

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

Approved
Sept. 8, 2014

**Development Review Board – Panel A
Minutes–July 14, 2014 6:30 PM**

I. Call to Order

Vice Chair **Ken Ruud** 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: Lenka Keith, Ken Ruud, Cheryl Dorman (Panel B), and Councilor Liaison Julie Fitzgerald. Mary Fierros Bower, Simon Springall, Kristin Akervall were absent.

Staff present: Blaise Edmonds, Barbara Jacobson 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

Councilor Fitzgerald reported on the following City Council meetings with these comments:

- On July 7, 2014, City Council:
 - Heard a presentation from the Willamette Water Supply Council. Tualatin Valley Water District (TVWD) representatives provided an update on the expansion plans for the water line planned to go from Wilsonville to Tualatin that would serve a number of different cities.
 - A focus group was recently conducted to gauge public understanding and opinion of the idea of extending the water line per long ago agreements. The main takeaway she found interesting was that while not everyone in the focus group was fully aware of the water line, they had a really good understanding of the water system in Wilsonville. The focus group provided the Communications Committee for this effort with a good baseline on the level of further outreach that needed to be done and she believed a lot more outreach was needed to get more people informed.
 - More information would be seen in the paper and she encouraged the DRB to steer people to any articles they saw and to the City’s website to stay informed.
- Reviewed the Charbonneau Consolidated Improvement Plan. The entire water/sewer system in the Charbonneau area, one of the City’s oldest systems, was being videotaped. Streets and sidewalks were also reviewed to ascertain the costs the City would need to undertake in the next 20 years to address aging infrastructure in Charbonneau. Staff had prepared a report about the number of projects needed to address the issue, which was substantial.
 - The second part of Staff’s report would be presented next week and considered ways to prioritize the infrastructure improvements. Nearly three decades had passed since everything was installed and different building standards and materials were used now. Many improvements needed to be made and the prioritization would group the improvements together wherever possible. The Charbonneau improvements would be spread out over the next 20 years, as not all of it had to be done immediately.
 - Council would also consider how Wilsonville’s water rate structure was currently set up in an effort to address the costs and determine whether other changes needed to be made.

- Identified four or five priorities from the 2015 legislative priorities of the League of Oregon Cities for Staff to keep an eye on.
- Received an update on the Basalt Creek Concept Plan. A joint meeting with the Tualatin and Wilsonville City Councils was scheduled for July 16, 2014.
 - Mayor Knapp went to the last meeting and had noted more Tualatin citizens participated in the meeting than Wilsonville citizens. This could be because the project seemed to be farther away from Wilsonville, but the project was probably closer than many realized, so she asked for the DRB's help in sharing awareness about the project.
- Heard a great presentation on current economic developments and activity in Wilsonville. If the DRB was interested, perhaps Staff could arrange a presentation for the DRB as well.
- On June 16, 2014, City Council reviewed the Wilsonville Calais Subdivision with the Sequoia tree. A considerable amount of time was spent trying to see if there was a way the tree could be saved and incorporated into the development. A proposal was made, but in the end the Council voted against incorporating the tree and agreed with the DRB-A's decision.
 - Although a different matter, an effort would be made to replace the downed oak located on the corner that died of its own accord with another oak tree, which was not Council's decision to make.

VI. Consent Agenda:

- A. Approval of minutes of May 12, 2014 DRB Panel A meeting
- B. Approval of minutes of June 9, 2014 DRB Panel A meeting

Approval of the minutes was postponed to the August DRB Panel A meeting due to the lack of a voting quorum.

VII. Public Hearing:

- A. Resolution No. 286. Wilsonville Greens Townhomes: West Coast Real Estate Holdings, LLC- applicant.** The applicant is requesting approval of Stage I Preliminary Plan, Stage II Final Plan, Site Design Review and a Monument Sign to enable development of twelve (12) townhomes. The subject .79 acre property is located on Tax Lots 1500 of Section 23B, T3S, R1W, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Blaise Edmonds

Case Files: DB14-0027 – Stage I Preliminary Plan
 DB14-0028 – Stage II Final Plan
 DB14-0029 – Site Design Review
 DB14-0030 – Monument Sign

Vice Chair Ruud called the public hearing to order at 6:40 p.m. and read the conduct of hearing format into the record. All Board members declared for the record that they had visited the site. No board member, however, declared a conflict of interest, bias, or conclusion from a site visit. No board member participation was challenged by any member of the audience.

Blaise Edmonds, Manager of Current Planning, announced that the criteria applicable to the application were stated on pages 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.

Mr. Edmonds entered the following exhibits into the record:

- Exhibit A4: Memorandum from Blaise Edmonds dated July 14, 2014 proposing a change to Condition PDB4 and noting corrections to the Staff report.
- Exhibit A5: Memorandum from Nancy Kraushaar dated July 14, 2014 providing clarification on the spacing of the site's driveway access and the site distance along Wilsonville Road.

Mr. Edmonds presented the Staff report via PowerPoint, noting the site's location, surrounding features, and residential densities, as well as future road improvements in the Transportation System Plan (TSP) with these key additional comments:

- No offsite improvements were required of the Applicant, except to close one of two driveways on Wilsonville Rd, retaining the one at the northeast corner, and reducing the size of the planting median on Wilsonville Rd to allow for full turning movements at that retained driveway.
- He reviewed the Planting Plan (Sheet A02), which was color coded for clarity, noting the following:
 - A beautiful large Flowering Cherry tree with burls that was located off the driveway accessing Wilsonville Rd would be protected in an island.
 - Parking would be provided on the west side of the north/south private drive and in the alley to the two-story units' garages.
 - All of the units in the development were two-story, three bedroom units and each unit would have patios for additional recreation space.
 - Pervious pavers were located in the drives of the units to help offset the stormwater runoff designed for the project, including the pathway that extended north and south.
 - The yellow lines showed all pedestrian connectivity, including a connection to the bike/pedestrian trail to the west. A lot of consideration had been put into pedestrian connectivity of the site and to the surrounding properties.
 - Areas in green were open space with grass or sod and trees, and a storm detention pond was located at the north end of the .79-acre site.
- One issue raised by the City Engineer was that the adjacent Timber Creek Village apartments had an architectural wall covered in ivy that would need to be lowered to about 2 ft high to improve the vision clearance. With the posted speed limit along that street, the vision clearance extended clear over through the wall. The adjacent property owner had verbally indicated by email that they were agreeable to reducing the height of the wall or removing it. He noted a parking lot was located on the other side of the wall.
- Almost 38 percent of the site was an open space or landscaped area and Code required at least 25 percent, so the Applicant exceeded the requirement for an outdoor living area.
- The Applicant was not requesting any waivers to setbacks, honoring the 20-ft setback at the rear and front yards and 10 ft at the sides.
- The Applicant provided adequate parking for the future residents. The Code would require 21 spaces for the project and the Applicant was proposing 36 parking spaces; 24 of which would be surface parking in front and on the sides of the units and 12 parking garage spaces.
 - More testimony would be heard from the Applicant about whether the project would be for rent or lease, but he believed the Applicant had grander plans for eventually making the units condominium units where people would actually purchase into the property.
- As requested, the Applicant proposed installing a landscaping strip with a hedge and fence along the east side of the property, so the parking lot did not go right up to the edge of the adjacent property.
- The trash enclosure, which was reviewed by Republic Services, would have to be relocated at some future date because an engineering condition of approval required that when Brown Rd was built to the south, the property would take access to Brown Rd and the main driveway would be closed off to improve driveway safety and separation along the minor arterial street, which was Wilsonville Rd.
- The architecture of the two-story multi-family apartment units was more of an American style. Due to some grade differences on the site, a bit of an elevation change might possibly be seen as the different units were stepped up as they followed the grade.
- The trash enclosure area would match the brick line and the architecture of the buildings.
- He circulated the color materials board, which was also displayed via PowerPoint.
- The exterior lighting was mostly wall mounted lighting and met the Development Code's Dark Sky Lighting Ordinance and the lighting would not project beyond the property lines.

- One monument sign would be located at the entrance. A condition of approval required the sign's final location had to be reviewed by the city engineer to ensure it would not obstruct the vision clearance.
- City Council asked Staff to investigate the inconsistencies in density between the Zoning Code and Comprehensive Plan allowances, so a consultant had been hired to review them. For example, the Zoning Code would allow up to 13 units on the subject property, whereas the Comprehensive Plan would allow up to 9 units.
 - He recommended approval of the 12 units under the Zoning Code, as the Applicant provided more than adequate green space, outdoor living area and parking, and did not request any waivers to any Development Standards. Although the density under the Zoning Code was a bit higher than that in the Comprehensive Plan, it seemed that the Applicant really took a lot into consideration in providing light, air and space for the livability of the residents ~~for approval of the 12 units.~~

Lenka Keith asked how the property to the east was currently zoned and how it was zoned under the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Edmonds displayed Slide 2, noting the adjacent property was Residential (R) zoned, which was odd. He believed it would be Planned Development Residential (PDR) zoned, but it was the same 10 to 12 units per acre. He believed the adjacent property is owned by Joe Bernert Towing Company, who also operated Wilsonville Sand and Gravel. He noted he had been with the City for a long time and had never seen a for sale sign on the property, adding that any long-term interests for the property had never been shared with him, but a filbert orchard surrounded the subject property. He would caution renters that farming practices, such as spraying, were still being practiced in the filbert orchard.

- He had recently received complaints from Wilsonville residents about the farming operations of the filbert orchards in town, which was managed by the Oregon Department of Agriculture, not the City. Conflict always existed when infill developments were built next to farming operations, but that was part of living and farming in the city.

Cheryl Dorman noted she had not seen a timeframe for the Applicant to comply with closing the main driveway when future development occurred around the Brown Road Extension, adding perhaps it did not matter since that was so far in the future.

Mr. Edmonds did not believe a timeframe existed, but asked City Engineer Steve Adams to provide an explanation regarding that matter.

Steve Adams, Deputy City Engineer, confirmed that no timeframe existed. He had talked in casual conversation to Joe Bernert who said he would never sell the property. What might happen in the future was uncertain, as there could be a right buyer at the right time, but if the property eventually sold, the City wanted to have the subject property's driveway taken either from the property to the south or the east. Development of the adjacent property would trigger the change to the Applicant's driveway.

Ms. Dorman asked if the Applicant would have to be in compliance within a certain timeframe, if the property sold and future development occurred.

Mr. Adams replied it would be concurrent with the development, adding as soon as the adjacent development had a public road leading into it, the subject Applicant would need to have access to it. Staff would condition that any adjacent development must extend a public access to the subject site from the south or east, and the adjacent developers could not develop without complying with that condition. Once the public access was built, the internal changes would need to be done by the subject property owner and the connection would be made.

Ms. Dorman confirmed that changes to the ivy wall had to be done with the subject project as well.

Mr. Adams explained that drivers had to be able to see 350 ft from the driveway, so somewhere between 60 ft to 80 ft of the wall had to be removed to lower it. Staff had said the wall must be only 2 ft high so drivers could see over the top of the wall. The owner of the Timber Creek Village apartments liked the 2 ft high wall because it still provided the physical separation from the sidewalk to his property and still worked as a safety measure for small children. He confirmed the preferred line of sight would be achieved

Vice Chair Ruud understood 36 parking spots existed in all, with 12 spaces on the side of Unit 1 plus two spaces in the garage of each unit. He asked where parking was located for Unit 1.

Mr. Edmonds responded it looked like they were single car garages. He was unsure where the parking lot was located for Unit 1 and deferred to the Applicant to answer specific questions.

Ms. Keith inquired about the ingress and egress and whether Staff had considered requiring mirrors or something on the opposite side of the road so that when people pulled out of the driveway, they could look at the mirror to see if anything was coming from the west. She noted the spot was pretty tight.

Mr. Adams noted one mirror was installed by Public Works in Charbonneau as a test, and he was not convinced that mirrors were a benefit. He believed directly looking and seeing cars coming was needed instead. With the removal of the wall and the proper installation of landscaping and maintenance of the landscaping, the site distance would be maintained.

- He noted traffic coming from the east was not a problem because the road straightened out and a nice site distance existed for hundreds of feet; the issue was turning right onto Wilsonville Rd. Knowing how traffic flowed in Wilsonville, he expected 90 percent of the traffic would turn left into the site and right out of the site; not a lot of traffic would be crossing to turn left and go out towards Sherwood, although some cars would. He noted that he and Community Development Director Nancy Kraushaar believed the driveway was safe.

Ms. Dorman believed the traffic study seemed very minimal and asked for further comment.

Mr. Adams responded that the City had a policy that if 25 PM peak hour trips were being generated, the traffic study would expand to look at intersection impacts to see what was going on. When developing a site that created less than 25 PM peak hour trips, which was one hour between 4:00 pm and 6:00 pm, it was not considered a major impact to the city's intersections and the traffic study was scaled down.

Ms. Dorman stated the traffic study indicated 11 PM peak hour trips with the 12 townhomes. She asked if that was a ratio or percentage was considered for the 12 townhomes.

Mr. Adams responded the City followed the International Transportation Engineers (ITE) Manual, which assigned a figure for each housing type. For apartments, he believed it was 0.75 PM peak hour trips per unit, while individual homes had 1 PM peak hour trip per unit. He noted that housing styles varied and figures were based on studies.

Vice Chair Ruud asked if townhomes were considered apartments in Wilsonville.

Mr. Adams replied he would review the study to see how the proposed units were classified as, but noted condos had a different rate, adding single-family, detached housing had the highest rate at 1 PM peak hour trip, so an apartment or condo would have less than 1 PM peak hour trips per unit.

Ms. Keith asked if the number of trips per unit was related to the number of bedrooms, as it would seem that larger units would generate more trips than a one- or two-bedroom unit.

Mr. Adams responded that was a good question, adding that to his knowledge he had not seen that distinction in the study. He would have to do a quick review as the latest copy of the ITE Manual was available.

Vice Chair Ruud called for the Applicant's presentation.

Eugene Labunsky, West Coast Real Estate Holdings, 21510 Shannon Ln, West Linn, OR, 97068, stated he was the property owner and doing the development on the site. The plan was basically to clean up the existing site and long-term, the plan was to make the units into condos versus apartments. As mentioned, they had tried to put as much emphasis on landscaping and sufficient parking as possible. He believed that all of the City's requirements had been met, adding that Mr. Edmonds had been a big help in helping provide recommendations to meet the standards. He believed the project was nice and would fit well on the site.

Vice Chair Ruud asked for an explanation regarding the Unit 1 parking configuration.

Mr. Labunsky directed the question to the project's architect.

Bayard Mentrum, Architect, 11860 SE Morrison St, Portland, OR, 97216, stated no driveway existed for Unit 1, as there was not enough room with the front setback, but all of the other units had driveways and plenty of extra parking was located on the east end of the site. The extra parking would be adequate for the number of cars there would be based on the number of units, even with three-bedroom units.

Vice Chair Ruud asked if that reduced the total amount of parking spaces by one or two.

Mr. Mentrum responded Unit 1 had a garage space, but any guests would have to use the end parking instead of parking in front of the garage. He confirmed the resident could park in the garage or in guest parking, but could not park in the driveway.

Ms. Dorman asked if the unit would have an assigned spot.

Mr. Labunsky confirmed a spot could be assigned for the unit and suggested Space 6, as it was located closest to the unit and was not by the handicapped parking.

Ms. Dorman said it looked like the Applicant was requiring that residents be able to park in the garage; that it was not meant solely for storage, so it could be a parking spot.

Mr. Mentrum responded they had planned one parking space in each garage and also at least one bike rack in each garage for long-term bike parking.

Vice Chair Ruud asked about some of the dimensions for the first unit, as he wondered whether the space was adequate for the turning radius for entering the garage.

Mr. Mentrum replied the alley was about 24 ft wide, so one could easily swing into the garage driveway, which was about 20 ft long, with the proper turning radiuses and the curb.

Ms. Dorman said it might be difficult for someone to turn around if they drove down there and should not have.

Mr. Mentrum noted room was available to back out into the extension going west to then head out.

Mr. Labunsky added it almost was like a hammerhead type turnaround, so one could back out either way.

Vice Chair Ruud asked if the garage for Unit 1 was located on the east or west side of the unit.

Mr. Mentrum replied he believed the garage was located on the east side of the unit, so there was room to back out and go forward. He confirmed the garage on Unit 1 was facing south, but was located on the southeast corner of the unit. The garage was about 12 ft wide with about 8 ft for the entry and stairs.

Mr. Labunsky said it should be more than sufficient to do a turnaround either way, backing out or going out into the main driveway.

Mr. Edmonds said he often saw cars in Villebois parked parallel to the garage in alley-loaded lots. The only conflict was that the cars might be parked on the pathway to the common pedestrian way to the west.

Ms. Dorman asked if room existed for parallel parking at the back of Unit 1 instead of head-in parking.

Mr. Labunsky said they could, but a pedestrian walkway connected there, so they a no parking sign would be posted there. He noted plenty of space was available for Unit 1 with the additional parking from the main entrance and in their garage.

Mr. Mentrum noted the pedestrian connection to the main bike path and walkway was important.

Ms. Dorman appreciated the green space that the Applicant had included in the bike and pedestrian considerations.

Mr. Labunsky responded he really wanted to incorporate the green space so the site would not just seem like a big open space with a building by adding as much landscaping as possible and preserving the significant trees on site, including the flowering cherry tree and another tree located near the detention pond. They were adding a significant amount of greenery to the project. He confirmed all the evergreen trees were being retained; in fact, some would be added to match the rest when the driveway was closed off.

Mr. Mentrum noted the evergreens would help as a sound and visibility buffer for the development.

Ms. Dorman said the development was unique compared to what had come before the DRB in recent years and she thanked the Applicant for that.

Mr. Labunsky said they tried to make the development have the Villebois feel but with more parking, as he used to walk the Villebois neighborhood and could not understand where residents parked.

Ms. Dorman agreed that assigning space Space 6 to Unit 1 was a good idea, as everyone else had a designated spot but they did not. She noted that she appreciated her designated spot.

Mr. Labunsky stated that significant parking was available, so Space 6 would become the assigned parking spot for Unit 1. He noted that wrought iron fencing would be added as a guard rail to all the patios facing Wilsonville Rd to make them look more like townhomes. No fencing would be added to units facing the orchard because they did not want to block the view.

Ms. Keith asked if the trees along the north boundary would be tall.

Mr. Labunsky responded the cedar trees were about 8 ft tall and would grow about 1 ft per year.

Mr. Edmonds stated the trees should not obstruct the vision clearance so the Applicant needed to coordinate the tree plantings with Mr. Adams in order to maintain the sight vision of 350 ft.

Mr. Mentrum added some selective pruning was needed because many small trees were clumped together that would have to be opened up so one could see underneath them.

Ms. Keith stated she lived west of the site and was concerned about traffic speeding by the entrance to the site because sometimes people do not pay attention. She believed anything that could be done to improve the visibility, not only for oncoming traffic heading east, but also for people pulling out of the driveway, would be beneficial.

Mr. Labunsky noted that to address that concern, the monument sign would be lit near the entrance and an additional light on a post would be added to the right to signify the access point. He believed making the island smaller would make a big difference for visibility and for traffic entering and exiting the development.

Ms. Keith asked if any devices existed for pulling out of a driveway, similar to a crosswalk with a button that sets off flashing lights as someone crosses the street.

Mr. Labunsky did not believe that could be done in this case because it was an entrance, not a parking garage with a gate and noise to alert pedestrians. There would be quite a bit of visibility to see both ways because the driveway with the parking was 44 ft and taking the wall down 2 ft would also help.

Ms. Keith asked what the width of the site was along Wilsonville Rd.

Mr. Labunsky confirmed with Mr. Mentrum that it was about 230 ft, not including the bike path because that was not part of the subject property.

Ms. Keith replied that made her feel better because if a 50 ft stopping distance was needed, plenty of room was available for stopping if someone pulled out.

Vice Chair Ruud expressed concern about the usability of Parking Space #1 because one could turn in, but with the trash enclosure there, he did not see any option other than backing all of the way out.

Mr. Labunsky replied if the driver backed all of the way out, they should have significant room to make a full turn unless they were driving a very large vehicle because the driveway was 22 ft wide.

Mr. Edmonds confirmed the parking spaces were 18 ft deep, which was the standard size.

Mr. Labunsky stated one could back out and make a full turn without having to back out and turn into the trash enclosure. He confirmed the space looked similar to the length of the car, but in actuality it was quite a bit larger.

Mr. Mentrum stated the site had 7-ft sidewalks with a 2-ft overhang for the bumper of a car, so the sidewalk would clear 5 ft and the driveway was 18 ft with 22-ft to backup. He clarified the hedge and fences were extra.

Ms. Dorman stated the bike/pedestrian lane appeared to be wider near Unit 1. She asked whether that actually was the case or if that was just the way it was colored in. (Slide 3)

Mr. Edmonds believed it overlapped when he colored it in, as it jogged over.

Vice Chair Ruud stated one of his concerns with the design was if a lot of people were all backing out at once and maneuvering around.

Ms. Keith asked if the Applicant had considered putting the trash enclosure just south of Space 6 and screening it somehow.

Mr. Labunsky believed the trash company needed access for turning around, so the location was designed so they could pull in and empty the large trash container, which would go overhead, he believed, and then back out into the alleyway and go forward again. He believed the trash enclosure was placed in the best spot possible in terms of aesthetics, use of the space and accessibility.

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

Linda Engelman, 10457 SW Wilsonville Rd, Wilsonville, OR, 97070, said she was impressed with the project and her only objection to it was the amount of traffic. She lived directly across the street from the proposed development and sometimes it was practically impossible to get out onto Wilsonville Rd from her driveway. Many times she turned right, went up to the school, turned around and came back because she could not turn left onto Wilsonville Rd, and with this many more vehicles, she could not see how it would all work. When the Boeckman Bridge reopened, she had hoped that some of the traffic would be mitigated, but it was not and a tremendous amount of cars still traveled Wilsonville Rd. She noted that she and her siblings owned an acre together and had checked into dividing the property but were told they could not because of the property's zoning. They still had the full acre, which was fine, but she just wondered what made that change.

Vice Chair Ruud asked if her zoning was the exact same as the application's.

Ms. Engelman replied she was not sure what it was now, but she could not remember going through a zone change. She found it interesting that she was told she could not divide her property only to find 12 units were going in directly across the street. She had lived there most of her life and had seen many changes in Wilsonville, but traffic was the worst part of the whole city.

Ms. Dorman said it sounded someone leaving the new complex might have a challenge turning left just as Ms. Engelman did when exiting her property.

Ms. Engelman agreed, adding she had walked across Wilsonville Rd many times to visit relatives and at times it was impossible to look left and see what was coming until you were already out into the road. She understood the west driveway would be closed and she believed that should take care of that issue, but she was still concerned about the traffic.

Buz Wiedemann, 5195 SW Prosperity Park Rd, Tualatin, OR, 97062, said he was also a party to the property directly across the street at 10455 SW Wilsonville Rd. He was not necessarily opposed to the project, but had some concerns. He believed City Staff seemed to be awfully generous regarding the distance between the property's driveway and the Brown Rd intersection. He noted Staff had stated in PFB 29 that the City did not wish to land lock the site, so they waived the requirement for the distance between the egress from Brown Rd. He had always understood that Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue

(TVF&R) required two points of ingress and egress and apparently Staff was not concerned about that in this case as they had not made that a requirement.

- As far as the timing of when Joe Bernert might sometime decide he wanted to extend Brown Rd onto his property, he noted that was pure speculation. He did not believe anyone had any idea that Mr. Bernert would do that anytime in the foreseeable future, so that should not be counted into the planning on this project. If that did indeed happen that was fine, but he did not see any reason to believe that it would.
- He grew up on the property across the street, used the driveway most of his life, and he would not even want to guess how many accidents there had been, under all kinds of circumstances and not necessarily people turning onto the road, but it was not a good stretch of road. He had a lot of personal experience getting on and off of the road there and it was not easy to do when traffic was heavy because it was hard to catch a break. He would not say visibility was awful, but sometimes traffic was just heavy enough that it was hard to do.
- He noted no stormwater plan was in place as of yet from what he could make out from the Staff report, and Staff might want to give that some consideration.
- In terms of parking on site, people do drive pickups and he did not think adequate room was available for turning around a vehicle of any size without it taking a long time.
- He reiterated he was not opposed to the project, but believed some parts of it needed a bit more thought, primarily the traffic situation. He noted the Brown Road Extension would not be pushed through without Joe Bernert's cooperation but it almost looked like that would be a necessity.

Ms. Engelman stated her neighbor across the driveway from her was on his honeymoon this week and could not attend the meeting, but he requested that she speak for him about the traffic and driveway problems there.

Mr. Wiedemann noted a number of driveways and properties were involved, adding that four properties used one driveway and a few more driveways slightly further to the east would be affected in the same way.

Vice Chair Ruud noted PFB 29 had been mentioned and asked Mr. Adams what made Rd a minor arterial and why Wilsonville Rd did not qualify for the next level up because it did tend to be a very well traveled road.

Mr. Adams responded generally the City's Traffic Engineer, DKS & Associates, worked with Staff when updating the City's Transportation System Plan (TSP), which was completed in 2013. DKS did traffic counts on the roads to determine traffic volumes and various traffic counts coincided with the different street designations, whether a local street, collector, minor arterial or major arterial. This part of Wilsonville Rd was a minor arterial, but once east of the railroad tracks, where Kinsman Rd came in, Wilsonville Rd became four lanes and was a major arterial clear down to Town Center Loop E. Major arterials have 20,000 to 25,000 vehicles a day; minor arterials have 15,000 to 22,000 and collectors have 7,000 to 15,000 vehicles a day. The volume on Wilsonville Rd at the project's location did not warrant a major arterial now, but might in the future.

Vice Chair Ruud asked what visible change would be made when it did qualify as a major arterial.

Mr. Adams responded an extra lane would be added on each side of the road, typically a major arterial was a 4-lane street with one center turn lane.

Ms. Dorman understood the island was being shortened and a left turn lane was being added.

Mr. Adams clarified it was being shortened for a left turn out of the site. The left turn already existed; drivers coming from the freeway had a pocket to easily pull over into and turn casually into the site. However, when leaving the site, the island blocked too much of the driveway, so it needed to be shortened to allow a driver to make the left turn out.

Ms. Dorman asked if a center lane would be available, so one could merge right if they wanted.

Mr. Adams answered yes, the island would be shortened enough for a driver to leave, occupy the center lane, look right, look in their rear view mirror, look over their shoulder, and merge when it was clear, similar to what was done in other areas of that center median.

Ms. Dorman commented that would help the Applicant's side of the road, but might not help those on the opposite side of the road.

Mr. Adams agreed, noting those on the opposite side of Wilsonville Rd would have more difficulty maneuvering onto Wilsonville Road because they were directly opposite of the existing driveway that was being demolished at the other end of the island. The island ends at the driveway in front of Ms. Engelman and Mr. Wiedemann's driveway and in front of the east driveway to the subject site, which he knew as the Bradley property. Those across Wilsonville Rd had to cross traffic coming from the freeway, and then merge with traffic headed east.

- He confirmed that Ms. Engelman did come in and asked for development options a few years ago and Staff instructed that they could not subdivide their property and had told the Applicant the same thing, which was why the Applicant's project was on a single lot. He was not allowed to split the property up because of the traffic problems on Wilsonville Rd.
- The Engelman's had an option to connect to private roadways to the north of their property, which would require an agreement with the owners of the Silver Creek Apartments, and some options for that connection existed on the plat map. He was not sure if that had ever been pursued, as it never went forward after Staff explained developing the more dense area was the preferred option from the City's standpoint. In this case, the City's preferred option was that the connection go south or east through the Joe Bernert property. He reiterated Staff had no idea when Mr. Bernert might sell.

Ms. Dorman asked if the development would not hurt or help those on the opposite side of the road.

Mr. Adams responded it would only affect them if someone were to leave the driveway and turn left. The traffic study indicated seven of the 11 PM peak hour trips would wind up in the interchange. The other four might go down and turn onto Kinsman Rd or Boones Ferry Rd, which would not qualify as interchange traffic. The amount of trips that would actually go west of the development was really not considered.

Ms. Keith asked if anyone had measured the actual speeds along this stretch of Wilsonville Rd.

Mr. Adams replied yes, but he did not recall when and he did not have those numbers handy. He confirmed Wilsonville Rd was posted at 35 miles per hour, adding he was not aware of any speeding issues on the road as no one had complained about cars going too fast. The volume of the traffic was there and sometimes when he turned onto Wilsonville Rd the traffic was moving at 10 or 15 miles per hour, but that was because of the amount of traffic. No study had been done on Wilsonville Rd for several years, so he would talk to Nancy Kraushaar to see about doing a one-day study to determine what was happening.

Vice Chair Ruud concurred, adding he was not sure if it was necessarily speed, as it was hard to tell; however, the volume during certain hours was very heavy.

Mr. Adams stated Staff had looked at the volume quite a bit after the interchange improvements that were completed two years ago, adding DKS & Associates was on board and had been looking at all of the signals along Wilsonville Rd trying to maximize their efficiency in the morning hours, getting people to the freeway, which sometimes conflicted with getting people to schools, because they were heading in different directions. In the afternoon, schools got out at 3:00 pm, so at 5:00 pm the key thing was trying to keep the green lights coordinated so as much traffic could head westbound as possible without stopping. Staff had been working with DKS & Associates to tweak and modify the timing for the past two years.

Ms. Dorman said she was empathic to some of the testimony heard, noting it made sense, but based on the traffic study, it did not make sense to go to any great length of studies or testing for 11 trips in the PM peak hour. It was not a great situation, but if the number were more she would be more concerned.

Vice Chair Ruud noted the last study was done in 2013, so the information was still pretty time pertinent.

Mr. Adams agreed, noting that one thing that was different between this property and properties to the north was that this property was zoned differently. Staff had discussed it and no one really knew why it was zoned the way that it was.

Mr. Edmonds added the zoning probably went back to 1980 when the Comprehensive Plan was adopted. The Comprehensive Plan density range, which was originally 8 to 12 du/ac and was now 10 to 12 du/ac, had been consistent since its adoption in 1980 and the zoning basically matched the table in the Zoning Code, which indicated the property was zoned as PDR-5. Historically, he believed the original city planners did not want to concentrate any one type of housing in one part of the city, but instead wanted to spread the housing out and mix the types throughout, and that was probably how this occurred. This site had very tight lot, single-family zoning while elsewhere in the city, like at Wilsonville Meadows, had much larger lots with some multi-family.

Vice Chair Ruud asked if different zoning truly existed between Ms. Engelman's and the Applicant's properties.

Mr. Edmonds responded the density was the same. He believed Ms. Engelman's zoning was still Residential Agricultural - Holding (RA-H), which might be a result of having a septic tank at the time instead of City sewer as urban-type zoning was not placed on a property unless it had City sewer and water. The density was still 10 to 12 units per acre, so the properties had the same type of density.

- He clarified the property could be subdivided, but it was all a question of where access was taken. Staff has had numerous discussions over the years talking about one parcel, as well as combining and master planning all of the properties to save access and infrastructure construction costs. A wide range of discussions had taken place over the years from singular properties to multiple properties and of course, that changed the discussion of what kind of access would exist and how it would be partitioned or subdivided, a wide range of public improvement requirements existed for those kinds of ranges.

Vice Chair Ruud called for the Applicant's rebuttal.

Mr. Labunsky stated he had similar concerns about the property having too much traffic, as he used to live on SW Camelot St exiting from Brown Rd. He noted that with the help of Mr. Adams and Mr. Edmonds, they had gone to great lengths to determine how to minimize the project's impact to Wilsonville Rd and make it aesthetically pleasing with good visibility in and out, which was the biggest concern from the start.

- The Applicant had worked hard to come up with a plan to address the traffic problems. In his opinion, they were improving the traffic situation. Although units were being added, the second driveway was being removed, the existing driveway was being widened, an alleyway was being installed to allow people to turn around, and the wall was being shortened, as well as the island on Wilsonville Rd.

Vice Chair Ruud closed the public hearing at 7:47 pm.

Lenka Keith moved to adopt the Staff report as amended by Exhibits A4 and A5. **Cheryl Dorman** seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Cheryl Dorman moved to adopt Resolution No. 286. The motion was seconded by **Lenka Keith**.

Ms. Dorman stated she was concerned about the traffic, but the Applicant tried to minimize the impact and, while it did not solve the problem across the street, she believed the Applicant had done a good job of mitigating the traffic impact and had done a good job on the project overall.

Vice Chair Ruud agreed; the Applicant had worked well with the City and within the Code, for the most part. He added it was nice to be part of a growing city and sometimes there were pains involved; traffic was definitely one of them.

Ms. Keith believed the plan was very thoughtful and the fact that it provided three parking spaces per unit, which was pretty impressive and she was very happy to see that.

Vice Chair Ruud thanked Mr. Wiedemann and Ms. Engelman for attending tonight's meeting and providing valuable input from residents that lived right across the street.

The motion passed unanimously.

Vice Chair Ruud read the rules of appeal into the record.

VIII. Board Member Communications

A. Results of the June 23, 2014 DRB Panel B Meeting

Mr. Edmonds explained that Resolution No. 279 had been withdrawn by Republic Services because they were not prepared to do Phase 2 because of budget reasons. The Applicant would come back through the process at some unspecified future date, which would require a separate new application. He confirmed they were expected to return at a later time.

IX. Staff Communications

Mr. Edmonds expressed his appreciation for everyone's attendance tonight.

X. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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

DRB Panel A Board Members in Attendance:

Ken Ruud

(Please circle one)

Approve

Deny

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Lenka Keith

(Please circle one)

Approve

Deny

Signature: _____

Date: _____

DRB Panel B Board Member in Attendance:

Cheryl Dorman

(Please circle one)

Approve

Deny

Signature: _____

Date: _____

***Please Note: Signatures of approval from attending DRB members have been obtained and are on file in the Planning Division.**