

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

**Development Review Board – Panel A
Minutes–September 8, 2014 6:30 PM**

Approved
November 10, 2014

I. Call to Order:

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

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, Simon Springall, and Kristin Akervall. Ken Ruud and Councilor Liaison Julie Fitzgerald were absent.

Staff present: Barbara Jacobson, Daniel Pauly, and Steve Adams

VI. 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:

No City Council report was given due to Councilor Fitzgerald’s absence.

VI. Consent Agenda:

A. Approval of minutes of July 14, 2014 DRB Panel A meeting

- Note: Due to a lack of quorum to approve minutes from the July 14, 2014 minutes in the normal fashion, staff has attained signatures of approval from all attendees. The board is asked to recognize those signatures as valid and therefore adopt those minutes as approved.

Kristin Akervall moved to adopt the July 14, 2014 DRB Panel A meeting minutes as approved. Lenka Keith seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

B. Approval of minutes of August 11, 2014 DRB Panel A meeting

Simon Springall moved to approve the August 11, 2014 DRB Panel A meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Kristin Akervall and passed unanimously.

VII. Public Hearing:

A. Resolution No. 290. Carvalho and Seviles Row Houses: RCS-Villebois Investment LLC and RCS-Villebois Development LLC – owners. The applicant is requesting a modification to Preliminary Development Plan 1 Central, a Refinement to SAP Central, a Tentative Subdivision Re-Plat for the Carvalho Row Houses, a Tentative Subdivision Re-Plat for the Seviles Row Houses and a Refinement to the Linear Green Address of the Village Center Architectural Standards. The subject properties are located along SW Villebois Drive South and SW Barber Street. The properties are described as Tax Lots 11800 – 12500 and 7800 and 8000 of Section 15DB, T3S, R1W, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Blaise Edmonds

Case Files: DB14-0050 – Carvalho & Seviles Row Houses PDP Modification
DB14-0051 – Carvalho & Seviles Row Houses SAP Refinement

DB14-0052 – Carvalho Row Houses Tentative Subdivision Re-Plat
DB14-0055 – Sevilles Row Houses Tentative Subdivision Re-Plat
DB14-0056 – Revisions to the Village Center Architectural Standards for
the Linear Green Address

Chair Fierros Bower called the public hearing to order at 6:37 pm 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. Kristin Akervall declared for the record that she lives in Villebois, but that would not bias her decision. 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 and 3 of the Staff report, which was entered into the record. Copies of the report were made available to the side of the room. He announced that he was filling in for Blaise Edmonds, who was called away this evening.

Mr. Pauly presented the Staff report via PowerPoint, briefly reviewing the separate locations of the Carvalho and Sevilles row house sites, surrounding features within the Village Center and details about the applications before the Board, with these key comments:

- The Carvalho & Sevilles Row Houses were part of the same Preliminary Development Plan (PDP), and the PDP modification request regarded changing the formally proposed attached row house products for Sevilles and the stacked flat condominium type structures for Carvalho to detached row houses on both sites.
 - A future Final Development Plan (FDP) application, where the details of the architecture and landscaping would be addressed, was still forthcoming. Most of Villebois' architecture was reviewed by the consultant architect based on the Architectural Pattern Book and not at the DRB level; however, in the Village Center, the DRB reviewed architecture through the FDP based on the Village Center Architectural Standards (VCAS). He reminded that while some architectural drawings would be seen tonight, review of the projects' architecture was out of the scope of tonight's hearing; however, the drawings were being provided to help the DRB understand how the projects were changing in terms of density.
- The Specific Area Plan (SAP) Central Refinement request related specifically to density and the proposed number of units. Considering the number of units in the Village Center, the proposed change was relatively small at 1.3 percent, which was well within that allowed through the refinement process in the Development Code.
- The Tentative Subdivision Re-Plat requests were made because the Applicant wanted ~~them~~ the properties re-platted from their current configurations to allow for the detached row houses.
- The proposed revisions to the VCAS regarded the Linear Green Address. He explained that the VCAS identified specific standards for what the urban design of certain streets would be in Villebois.
 - No changes were proposed for the Barber Street Address, which applied to the Sevilles, because it was previously changed to allow for detached row houses. However, the Linear Green Address, which applied to the Carvalho projects along SW Villebois Dr, needed to be changed to allow for the detached row houses and be appropriately referenced to avoid any conflicts in the language.
- He displayed the previously approved Site Plan (Sheet C-4) for the Carvalho Row Houses, noting that one French-style building, consisting of three units, had already been constructed at the corner of SW Toulouse St and SW Villebois Dr. The additional five buildings, consisting of six units each with three units stacked on top of each other, would result in a total of 33 condominium units. An elevation of the proposed six-unit buildings was displayed (Sheet A.2)
 - The requested subdivision re-plat would create individual lots for each of the detached row houses located on both sides of SW Villebois Dr between SW Zurich St and SW Toulouse St, as well opposite the single three-unit structure built between SW Toulouse St and SW Barber St.

- Aerial perspectives showing the conceptual architecture of the future development sites were displayed. The Carvalho buildings on either side of SW Villebois Dr between SW Toulouse St and SW Zurich St consisted of one type of design, but the Applicant could explain why a different type of architecture was proposed for the Carvalho buildings to the north. He reiterated that much of that detail would be addressed in a future application.
- Parking standards had been met, as the Development Code required only one parking space per single-family unit and the units had two-car garages in addition to on-street parking.
- No issues existed in terms of tree removal. As previously requested, a few trees were requested for removal and one important tree would be preserved.
- He provided a brief overview of the language revisions made to the VCAS to allow row houses in the Linear Green Address.
 - Under 2.1 Building Types, the VCAS required multi-family dwellings, so “*or Row Houses - Village Center. Row Houses may be attached or detached.*” would be added. (Slide 22) The Development Code already stated that row houses in the Village Center could be attached or detached.
 - Rules of Adjacency were considered in a lot of neighborhoods, meaning that two like homes should not be next to each other or across the street. This was different in the Village Center, as opposed to other similar detached row house-type products in Villebois. The existing language, which continued to be recommended, discussed having units of the same architecture grouped together. Specifically, between SW Zurich St and SW Toulouse St, having bookends of the same architecture on either side of SW Villebois Dr would maintain a consistent look in that urban room. Keeping the roof forms consistent at each level would help create a look of being a single urban mass, even though the units were detached.
 - Language to include multi-family buildings was added in several places to differentiate the requirements between detached row houses and multi-family buildings.
 - A letter was received from some neighbors, which was distributed to the Board (Exhibit E1), and the Board also had questions regarding proposed changes to the requirement to have a fence between the yard and street. (Slide 25)
 - He explained that the Architectural Pattern Books, which applied to neighborhoods outside the Village Center, stated courtyards were optional on single-family homes, but in recent applications a certain percentage of some subdivisions were required to have courtyards.
 - The purpose of a courtyard was to create a semi-private space; a transition between the private space in the home and the public space on the street, much like a front porch.
 - In the proposed configuration, where the homes were set fairly close to the street with full front porches, the semi-private space was already provided on the American Modern designs. A courtyard fence would not make sense and might not work well in instances where a porch or semi-private space was already provided.
 - French Revival and English Revival homes, as well as some American Modern Craftsman style homes, tended to have only a stoop or small porch to one side, so courtyard would play a key role in creating a semi-private space.
 - He deferred to the Applicant to discuss why the fence might not be desirable in every instance of the Linear Green address as they were considering the architecture.
- No changes would be made to the VCAS for the Sevilles Row Houses. The Tentative Subdivision Re-Plat was requested to allow the right number of lots, similar to what had been done across SW Ravenna Lp, immediately adjacent to the development. The architecture would certainly be different than other recently built detached row houses, but in terms of platting, the idea was the same.
- The Seville development provided the appropriate amount of required parking and no tree issues existed.
- He entered the following exhibits into the record:
 - Exhibit E1: Letter dated August 31, 2014 received from Ron and Dona Larson and subsequent responses by and correspondence with Blaise Edmonds.

- Amended Exhibit A3: Memorandum from Blaise Edmonds dated September 8, 2014 that proposed clarifying changes to the Staff report with regard to fencing.

Lenka Keith asked if the roof consistency mostly regarded the pitch of the roof.

Mr. Pauly replied yes, adding that it also involved having the horizontal lines consistent across the façade. The bookend units could come down a little, but the horizontal lines on each level needed to be consistent along the street frontage.

Kristin Akervall noted Page 4 of the Staff report summary discussed waving the requirement for a traffic impact study. She understood the total number of units was decreasing from what was originally planned, but she was curious when the last study was done.

Steve Adams, Development Engineering Manager, responded the last full study was done by Polygon Northwest when they came in with their Grande Pointe subdivision last year. At that time, Staff had them relook at everything that was going on to-date to determine whether traffic was increasing or decreasing.

Simon Springall understood no important trees were proposed for removal, but the plans identified that one small important Oregon White Oak was slated for removal, Tree 469.

Mr. Pauly clarified Tree 469 was previously approved for removal and no changes were requested to what was approved with the previous project. He added the lots were pretty much all used up besides a small side yard and the alley.

Mr. Springall noted the original arborist report from 2006 was being reused in the application. He asked if it was appropriate to reuse an old arborist report or was it just being reused because a re-plat was being done.

Mr. Pauly replied that was an excellent question, noting that often times it was not appropriate. However, he believed it was appropriate in this case because no development alternative existed for going around the trees in question and the tree was proposed for removal in 2006, it would be removed whether it was in good or poor health. If the situation involved moving buildings around to save a tree, an updated arborist report would certainly be desired to ensure no conditions had changed with adjacent construction over the past five or six years.

Mr. Springall asked why the tree was slated for removal because it was marked as important and the original arborist report marked it as retained.

Mr. Pauly responded that he saw the trees were all X'ed out, but noted he had only started looking at the plans today. He offered to research the matter further during the Applicant's presentation to better understand the full history behind the trees and provide a better answer. He imagined the Applicant might also have more information and be able to provide further clarification about the trees. He appreciated discussion about any issues involving important White Oaks, which have been discussed a lot recently.

Mr. Springall confirmed the conceptual elevations were not really part of the application the Board was considering tonight, but he believed it was worth pointing out that repetition existed in the conceptual elevations provided and that the set was not complete.

Mr. Pauly clarified that the Board was not approving any of that at this point, even on a conceptual level. The elevations were provided to make the DRB aware of what the Applicant was working on and help the

Board visualize the changes from one product type to another and the different look of the urban linear park compared to what was previously approved.

Mr. Springall noted the SW Barber St drawings were mislabeled with “Villebois St” and all of the SW Villebois Dr drawings were mislabeled with “Villebois St” as well.

Mr. Pauly agreed the drawings were certainly not perfect, noting he also found some inaccuracies. In some of the materials, some units south of SW Barber St on SW Villebois Dr were actually labeled as SW Barber St units, but they were actually the SW Villebois Dr north units. The units on the northern part of SW Villebois Dr and those along SW Barber St were more of an American Modern-type design, and he understood the Applicant was trying to transition architecturally from a prominent flat roof multi-use building to more of a gabled roof product.

- He noted that he did not see the Seviles Row Homes included in the packet. He was not sure if the Applicant had that information with them tonight, but noted the architecture would be considered in a future application.

Mr. Springall noted that with the new development happening along SW Barber St, he found it interesting that a pretty big variety in roof lines existed, even within a single block. He believed the variety was partly due to the change in builder halfway through one of the blocks.

Mr. Pauly agreed, adding he was sure if there was only a single builder, there would be more consistency. He noted that when the DRB approved that application, they had to balance a number of different things to make that project happen and create something. He knew a significant amount of change was made to the product before it was actually built.

Mr. Springall believed making everything have a consistent look on SW Barber St was a bit of a challenge.

Mr. Pauly responded something the Applicant was aware of and working on, in terms of the architecture, was having a transition from the flat-roof structure to the other row houses, and then also transitioning to the single-family and other row houses. He believed a robust discussion would take place once the Applicant provided the final architectural drawings for the row houses.

Ms. Keith asked for the definition of a row house, adding she was a bit puzzled by “detached row house”, as she had the impression that row houses were typically attached.

Mr. Pauly clarified row houses were simply houses in a row. He noted a prior Polygon application, he believed in Phase 2 North, proposed the exact same type of product that was called a detached row house in the Village Center, but a small cottage across the street. While these were not the typical row houses found in urban areas, they were different from single-family homes in terms of spacing. With 5-ft to 7-ft spacing between them, together the row houses created an urban form and looked like one unit even though they were detached. Examples of such could be seen in Washington DC and San Francisco. On the other hand, he noted some of this was about working with the language that had been in the Code from the beginning and adapting it as products changed over time, so the nomenclature was probably not perfect.

Ms. Akervall noted PFA6, PFA10 and PFA14 in the Engineering Division Standard comments stated “as built plans indicate eight water services” and “eight storm service laterals”, but only seven lots were shown. She asked for clarification regarding the difference in numbers.

Mr. Pauly explained that eight lots were previously platted, so when SW Barber St was constructed and all the utilities were installed, service lines were run for eight lots. The lots were now being re-platted into seven lots and one of the service lines would not be used, so it needed to be capped, decommissioned or filled depending on the type of line it was. He noted this had been done essentially for all the other detached row houses built in the Village Center. The City just wanted to ensure that no underground pipes that lead to nowhere existed.

Ms. Akervall inquired the utilities lined up with the new re-platted lot lines.

Mr. Pauly explained that little triangular easements were created on the edge of previous row homes to service the adjacent lot, but had worked.

Mr. Adams explained City Code required a straight connection from the main line to the edge of right-of-way. From the right-of-way to the house, the service line could go in different directions, split, etc. because it was considered a private line at that point and would be the private homeowner's or contractor's responsibility. Once the line left the right-of-way, it would no longer be the City's responsibility.

Ms. Akervall asked if this had worked and been successful elsewhere in Wilsonville.

Mr. Adams replied he could not provide a second example outside of Villebois.

Chair Fierros Bower asked if a fence was proposed for the yard between the row houses.

Mr. Pauly replied Staff had not gotten into the fencing yet at this level, but in other cases throughout Villebois, there was typically no fence; instead, the row houses had an active side yard and an inactive side that was the neighbors' active side yard. The maintenance and use of the side yards were governed by the Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC&Rs) and the easement.

Chair Fierros Bower called for the Applicant's presentation.

Rudy Kadlub, President, Costa Pacific Homes, 11422 SW Barber St, Wilsonville, OR, 97070, stated he was also the Master Planner for Villebois. He provided some background regarding the proposed application with the following key comments:

- In 2002, when Villebois was first conceived, the idea was to center the density around the Piazza and the Village Center so the maximum number of people could walk to the services to be built in the community. The market was strong; it was exciting at that time and it seemed like one could build anything and do no wrong.
- Costa Pacific Homes began building the first Carvalho Condominium, the three-unit condo Mr. Pauly mentioned earlier, in addition to the first group of luxury row homes on SW Barber St and the 8-unit building located right around the corner on SW Barber St. The homes, which were luxurious and extremely expensive, were first introduced in the spring of 2009 because he was certain the recession would have passed by then. Unfortunately, it did not and the row homes, though all owned and occupied now, did very poorly in the marketplace. Today, those row homes continue to lag; costs have increased and the building codes created for Villebois made building attached homes in the suburbs extremely difficult compared to detached homes. In the urban areas, where rents were three times the amount of the suburbs and condominium sales prices were three or four times that of the suburbs, one could afford to build multi-family, attached, for sale products with structured parking, etc.
- Costa Pacific had been playing and continued to play catchup with costs and pricing since 2006. Rather than continue to wait and hope that the market and cost structure would reach a point where

the Villebois vision could be satisfied perfectly, Costa Pacific instead were considering working within the vision with a product that could be successful in the marketplace, while still providing the approximate density originally desired.

- The building originally proposed directly across the street from the existing Sevilles Row House eight-unit building was to have the same mirrored look; however, that building was not financeable. Costa Pacific had been trying to do the project for the last five to six years, but it just has not happened. The result was to determine what could be built there that would also be market acceptable; so, the eight-unit Seville Row Home building would now become a seven-unit row of detached row homes that could be financed individually and would actually cost less per square foot to build than an attached home, while also providing the same feeling of a row product.
- The existing Sevilles row homes were consistent in architecture and color. The same notion of design would take place across the street in that the homes would be consistent in design, roof forms and massing, but they would take on more of an urban feel. While the architecture would be seen in the future, the homes were more of an urban loft product, as opposed to detached row homes. Preliminarily, he had seen some really exciting forms of the urban lofts and that architecture would be repeated on the four lots around the corner on SW Villebois Dr, so there would be eleven (11) urban lofts total.
 - The lofts were three stories high, so the massing worked a bit better. The lofts on the north side of SW Barber St were adjacent to the three-over-one domain in Villebois, the four-story building. The proposed row homes were a half story taller than the original row homes across the street, so the transition was a bit better to the larger building and the row homes would have a really nice presence on the street.
 - Likewise, the four row houses around the corner would be adjacent to a four-story building that would front on SW Barber St, which was another mixed use building.
- The Carvalho Condominiums had extremely expensive construction costs that rivaled the cost of building a condo in downtown Portland, so that building was impractical for this location. Condos could be built there that would work in the market, but they would not look very nice, due to the corners that would have to be cut, and the building would not feel right for Villebois.
- Therefore, Costa Pacific developed another concept, called an officer row product, which could be seen in Vancouver, WA. Fronting on the Linear Green, these row houses would have American Modern architecture and be spaced close together with similar styles and forms, though not exactly the same. The buildings would be three-stories with second story balconies and first floor porches with all-rear entries off the alley.
- He confirmed they were going from 38 homes to 25 homes in the area, but noted the amount of square footage would probably be comparable to the condominiums, which were smaller in size.

Stacey Connery, Pacific Community Design, 12564 SW Main St, Tigard, OR, 97223, responded to questions posed earlier by the Board. She indicated that Trees 468 and 469 were located at the very end of an alley. The trees were previously identified for removal as part of the PDP application, but would not actually be removed until the surrounding development occurred. Because of the location of the alley way, removing the trees was still necessary to provide backup space for the garage of the closest Row House.

- In addition, a mixed-use building was proposed nearby. Although the site planning was still being worked through, she believed it was possible that the building's access could connect to the alley at the rear side of the building, so the trees would be impacted either by the alley and driveway of the row homes or the future mixed-use building's site planning.

Mr. Pauly asked if Ms. Connery had any idea about the current condition of Tree 469, noting the young tree had had a lot happen around it.

Ms. Connery replied she did not, but stated they could have the arborist go back and look at it.

Mr. Springall noted a lot of growth had occurred there.

Mr. Pauly stated the tree was listed as two inches in the arborist report.

Mr. Springall added the arborist report was done eight years previously.

Mr. Pauly responded that White Oaks did not grow that fast.

Ms. Akervall asked if the condominiums, the one already built and those now proposed as detached row homes, included single-level living units. She asked if an elevator would be provided in the building or would people with third floor units need to walk up three flights of stairs to reach their unit.

Mr. Kadlub replied the proposed condominiums and the one that had already been built were comprised of single-level homes on the ground floor with two-story townhomes stacked on top. All tenants would enter their units from the ground floor, but the second story townhome tenants would have to walk up the stairs since the building did not have elevators.

Ms. Akervall noted the ground unit that was a single-floor living situation was being lost. She asked if the Applicant had considered opportunities for an easier floor plan for people with mobility issues in Villebois.

Mr. Kadlub replied getting single-level plans was difficult when trying to get density, too. The only way to do so was by stacking single-level product, which then made it a condominium, driving up the cost of construction.

- Having said that, he noted Costa Pacific was still actively pursuing single-level living in the mixed-use buildings surrounding the Piazza. Next month, the DRB would see an application for the Trafalgar development on SW Barber St to the northwest, which would consist of three-story stacked homes with subterranean parking and elevators that would provide single-level living.
- He understood single-level living was very desirable for the Kennedy and Eisenhower generations, but it was pretty difficult to achieve the required density numbers. He believed there were only a handful of single-level plans in all of Villebois and he agreed the two did not marry up very well.

Ms. Akervall replied single-level living was important to continue to have a diverse group of people in the community.

Mr. Kadlub concurred, adding that Costa Pacific was working diligently to that.

Chair Fierros Bower confirmed the three-story row houses were single-family homes with a lot of open volume inside given the loft design.

Ms. Keith noted a patio on the floor plans adjacent to a kitchen and suggested shortening the patio so the space could be used as a pantry for the kitchen. The homes were large and no pantry was proposed.

Mr. Springall asked about the idea behind having only a large bonus room on the third floor and no living space or bedrooms.

Mr. Kadlub replied that would be an appropriate question for the architect. He added the building would be sold to a builder who had hired a prominent architect in the region. He believed the question was more appropriate for the FDP application than tonight's hearing because the architect might not have the answers to all of the questions at this point. He noted the DRB had conceptual designs that were not refined yet.

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

Ron Larson, 29101 SW Villebois Dr S, Wilsonville, OR, 97070, stated he and his wife lived directly across SW Zurich St from the subject property. He appreciated everyone's involvement with the development, as he and his wife had watched the development sit there for five years and they understood the pain. He noted they also understood the condominium issue, adding they had considered purchasing the lower floor condominium at 29010 SW Villebois Dr.

- Their key point regarded changing the fence requirement from "shall" to "may". After listening to some of the discussion and knowing a bit more about what was happening, they recommended that particular item be postponed or tabled until the FDP, so they could actually see what was going on. He believed how that was treated with the landscaping was extremely important because the fencing was required to be 25 percent opaque and vertical, which matched a lot of other homes on SW Villebois Dr.
- He displayed a photo indicating a metal fence and landscaping at the Renaissance Court Apartments, which were two-story apartments that he believed were architecturally designed well to fit in with the other homes, which were basically townhomes, on the other side of SW Villebois Dr.
 - He displayed another photo showing the view looking across the water treatment swale or facility, and noted a sidewalk between the vertical masonry and steel elements, as well as the sidewalk by the water quality swale and to the left hand side of the photo.
- He explained he was trying to show the Board the flavor of what it was like to live on SW Villebois Dr. Displaying a picture of his home, he noted he and his wife had lived there for five years and when the farmer's market was at the Piazza on Sunday mornings, they would sit on their front porch and could visit with the neighbors walking by, which was exactly what the urban core was all about. He believed the railing on the homes showing in the conceptual drawings would probably accomplish that same thing.
- He pointed out there was a little bit of a return and that element could be seen pulling down the side. He believed the interior patio on the end unit was really important in terms of how it would be treated, whether it would have a private space open to a view and if there would be landscaping along it. Unfortunately, the PowerPoint only showed a wall of wood, which was what he and his wife would be looking at from their dining room window, which was on the other side of the tree in the photo.
- While they wanted to see the development go forward, many unknowns existed about why fencing was being deleted and what would be done instead of a fence. Rather than stating fencing was optional carte blanche, they recommended having a more specific plan for considering the vertical elements of the railings on the front porch, which he believed they could support at the FDP. Making that change now without knowing what the change would be and simply stating fencing was optional was incorrect planning.

Dona Larson, 29101 SW Villebois Dr S, Wilsonville, OR, 97070, said she understood the situation the developer was in. She and her husband purchased their home in 2009 and it was no longer worth what they paid for it, so they were concerned about what would be built across the street. While they very much supported single-family detached row homes, they wanted them to be nice. Tenants would be able to look out and see the landscaping and railing that she and her husband paid for and maintained. She wanted to be able to look out her window and see the same thing, not just the big blank wall that was currently proposed. She noted that the front of the buildings was being discussed, but the side was what they were concerned about.

Mr. Larson explained that just like the Renaissance Court Apartments did a really nice job on their exterior and landscaping, together with the railing, to blend in a two-story blank wall, he believed that same thing could be done on the Carvalho Row Homes.

Chair Fierros Bower called for the Applicant's rebuttal.

Mr. Kadlub stated the buildings would be designed in such a way to have an active and passive side. As Mr. Pauly stated, the space between the buildings was shared, so no fence would go down the middle of the property line. All of the space on the active side of the building would be used for the active owner. The passive side, which would not be a blank wall, but the one with less windows or windows that looked into the active space of the neighbor next door, worked its way all of the way down, but there would be a point in the middle where it would flip over. There were always two passive to passive sides and always an active side at the end of the street. The side of the building that would face the Larson's home would be an active side with fenestration, doors and strong architecture.

- As far as fencing was concerned, the Applicant said "may" because they were uncertain how the architecture would work itself out; whether some of it might be attached at the front, so they did not want to be saddled with the notion that a fence was a requirement. He was having a hard time conceiving what the fencing looked like for the urban loft product, so that would still need to be designed as it went forward.
- The fencing for the American Modern part was fairly straightforward and easy to do. He knew the builder would want to create privacy for the homeowners that lived there, so it was highly likely that fencing would be included. He noted the Applicant said "may" just to provide some flexibility on design, but he would not fall on their sword over that if that was the case. He would be happy if the DRB wanted the language to state "may be required by the DRB at the FDP application".

Mark Stewart, Mark Stewart Home Design, 22582 SW Main St, Design Ste 309, Sherwood, OR, 97140, agreed that Mr. Larson's had great points, and noted the Applicant had not been addressed what the neighbors would see yet, but it was extremely important; if it was just left with nothing it would not work and that was not the intention.

Mr. Larson indicated his agreed with Mr. Stewart from the audience.

Mr. Springall noted the response memorandum from Staff talked largely about the American Modern architecture and whether or not fences were needed, which might not really be the issue. He asked whether the issue might be the loft design, which was not addressed in Staff's memorandum.

Mr. Pauly responded the design was American Modern; it was just a different style of American Modern.

Mr. Kadlub confirmed the loft design was American Modern, as Contemporary and Craftsman architecture both fell under the American Modern style.

Mr. Stewart believed the final solution should include some fencing, but it had not been done yet. He added it would be nice to be able to do the best they possibly could for the neighborhood without being saddled with a specific fence.

Mr. Pauly noted required fencing had been made optional on other applications where Staff worked with the Applicant. The DRB retained the right to require fencing in certain locations if the Board believed it was needed somewhere where it was not proposed during the FDP, so the Board could certainly make that clear if it wanted.

Mr. Springall asked if Exhibit A3 still stood.

Barbara Jacobson, Assistant City Attorney, clarified the DRB could just state in lieu of Exhibit A3, the Board wanted to defer the decision until the next hearing.

Mr. Pauly noted the language needed to be included in the VCAS, which was reviewed at a higher level than the FDP. The DRB could require fencing at certain locations, but that had to be determined tonight because they needed to identify the language to include in the Standards, which needed to be adopted tonight at the SAP/PDP level.

Ms. Akervall appreciated that the Applicant was trying to maintain a high level of quality in the neighborhood, which was something everyone strongly agreed on. She thanked the Applicant for maintaining a quality of all of the different products, units and homes that were built.

Mr. Springall said it was good to be moving forward with building up the density in the Village Center, as that seemed to be critical to many things including retail and everything else going on in Villebois. He believed it was important for the community to have a largely built out center and he was happy the proposal was going ahead as well.

Mr. Kadlub stated it was the first time since 2006 that Costa Pacific's phone was actually ringing from retailers and people who want to pursue an opportunity to be in the Village Center, which was exciting.

Ms. Keith echoed Ms. Akervall's comment about quality, adding she also appreciated the layout of the units. She understood this proposal was very preliminary, but for the most part the size of the rooms was very functional. She was surprised by how much functional space could be put on a very small lot.

Mr. Stewart noted pantries would be worked into the design and added the builder would not have it any other way.

Mr. Pauly stated that retaining Finding 2 as originally written in Amended Exhibit A3 would be best. He read the proposed language for New Condition PDE 2 as follows, "While the VCAS language is being changed to "may" rather than "shall" in relation to front yard fencing for the Linear Green Address, the DRB may still require fencing at certain locations during FDP review."

Mr. Stewart replied the Applicant would provide a very complete view of where they were suggesting fences to be located, such as in 3D drawings, so the intention would be very obvious.

Mr. Kadlub said he accepted Staff's proposed language.

Chair Fierros Bower closed the public hearing at 7:49 pm.

Simon Springall moved to accept the amended Staff report, deleting Amended Exhibit A3, and adding Exhibit E1 and new Condition PDE2 as follows: *"While the VCAS language is being changed to "may" rather than "shall" in relation to front yard fencing for the Linear Green Address, the DRB may still require fencing at certain locations during Final Development Plan (FDP) review."* **Lenka Keith** seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Simon Springall moved to approve Resolution No. 290. The motion was seconded by **Kirstin Akervall** and passed unanimously.

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

VIII. Board Member Communications

A. Results of the August 25, 2014 DRB Panel B meeting

Daniel Pauly, Associate Planner, summarized the application approved at the DRB Panel B meeting for the former Kraven's building in Town Center. The building would be divided into two tenant spaces and

completely updated architecturally. While not part of the Board's review, the Applicant was resurfacing the parking lot.

IX. Staff Communications

There were none.

X. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:54 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

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