, there would not be much light and she questioned whether the landscaping would survive.

Mr. Edmonds said he was also leery about the landscaping being able to live in the limited active space between the units. He had talked to other builders in Villebois about the limited sunlight and planting trees in the already limited active space. He did not know if this was recommended as part of the Linear Green Address or a requirement of the VCAS. He was not keen on requiring planting materials and trees in such a crowded space, but preferred leaving it up to the individual property owner as long as it was fenced off and not visible to the public.

Ms. Keith believed maintenance of the shrubs in the limited active space would be difficult for the property owners.

Mr. Edmonds said he was more concerned about what would be visible from public view, adding the Applicant could speak to the issue.

Ms. Keith asked if the colors would be locked in once the application was approved. With the exception of the doors, it seemed there were basically two colors, which might be too much of the same thing.

Mr. Edmonds said it was not clear what units would have what colors because there were 14 color boards and 18 homes instead of 18 color boards for 18 homes. He agreed there were only subtle differences in the colors, but explained the detached row houses were designed to look alike except for some variations in architecture.

Chair Fierros Bower asked if the condition of approval regarding the elevations facing the Carriage homes was open to interpretation and if the Applicant understood what it entailed.

Mr. Edmonds clarified the idea was to mimic the design elements shown in the illustrations of the front facades. For example, the upper stories could have trim, some board and batten, and the appearance of

double hung windows. Adding stone on the back in the alleys would be overkill because it was mostly garage on the lower floor.

Chair Fierros Bower called for the Applicant's testimony.

Mark Stewart, 22582 SW Main Street, Sherwood, OR, said the very clear rules of the Linear Green Address and the size of the original building made this project more challenging. The Arts and Crafts style architecture was chosen because it allowed the Applicant to make single-family homes appear in scale, like one large building with variations, not uniform, while also blending with existing structures along the street.

- Colors, for example, clearly needed to be consistent in a block of homes. The project would not meet the intent of the Address if different colors were proposed on one side of the street.
- On the other side of the street from the colored rendering shown in Staff's PowerPoint, opposing colors were proposed in that what was dark gray would be light gray, what was light gray would be dark gray, creating a strikingly different looking pallet with the same basic colors.

Mr. Heberlein asked where the paint differences on opposite side of the street were defined. The color boards did not seem to depict where the colors would be in the development.

Mr. Stewart clarified the color boards should say A and B, noting A was shown on the slide and B would be the opposite. He clarified his company had not prepared the color boards, and proposed making the color differences clear by adding notes in an addendum.

Chair Fierros Bower asked what was proposed to enhance the facades facing the carriage homes.

Mr. Stewart clarified that the carriage homes had garages with a side entry. One would walk between the garages to get to the door with the second floor above. The living space was not looking at a garage, but the second story of the proposed homes. Page 5 of the architectural plans titled, "Carvalho Villebois End Homes A or B" indicated how the facades would be addressed. He explained the same trim package would be used on the back façade as that on the front; the gable ends had board and batten with trim bands; the high end garage doors were multi-paneled with glass and grids in the glass.

- The garage doors and the trim would be off white, matching the trim on the rest of the house.

Mr. Heberlein commented that a lot of off white was proposed.

Mr. Stewart replied that not much more could be done to enhance the façade. Not enough stone could be added to matter and would be expensive. Because they were right at the property line, stone would stick out 5 or 6 additional inches on an already tight alley.

Mr. Edmonds asked about the continuation of masonry on the side elevations facing public streets.

Mr. Stewart explained those would be end units on the active side, so there would be an abundance of trimmed windows in caliber to the front façade, as well as trim bands that scale it. The roofs were massed so that they stepped down from the garage gradually. Stone was wrapped around the corners to make a nice corner.

Mr. Heberlein inquired about the feasibility of planting landscaping in areas that would get little to no sunlight.

Mr. Stewart explained the landscape designer, though not present, believed he knew what he was doing; however, Mr. Stewart did not oppose removing the trees. Retaining the trees, and if they lived, would

make a nice room back there. He noted that Lots 91 through 94 face directly south, so those trees would live. The backs of the lots across the street also face south and would get sun. If the side of the building faced south or was at an angle, the landscaping would not have a chance. He believed the landscape designer proposed landscape that would stay small.

Chair Fierros Bower complimented the choice of using the Arts and Crafts architectural style.

Mr. Stewart replied it was almost impossible to do with the massing required for the Linear Green Address. He believed the colors were perfect for which he credited the builder.

Mr. Heberlein said he was concerned with the rear elevation and the use of the white trim and white garage door.

Mr. Stewart replied anything could be done with the garage door; perhaps it could match the front door, but that might be too strong. He suggested using a light gray door on houses that was mostly dark gray and on the opposite side of the street, using a dark gray door on houses that were mostly light gray. The Applicant had not really picked a color for the garage door.

Mr. Heberlein agreed using opposite colored doors on the opposite sides of the street was appropriate.

Ms. Keith believed using a lighter, off-white garage door would make the area appear roomier since there was not much distance between the backs of the proposed homes and the carriage homes.

Mr. Stewart agreed using darker colors would make the area appear smaller. With seven homes in a row, he preferred a lighter color on the garage doors. He reminded the garage doors would still face garage doors, so no one would see much of that elevation.

Mr. Heberlein asked about the color of the carriage homes.

Mr. Edmonds believed gray tones with white trim would be used, not much different than what the Applicant was proposing.

Mr. Stewart believed that color scheme was appropriate in this Address. These buildings were big, massive buildings, and to keep the spirit of how the whole thing was designed, the buildings needed to be similarly colored and massed, and the carriage houses would look great if they were similar.

Mr. Edmonds noted that during the public hearing for the carriage houses, there was concern about the carports being too close to Zurich St and other streets, so a carport was removed to provide a little setback of landscaping.

Chair Fierros Bower noted the proposed project did just that by providing landscaping on the end caps.

Mr. Edmonds appreciated that the proposed homes did not meet the 65 percent requirement, but were setback with more landscaping which created a more park like setting along the street.

Mr. Stewart added making the homes wider would have blown the proportions of the Linear Green Address, though the builder would have likely preferred larger homes. Sight distances were another factor given the tall buildings so a little more of a green buffer was good. The overriding concern was the requirements of the Address, rather than the four or five percent difference in width.

- He believed such revisions to the Villebois Master Plan worked, if done carefully and while still honoring the language of the Addresses in the design work. Going forward, he encouraged the Board

to be sure people were paying attention to that because the foundational DNA in Villebois was really good and solid. If that DNA was respected, all of these kinds of things would work.

Chair Fierros Bower called for public testimony in favor of, opposed and neutral to the application.

Ron Larson, 29101 SW Villebois Drive S, stated he and his wife Donna lived at the corner of Zurich St and Villebois Dr, immediately southwest of the southwesterly end of the row homes, facing the end view across Zurich St. Overall, they were very supportive of the project and believed the Applicant/developer did a wonderful job, adding the architectural plans were great. They liked how the homes were set back as they got higher, not just a sheer wall. He believed the landscaping plan was excellent.

- He complemented Mr. Edmonds on the excellent Staff report, which he knew took a lot of effort. However, this was the price of living, working, and developing in Villebois. He thanked the DRB for doing a good job of ensuring the quality of design in everything that was happening in Villebois.
- He noted the recent water and sewer construction along the promenade and wanted to ensure everything would be replaced as it had been; he believed the stones were stored onsite. The promenade was very popular, especially during the summer.

Donna Larson, 29101 SW Villebois Drive S, said they had previously expressed their concerns about landscaping along Zurich St and the promenade and were happy the developers and Staff recognized this need. She thanked the DRB, the Applicant/developer for hearing their concerns and being good to work with; she and her husband felt real good about the whole process.

Tim Roth, JT Roth Construction, 12600 SW 72nd Ave, Suite 200, Portland OR, stated he would be purchasing the property and building the Carvalho Row Homes working with Mr. Stewart and Mr. Kadlub. He and Mark Stewart worked together off and on for over 37 years and had a common feel and taste. He was involved in the design of the units on both the Seville and Carvalho sites from inception and wanted to address questions raised about the exterior and garage door colors, as well as landscaping.

- Regarding the exterior and garage door colors on the west side of Villebois Dr, there would be seven units on one block and four units on the second block separated by Toulouse Dr. The intended color scheme on the west side of Villebois Dr was as shown on the colored street elevation with the darker gray colors on the main body and the accent light gray color on the gables and batten board.
 - The rear elevation would have a similar scheme, with the garage door being the body color and picture-framed or accented by the white trim color. On the second floor, the back elevation would reflect the front elevation with the batten board and same lighter gray scheme color.
 - The garage door color scheme had not been discussed yet, but he preferred having the garage door be the body color.
- On the units directly opposite the seven-unit complex, a conscious decision was made to break up the color scheme to avoid a tunnel effect of seeing the same thing on both sides of the street. The colors would be swapped so the body color would be the lighter gray and the accent color, the darker gray.
 - The material on the gables was also changed from batten board to a synthetic shingle to break up the elevation, while maintaining unity in that the exterior designs were pretty consistent on both sides of the street.
- A conscious decision was made to give each of the units a bit of its own personal identity by applying a different bold color strictly to the front entry door, not anywhere else on the structures.

Mr. Heberlein asked if the entry door colors on the opposing side of the street would be the same.

Mr. Roth replied seven colors were selected for the entry doors. The color combinations used from left to right on one side of the street would then be used from right to left on the opposite side of the street. The colors would not directly oppose one another, except in the middle of the units.

- The Applicant worked with Mr. Edmonds, who made a lot of good comments about the landscaping. Their main focus was to be more sensitive to what was happening on the front and end of the units exposed to the street, and not so much on the interior space.
 - The units had a confined outdoor living space. By design, a glass overhead door was incorporated into the garage to expose the patio area and provide the opportunity to extend the outdoor living space from the covered patio into the garage, if desired. This would work well for residents with one car since they would use one parking stall, but not as well if a person had two cars.
- The Applicant would like some freedom to experiment with what was done on the active side. The area would be enclosed with fences between the structures and a gate access on the garage side of the enclosed area. He agreed planting a tree in the active space was probably not a good idea because it would restrict access within the 6-ft active area from the gate into the patio area.
 - He did not necessarily want to be held to the landscaping plan on the interior space. They would not want to plant shrubbery in the active space that would not flourish, so he hoped for some flexibility to make such changes. Columnar evergreen trees were used in between the tall, vertical structures and a similar type product would be carried around the sides of the structure. Although they wanted to maintain a flourishing green effect, they did not want a product with a canopy that would engulf the area.

Mr. Heberlein confirmed the trash enclosures would be located on the side of the garage, behind the fenced area and asked where the enclosures would be located on the corner lots.

Mr. Roth replied behind the gate on the other side of the garage where the two passive sides come together.

Mr. Heberlein noted the first page of the Landscaping Plan showed a 6-ft fence on the living space on the corner end lots, but no area where the trash would be located.

Mr. Roth understood the whole side yard would be fenced on the end unit facing the street.

Mr. Heberlein noted a 24-in steel fence was shown around, as well as a 6-ft fence where the living area would mirror the patio area.

Mr. Edmonds explained limitations exist in the Master Fence Plan for Villebois which defined fencing designs; for example, a solid obscuring fence had to setback two feet from the street.

Mr. Roth clarified the intention was to find a location for an enclosed area for the containers, not necessarily in the garage because oftentimes, the containers just get left outside. They intended to designate an area with a pad enclosed behind the fence.

Mr. Heberlein said he was concerned that a fence design was not submitted.

Mr. Edmonds clarified any fence the Applicant installed would be controlled by the limitations and existing designs set out in the Master Fence Plan.

Chair Fierros Bower called for the Applicant's rebuttal.

Mr. Stewart noted the designs for both the 6-ft and 2-ft fences were defined at the bottom of the Landscape Plan, and both came from the Master Fence Plan.

Mr. Edmonds reiterated a solid 2-ft fence was required to be setback two feet from the property line or sidewalk to ensure vision would not be impaired. The Master Fence Plan was honored by approximately

90 percent of the homes in Villebois; some builders had built right out to the sidewalk without the strip of landscaping between the fence and sidewalk.

Mr. Heberlein said he liked what was being done; his only concern was there was no indication about where the trash might be located.

Mr. Stewart clarified the trash areas were depicted by small squares in the upper right hand corner of Lots 100 and 101, but noted the design would not work with a gate. Moving the trash enclosures for each unit to the other side of the building would allow a gate to work on all of the lots.

Mr. Heberlein said that in Wilsonville, there would be three cans for trash, recycling, and yard debris.

Mr. Stewart added the cans were actually in the garage. He explained that one of the trash enclosures would need to be on the end for the design to work and shielded from the street with a fence.

Mr. Keith asked where the air conditioning units would be located.

Mr. Stewart replied the units had not been located yet, but he guessed they would end up on the passive side back near the garage.

Mr. Heberlein noted there was no passive side on a majority of the homes except between Lots 100 and 101. Everything else would be an active side for the next unit.

Mr. Stewart agreed and clarified the unit would probably be on the garage side near the patio.

Mr. Edmonds noted the Code did have standards regarding where residential HVAC units should be placed, so the City did not control that. The units were not required to be set back and could be in the setback area. Charbonneau and some other subdivisions had more control with their homeowners associations. HVAC units were addressed in the commercial and industrial standards of the Code, but it was a moot point for residential lots.

Mr. Stewart added the builder was sensitive and would put the units in the best possible place; they just did not know where that would be yet.

Mr. Heberlein confirmed with Mr. Edmonds that the unit could theoretically be on the active side of Lot 101, on the street side.

Mr. Stewart added if it were placed on the active side of Lot 101, it would be shielded.

Ms. Keith was concerned there would be no room for movement between the buildings if there was an air conditioning unit, trees in the middle, trash on one end and a fence on the other end.

Mr. Stewart said the home design would suit an indoor person, but noted there was 14 feet from the patio door to the perimeter wall, which really was the yard area, the rest was a corridor.

Ms. Keith understood, but was concerned about exterior maintenance being a challenge due to the space constraints.

Mr. Stewart commented most yards required maintenance. He reiterated that he did not believe the Applicant was bound to the interior landscaping.

Mr. Edmonds believed some criteria existed for trees in the interior for this Address. He believed the Applicant was asking for flexibility in the landscaping treatments between the yards. He feared out of sight, out of mind and that after two or three years, the landscaping would be replaced with hardscape, dog runs, and other things.

Mr. Stewart said this was one requirement of the Address that made no sense with detached row houses.

Mr. Edmonds explained the original Address was designed for larger condominium units, and when the Code was changed for detached units, how some of those design elements would apply to detached row houses as opposed to larger units was not considered.

Chair Fierros Bower confirmed the individual property owner would be responsible to maintain the passive area.

Rudy Kadlub, 1142 SW Barber Street, Wilsonville, OR, said he wanted to underscore a few points. He was excited to welcome a reputable builder to add to the diversity in Villebois, especially one with a reputation for quality of design, construction, and customer service.

- He believed the homogeneity of the proposed colors in a row was unique and diverse because it did not occur anywhere else in Villebois or in the Village Center. Lee Iverson, the master planner, came up with the officer's row term, which was consciously chosen because the architecture and how it was set up was representative of equanimity of status as it would be on an army base.
- One thing that was important to this Address was the required horizontal banding to tie the buildings together, and Mr. Stewart had done a wonderful job of doing that with the strong horizontal banding at four levels, the base, the first and second floors, as well as the upper fascia. He was very pleased with how the banding worked out.
 - He also noted the extraordinary number of windows included in the buildings' design. Windows are much more expensive than siding, but they added to the design quality, as well as the value of the buildings. The extra windows kept the homes light and bright, a benefit in Oregon's weather.
- With regard to the replacement of the trees, he explained that since the development was originally to be condo buildings, the infrastructure had to be remodeled with new sewer and water lines and tap connections. An easement was obtained to install the new sewer line under the proximate sidewalk in the linear green. After construction of the buildings on the linear green side was complete, the sidewalk would be rebuilt using the original pervious pavers, currently being stored, that were part of the rainwater program. The trees moved as a result of this construction would also be replanted or replaced if needed.
- The maintenance use easement of the active and passive was not new to architecture and was used throughout Villebois. The active side of the unit receives the passive side of the other person so the passive side grants the use of that side to the active person. The active person grants the right for the owner of the passive side to come in and maintain their side of the building via an access easement.

Chair Fierros Bower confirmed there was no further questions or discussion and closed the public hearing at 8:55 pm.

James Frinell moved to adopt Resolution No. 298. Lenka Keith seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Chair Fierros Bower read the rules of appeal into the record.

VIII. Board Member Communications

- A. Results of the January 26, 2015 DRB Panel B meeting

Chair Fierros Bower welcomed Mr. Frinell and Mr. Heberlein to the Board.

IX. Staff Communications

Mr. Edmonds commended the Board for their great work and especially their questions related to architectural review.

X. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:59 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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