

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

Approved  
August 11, 2014

**Development Review Board – Panel A  
Minutes–May 12, 2014 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 and Kristin Akervall. Ken Ruud, Simon Springall and Councilor Liaison Julie Fitzgerald were absent.

Staff present: Blaise Edmonds, Chris Neamtzu, Barbara Jacobson, Steve Adams, and Daniel Pauly

**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 liaison report was given due to Councilor Fitzgerald’s absence.

**VI. Consent Agenda:**

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

**Lenka Keith moved to approve the April 14, 2014 DRB Panel A meeting minutes as presented. Kristin Akervall seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.**

**VII. Public Hearing:**

**A. Resolution No. 277. Calais at Villebois (PDP-3 North): Stacy Connery, AICP, Pacific Community Design, Inc. – representative for Fred Gast, Polygon NW Company-applicant.** The applicant is requesting approval of an Annexation and Zone Map Amendment from Rural Residential Farm Forest 5-Acre (RRFF-5) to Village (V), an Amendment to SAP North, a Preliminary Development Plan for SAP-North PDP-3, Tentative Subdivision Plat, Type C Tree Plan, Final Development Plan for linear greens and parks and SRIR review for an 84-lot single family subdivision in Villebois and associated improvements. The subject site is located on Tax Lots 1200, 1202, 1205 and 2995 of Section 15, Township 3 South, Range 1 West, Willamette Meridian, City of Wilsonville, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Daniel Pauly

Case Files: DB14-0009 – Annexation  
DB14-0010 – Zone Map Amendment to Village (V)  
DB14-0011 – PDP 3North - Preliminary Development Plan  
DB14-0013 – SAP Amendment  
DB14-0014 – Tentative Subdivision Plat  
DB14-0015 – Final Development Plan for linear greens and parks  
DB14-0016 – Type C Tree Plan  
SI14-0003 – SRIR Review

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

**Chair Fierros Bower** called the public hearing to order at 6:35 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.

**Kristin Akervall** stated that she lives in Villebois but would participate in the hearing.

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 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. Pauly** presented the Staff report via PowerPoint, reviewing the project location and the proposed applications with these key comments:

- Annexation. The shaded area on Slide 5 was proposed for annexation into the city. The area was within the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) and already had a Comprehensive Plan designation similar to the rest of Villebois. The City had obtained signatures of all property owners and electors within the area necessary for the annexation, which allowed for a quasi-judicial process through the City without an election, as defined in the Development Code.
- The Zone Map Amendment. The area had a Comprehensive Plan designation of Residential-Village, which was the Comprehensive Plan designation designed for Villebois with the only zoning option being the Village Zone.
- Specific Area Plan (SAP) North Amendment. The proposal involved more than just Phase 3 North, but extended into changes involving SAP-North as well. He briefly reviewed the approval history of SAP-North, noting that in the initial 2007 approval of SAP-North, much was uncertain about what the remainder of the SAP would be, specifically, with regard to the property purchased to serve as a school site. To enable development of Phase 1, the 2007 approval divided the SAP into two areas with Area 1 being Phase 1, and the remainder being Area 2. All the SAP elements were approved for Area 1, but only certain elements were clearly approved for the entire SAP including the Pattern Book and Community Elements Book. (Slide 11)
  - During the application for Phase 2 North (DB13-0022) last year, no rationale was found as to why all SAP elements were not approved for Phase 2 North, as it was not affected by any uncertainties surrounding the school. For the purpose of that 2007 approval, the area highlighted in yellow on Slide 12 was considered Area 1B, meaning all SAP elements were adopted leaving all other planning and details outside of the city to a future application, which was now being considered. In addition to addressing Phase 3 North tonight, the goal was to remove uncertainty in the record about the approval status of some of the other components across the entire SAP.
  - The Applicant had the option to purchase the subject properties contiguous to the western portion of Phase 2 North, which were labeled Phase 3 North in the Applicant's proposal, and all the SAP elements were being requested for adoption for Phase 3 as well. The Applicant and City agreed to a broader SAP amendment to address any uncertainties that still existed for future phases. The amendment only involved formalizing the adoption of SAP elements, rather than changes to any land use decision, realizing that when these properties were brought forward for development in the future, a SAP refinement or amendment would be needed to address the last pieces; for example, no site access currently existed to perform a tree inventory or historic resource study.

- A small triangular area on Slide 13 was shown as a future phase because Staff had been unable to identify the property owner to secure necessary consents and permissions to allow for its inclusion in the annexation. As explained in Exhibit C6 by Steve Adams, the Development Agreement, which would be adopted by Council in the draft, proposed that the City would pursue this property for required improvements to Grahams Ferry Rd. No homes were proposed for this area of the Master Plan, so the improvements would include fencing, roads and sidewalks as nothing else was expected under the current zoning.
- As allowed by the Development Code, the SAP Amendment request also included a number of Master Plan refinements or changes, all of which met the threshold requirements described in the Development Code.
  - Street network refinements included removing the previously planned connection of SW Palermo St to Grahams Ferry Rd in order to retain a wetland. Instead, SW Oslo St to the north would be the connection to Grahams Ferry Rd. The internal streets were also realigned due to the layout of residential lots planned by the developer.
  - Parks and open space refinements included the addition of a pocket park on the northeast corner of the site, park amenities in Open Space 2 along the south side of the property, open space at the southwest portion of the property related to the preserved wetland, and a number of other small linear greens throughout the development.
  - Utilities and stormwater refinements included realigning the utilities to match the proposed street network, as well as stormwater facilities based on site conditions and more detailed engineering work.
  - Land use and density refinements involved increasing the number of Large lots, adding Medium lots, and decreasing the number of Standard and Small lots, resulting in an overall reduction of 17 units from the calculations of the blocks based on the densities in the Master Plan. The placement pattern had Larger or Standard lots along the edges with a mix of housing types in the interior, resulting in denser product as one moved towards the center away from the intersection of Grahams Ferry Rd and Tooze Rd, which was consistent with other areas of Villebois and shown in the Master Plan.
- Preliminary Development Plan (PDP). Within the refinement to the Master Plan, a total of 84 units were proposed, including 23 Large, 3 Standard, 26 Medium and 32 Small lots. About two acres of the site were comprised of parks and open space, in addition to the large forest preserve to the south that would provide trail connections from the development. He noted that two regional parks were also located just to the south and east.
  - He displayed a number of preliminary front elevations proposed on the different lots.
  - With regard to traffic and circulation, required improvements for Tooze Rd and Grahams Ferry Rd were planned within the timeframe allowed by the Development Code. The Applicant was working with the City to determine cost sharing and other details.
  - In terms of circulation, providing internal road connections to the south prior to or concurrently with the development was required and involved Palermo St to the west and Ravenna Loop to the southeast. If Ravenna Loop was built as previously approved in Phase 2 North, a gap would still exist, so as part of the Development Agreement, the proposed off-site street improvements on property currently owned by the City planned to be sold for future development to provide the needed road connections. Having the road connections already completed would add value to the adjacent property.
- The proposed Tentative Subdivision Plat was consistent with the proposed PDP with lot sizes consistent with the dimensions allowed in the Pattern Book. A Future Development Tract would be combined with land from a future phase to create a buildable lot.
- Type C Tree Plan. A total of 41 trees were inventoried, and the majority of trees being retained on site were located on the one-acre Taber property. A number of trees not inventoried were being preserved in the wooded wetland located at the southwest corner of the development area. Overall, seven trees were being retained. A vast majority of the trees were being removed due to their condition rather

than construction.

- Only one sentinel Oregon White Oak had existed on site and was planned to be within the pocket park, but it had since failed and would be removed. The Applicant was required to plant a specimen shade tree in its place to become a focal point at that corner.
- He identified the trees proposed for retention and removal, noting the persevered trees which included Douglas fir, Ponderosa Pine, Western Red Cedar and Ginkgo trees. His key additional comments included:
  - A condition required the sidewalk to meander around the three trees being retained along a future portion of SW Tooze Rd in front of the Taber property.
- One notable tree designated for retention was a 25-inch Douglas Fir rated as Excellent that was located in the middle of a block. Given the tree's location and because the tree would be a focal point of the subdivision, a tree maintenance easement was required so the homeowners association (HOA) could access the tree to care and maintain it for the neighborhood.
  - A number of trees were likely to be removed and final decisions would be made as construction occurred. Staff encouraged that many of the trees located on the east side of the Taber's property be retained unless no other option existed. In addition, Staff strongly encouraged trees that one of the two trees near the current Tabor home be retained. Due to the potential of a home being placed on the lot, both trees could not be retained.
  - A notable tree proposed for removal was a 61-inch diameter Giant Sequoia tree in Excellent condition that sat in the middle of a street that could not be sufficiently realigned to avoid the tree without significantly changing the layout of the subdivision. Staff had reviewed the Applicant's ideas and did not see a clear design alternative to removing the tree without vastly changing the design of what would otherwise be a practical design for the subdivision.
- Final Development Plan for Parks and Open Space. In addition to the preserved wooded wetland, the pocket park located at the northwest corner of the site would be a nice open space providing a view of the intersection, a play area and the large shade tree. When Phase 2 North was approved as part of the Final Development Plan, the design of the park amenities at the northern edge of the forested area was delayed until the current phase, so all the amenities could be coordinated with this phase. The impacts to the Significant Resource Overlay Zone (SROZ) were expected, given the inclusion of nature play, a bench and some amenities leading into the forested area.
- The Significant Resource Impact Report (SRIR) Review identified the resources that would be impacted and the Applicant was providing the required mitigation so no issues existed.
- He corrected the Location section on Page 1 of the Staff report by adding Tax Lot 2995, which was identified on the Public Hearing Notice but had been excluded on the Staff report.

**Ms. Akervall** confirmed Phase 2 North was proposed with the same conditions and expectations as Phase 1 North, and that Phase 3 North would also have the same conditions and expectations as those prior phases because all the phases would use the same Pattern Book and Community Elements Book with approval. She asked about the entrance from Grahams Ferry Rd onto Oslo St.

**Mr. Pauly** replied the Oslo St entrance would have the same treatment as other similar entrances, such as Surrey St and Grenoble St further south and would follow the Master Signage and Wayfinding Plan as far as the fencing and signage at the entrance.

**Ms. Akervall** asked about the fence around the pocket park area, for example.

**Mr. Pauly** replied the fence material would follow the Pattern Book. Staff encouraged that it match the fencing currently along Grahams Ferry Rd, which provided a limited view with half brick along the bottom and half iron looking material.

**Chair Fierros Bower** asked if garages entrances to the residences were from the rear of the lot.

**Mr. Pauly** explained the garage entrances on the Medium and Small lots had alley-loaded access and the Standard and Large lots were front-loaded products. He noted Exhibit B6 was the revised Street Tree Plan, adding the Applicant was asked to ensure the street trees were placed in a manner that allowed for the curb cuts for the front-loaded products.

**Chair Fierros Bower** called for the Applicant's testimony.

**Alaina Robertson, Polygon Northwest, 109 E 13<sup>th</sup> St, Vancouver, WA, 98660**, thanked Staff for the thorough presentation and the DRB for hearing the Applicant's testimony tonight. She displayed a comparison of the Villebois Master Plan to the proposal and provided the following key comments:

- Polygon was fortunate to be part of such a wonderful community and had been able to build its product mix in Villebois, beginning with some of its smaller product in 2011. This particular plat gave the Applicant an opportunity to provide the larger lots that the City, neighbors and residents of Villebois had been looking for as development expanded toward the outer boundaries of the Master Plan.
- As mentioned, the Applicant did reduce the density in this area from what the original Master Plan showed for the SAP, which meant larger lots and homes and more pocket parks and open spaces, which were integral to the overall Villebois Village Master Plan as well. She noted the home elevations were available for review to see how they fell in line with the Pattern Book.
  - The Applicant would continue making improvements to some of the trails in the open space to the south approved as part of Phase 2 North, while also continuing the cleanup that had begun on the south side of the property with the Phase 2 North build out.
- She displayed the overall site plan showing a mix of the different plan types, which would be a mix of alley and front-loaded products. Similar to the Applicant's other products at Villebois, the development would consist of different floor plans. In the Small and Medium designation, a wider alley-loaded product would be built, resulting in an increase to the size of the homes.
  - The Applicant planned to keep the pocket park in the northwest corner to add more amenities to the area for Polygon's homeowners and the greater Villebois neighborhood. As recommended by Staff, the Applicant would pursue adding a large shade tree, which would be a bonus for their homeowners who appreciated such amenities. Falling in line with the preservation of other trees in the area made the decision an easy one.
- She briefly reviewed the conceptual elevations, noting the alley-loaded styles had rear garage access in keeping with the Pattern Book. The Medium elevations were newer floor plans for Polygon, which meant increased stone and brickwork, as seen in some the larger product in Villebois, as well as the ability to introduce some wider home plans. This would also be an alley-loaded, Medium product.
  - The front-loaded product consisted more of the traditional style, larger, wider homes. The Applicant was now able to introduce different elevation types than in previous proposals because their lots had been smaller previously.
- She added that many of the subject elevations were slightly reminiscent of the larger product on the Living Enrichment Center (LEC) property, as the Applicant planned to carry some of that product over to this project as well.

**Ms. Akervall** asked what the boundary would be like between the pocket park on the northwest corner and the two lots that bordered it.

**Ms. Robertson** answered a standard 6-ft cedar stained good neighbor fence would be used to provide privacy on the backyards for the homeowners. If other architectural requirements existed, the Applicant would be sure to comply to increase the viewpoint. She noted a pedestrian access ran through that portion of the pocket park, so in an effort to maintain privacy for the homeowners, the cedar stained fence would be installed unless Staff had any other recommendations.

**Mr. Pauly** recalled discussions about wrapping the fence along Grahams Ferry Rd and Tooze Rd if it was still within the view shed.

**Jim Lange, Pacific Community Design, 12564 SW Main St, Tigard, OR 97223**, clarified the Community Elements Book required a view fence around the perimeter, which was the half-height wall with wrought iron fence that currently existed. At either corner of the pocket park, the Applicant had planned to wrap the fence down the sideline of the lot to where the fences would normally end, and the same was planned for along Tooze Rd.

**Mr. Pauly** understood a shorter fence would be along the corner with the right turn pocket.

**Mr. Lange** responded the Applicant did not believe the entire park should be surrounded with a wrought iron fence, as that seemed contrary to the way the parks had been planned, but if that was required, then the Applicant would have to comply. He confirmed the plan was to wrap the fence around the edges of the homes and leave it open on the corner.

**Ms. Robertson** recalled the original Master Plan pulled the brick with the wrought iron all the way around the corner, but that was when a home existed on the corner. This was a unique situation where the Applicant was trying to accommodate the Master Plan with that design piece. Visibility through the parks was key to much of what was done in Villebois, so it was definitely something the Applicant was open to.

**Mr. Lange** did not believe any safety issue would exist because the open space tract with the trail was between the lots and the street. The trail was well separated from the road and the play facility was tucked in closer to the internal road rather than right on the corner of Grahams Ferry Rd. The Applicant did not believe the park needed to be fenced from Tooze Rd or Grahams Ferry Rd.

**Ms. Akervall** stated it seemed like the design would be aesthetically pleasing while also providing a nice opening to the neighborhood from the outside, but her concern regarded small children on the playground near a busy intersection. Living in a different part of Villebois, one thing she loved was being able to see the park from some of the rooms in her house, similar to many of the houses on this street. She inquired about the visibility of the park with it tucked into the corner and how that would feel.

**Mr. Lange** responded that park visibility was more constrained than typical due to the park's corner location. In an effort to enhance visibility, a bulb-out was included on the knuckle to increase the frontage. The original impetus for including the bulb-out was the tree, which fell down subsequent to submittal. The Applicant still believed the bulb-out was a good amenity and in the right place. The only way to gain more frontage for the park would be small lot sizes and the Applicant did not believe that was warranted.

**Mr. Pauly** suggested that if the Board wanted to make it clear in the record, a condition could be added specifying the type of fencing along those lots and where it would wrap around.

**Chair Fierros Bower** believed that as long as the Applicant was following the Master Plan and Pattern Book, the fencing was okay unless any concern existed about some deviation.

**Ms. Akervall** believed the fencing would look really nice when everything was said and done, but her primary concern was ensuring a safe boundary for the playground area. She asked if there was another chance for review or to consider the fencing once things were in motion.

**Blaise Edmonds, Manager, Current Planning,** noted in the Pattern Book included a fencing option for backyards that faced open space that was not solid wrought iron, but was instead aluminum square tubing with the appearance of iron and was not half brick/half iron.

**Mr. Pauly** clarified the Pattern Book called for an enhanced full view or partial view. He noted many corner parks were open to the street so safety still existed.

**Mr. Edmonds** added the enhanced full view option would provide visibility into the park from Tooze Rd.

**Mr. Lange** said he misspoke a bit and wanted to clarify what the application contained, so the DRB could determine if a change was needed. Sheet 7 of the Final Development Plan set indicated the enhanced partial view fence wrapping around the corner with a break where the sidewalk entered the park. Sheet 7 indicated the baseline of what the application requested. He believed emails shared back and forth with Staff indicated that perhaps the best fencing would be the SROZ fencing type, which was a full height wrought iron fence without brick on the bottom to maximize visibility.

**Ms. Robertson** added that the opening for the pedestrian bike access would wrap the whole length of the corner and contain the play structure while also maximizing visibility.

**Ms. Akervall** stated that made her feel more comfortable.

**Ms. Robertson** said there were many parks and a lot of cars driving around Villebois, and the Applicant did not want to jeopardize their homeowners' children either.

**Ms. Akervall** noted an email she sent to Mr. Pauly regarding improvements to the Tooze Rd/Grahams Ferry Rd intersection and asked if more specifics could be discussed, as well as any details regarding timeline.

**Mr. Pauly** invited Steve Adams to respond, noting he had been working on the development agreements the most.

**Steve Adams, Engineering Development Manager,** explained that Staff was working with Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and federal funding to coordinate and gain approval for everything and the process was a bit slower than usual when state and federal agencies were involved. It appeared that the development at Villebois Calais would take place about six months to a year before the City's project, so the City's design team would work with the Applicant's company to ensure the overall look was similar and the street level elevations and locations matched. The Applicant's proposed improvements to Grahams Ferry Rd and the internal streets would likely be completed by late next summer and the City's proposed Tooze Rd improvements would probably be completed by the spring or summer of 2016.

- The proposed improvements included constructing a 3-lane width on Tooze Rd with a center turn lane or landscaped median, as well as sidewalks and a landscape strip on both sides. Staff tweaked the project slightly by adding a 2-ft bike buffer on Tooze Rd and Grahams Ferry Rd in an effort to make the area more bicycle-friendly. A bike buffers is a 2-ft painted stripe that separates bicyclists from cars and these would likely be the first bicycle buffers in the city.
- The Applicant was asked to add another right turn lane on northbound Grahams Ferry Rd, so there would be as Grahams Ferry Road approached Tooze Rd from the south. Instead of three lanes on Grahams Ferry Rd, there would be a single southbound lane and three northbound lanes: a left turn lane, a through lane and a right turn lane. Staff asked the Applicant to add the right turn lane to encourage the use of Grahams Ferry Rd from communities further south in Villebois, so drivers heading north would not be stuck at the red light. Concerns had been heard from many citizens about

people cutting through Villebois to get to the other side, so the idea was that Grahams Ferry Rd to Tooze Rd would be a quicker route because it was 45 mph instead of 25 mph. The Applicant had worked with the City and agreed to add another right turn lane on northbound Grahams Ferry Rd.

- He confirmed the City would be building a signalized intersection with the Tooze Rd improvements. Both streets and the signalized intersection would be completed in the spring/summer of 2016. The current goal was that the signalized intersection would be part of that project.

**Ms. Akervall** asked if a crunch time was expected for the summer of 2015 through the spring of 2016 when there would be increased traffic, but the improvements would not yet be finished.

**Mr. Adams** replied traffic was increasing on a fairly regular basis because of the incredible amount of homes being built. Several hundred lots had been approved, and while not totally ready to be built on, those lots were ready to be developed whenever the Applicant was ready to move forward. Consequently, the speed of the subdivisions moving forward and houses actually being built and occupied would affect the traffic flow there.

**Ms. Robertson** added that completion of the street improvements in the development would actually precede construction; homeowners would not necessarily be moving in immediately following the street improvements. Although Polygon might complete the improvements in the summer of 2015, there would be a development timeframe with production that would push out the time when homeowners could actually move in.

**Mr. Adams** added the City preferred having the road constructed prior to homes being built on the north side because homeowners typically do not like construction occurring behind or around them, and building the road while homes were under construction or lots were empty would make the job much easier. He was unsure what homes the Applicant planned to build first, but noted they usually had a specific approach of building homes out block-by-block.

**Ms. Robertson** replied the approach would be contingent on the market and what the market allowed them to do. The Applicant was absolutely committed to working with the City to ensure that their production time flow aligned appropriately with what was best for the City, Polygon's homeowners and Villebois as a whole. A lot of development was taking place and many new homeowners were moving in, so there would be an influx of new traffic and the Applicant was trying to be cognizant of that as they continued working to finish the Master Plan everyone has been waiting for.

**Mr. Adams** noted traffic flow at Grahams Ferry Rd and Tooze Rd had reached a point where the City decided to install four stop signs. Currently, Tooze Rd was a through street and the intersection was becoming dangerous, so the four stop signs would probably be installed by the end of this week.

**Ms. Akervall** believed the stop signs might slow things down and help with safety concerns as she had seen cars in accidents at the Grahams Ferry Rd/Tooze Rd intersection. She noted last month the DRB discussed another Polygon development that would also access Grahams Ferry Rd in that area, adding that many people used 110<sup>th</sup> Ave to exit the neighborhood and changes would be made to that road as well. She inquired about the timing of the other development and how the timing all of it would come together.

**Mr. Lange** stated a big infrastructure push was on with a plan to tie into the Village Core and get the loop in place around it, get the parks system linked through as well as some important transportation connections that were missing today. Many of those final pieces would fall into place this year. The southbound leg of a roundabout on Boeckman Rd would eventually become Villebois Dr and be extended to 110<sup>th</sup> Ave and another missing roundabout would be installed. This linkage would complete the linkage



around the Village Core and provide another exit point out to Boeckman Rd.

- Another piece that would tie everything together better was the Applicant agreed to build the road on the school site located on the east side of the subject development. That road would connect south to another road that had already been built, providing a second access point and eventually, when the City's property went forward, the road would connect to Tooze Rd.

**Ms. Akervall** confirmed construction on those important but currently missing linkages was scheduled for this summer. She thanked the Applicant for the clarification and illustrating what the linkages would look like in the future.

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

**Cyndi Satterlund Heider, 12041 SW Tooze Rd, Sherwood, OR 97140**, said her home was located at the northwest corner of the intersection in question, noting that Ms. Akervall was able to get answers for some of her concerns. Safety was a huge concern as she had seen accidents at the intersection about twice a month and people often went through the fence. Having more traffic was very concerning and she believed the addition of stop signs, and eventually a traffic light, were good ideas as long as people stopped.

- She asked about street improvements, such as the bike lane, and whether they would end at the intersection or continue down Tooze Rd. She also asked what side of the road the 6-ft bike lane would be on, as she wanted to determine whether it would impact her property beyond the additional traffic.

**Mr. Adams** answered the bike lane was intended to end at or shortly after the intersection. Heading westbound, drivers would go through to Grahams Ferry Rd and the bike lane would phase out before reaching SW Westfall Rd. The same thing would happen northbound with the bike lane on Grahams Ferry Rd phasing out a few hundred feet north of Tooze Rd. The bike lane on Tooze Rd heading east would connect to the existing bike lanes built on Tooze Rd/Boeckman Rd, which would eventually allow for bike travel clear across town to Wilsonville Rd with the completion of Frog Pond. The plan was to have a bike lane on Boeckman Rd from Grahams Ferry Rd to Wilsonville Rd. Southbound, the bike lanes were hit and miss; he added it would have been nice if some had been included earlier in the Grahams Ferry Rd design. The City would install bike lanes from Tooze Rd down to the Barber St roundabout and bike lanes would also be added as part of the Grande Pointe development; however, there would be a short-term 1,500-ft gap in bike lane system between the Barber St roundabout and Grande Pointe.

- In terms of construction affecting Ms. Heider's property, the project was just entering the design phase, so the project was very preliminary. He added Ms. Heider had probably seen staking flags, which were part of the preliminary survey. Mike Ward, the City's civil engineer and the project lead, had more direct knowledge of what was going on and would be able to answer more of her questions. He noted Staff had just gotten the contract signed with OPEC in the last two weeks.
- He clarified that the traffic lanes would be 11-ft wide and became narrower going up. Further down, the lanes were 12 ft with a 6-ft bike lane. Staff decided to go with an 11-ft lane people were going too fast and national studies showed that the narrower the lane width the slower people tended to drive.

**Ms. Heider** confirmed the stop sign would remain at SW Westfall Rd where the three roads intersected. She asked which side of the road the additional lane would come from.

**Mr. Adams** replied the additional lane would be split on either side of the existing road. The Applicant was dedicating 17.5 feet of their parcel to the south and Staff already acquired the right-of-way from the neighbor directly to the east of Ms. Heider's property when the neighbor remodeled. If the southern portion of Ms. Heider's parcel had a standard 40-ft right-of-way, the City would need 17.5 ft of the south edge of her property. He reiterated the City was months away from acquiring that or approaching her with an offer.

**Dirk Anderson, 11797 SW Tooze Rd, Wilsonville, OR 97070**, stated many of his questions were already answered. He strongly advised reconsidering the pocket park located at the intersection of Grahams Ferry Rd and Tooze Rd at the north side of the Calais development. Conservatively, there were at least two accidents per month at that intersection and it was not unusual for cars to go right into the corner where the oak tree was located. He noted that would probably be amended with the stoplight.

**Chair Fierros Bower** called for the Applicant's rebuttal.

**Ms. Robertson** stated the Applicant had no rebuttal, but appreciated the public comments and thanked the Board members for their time.

**Chair Fierros Bower** closed the public hearing at 7:40 pm.

**Lenka Keith moved to amend the Staff report by adding Tax Lot 2995 to the Location section on Page 1. Kristin Akervall seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.**

**Lenka Keith moved to approve Resolution No 277. The motion was seconded by Kristin Akervall.**

**Ms. Akervall** confirmed the fencing at the pocket park would be wrought iron. She asked if Staff would continue to work with the Applicant to ensure what was completed was a safe and good solution for the corner with regard to the boundaries.

**Mr. Pauly** answered yes, adding Staff would review the final plans consistent with the DRB approval and could require minor administrative changes because of the additional right turn lane that was discussed. The fencing would be per the Pattern Book, which designated either brick with wrought iron on top or just wrought iron.

**Ms. Akervall** said she had also seen cars go through the fence on the corner and believed wrought iron would be sturdier than a wood fence.

**Mr. Edmonds** clarified the wrought iron was not traditional iron, but was usually a tubing and much lighter. The fence was a faux wrought iron.

**Mr. Pauly** believed traffic would be a lot slower with the eventual build out.

**Mr. Edmonds** noted Mr. Adam's testimony that a four-way stop would be installed at the intersection very soon, which should help with run the through traffic that caused accidents and created problems for the neighbors.

**Ms. Akervall** said it was good that was happening now so everyone could get used to the four-way stop sign before construction began.

**Mr. Edmonds** added nothing could create safety in a park. He understood Ms. Akervall's concern regarded the safety of children going out into traffic and keeping them confined to the neighborhood. He noted that even the fence would not stop a speeding car. The brick fence might, but he was unsure what her tolerance of safety was and what she was thinking.

**Ms. Akervall** believed that the addition of the four-way stop, and later a stoplight, helped ease her concern. She added that for kids, the boundary did not have to be a full tall fence; a visual and tangible boundary would suffice in stopping kids from running out into the intersection.

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Mr. Edmonds** clarified that the annexation and Zone Map Amendment were recommendations to the City Council.

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

#### **VIII. Board Member Communications**

##### **A. Meeting notes from April 28, 2014 DRB Panel B Meeting**

**Mr. Pauly** noted new signs were approved for the World of Speed that were 32-ft poles with banners that kind of extended the lines of the building. Not many sign applications had been seen recently, and the application was brought to the DRB level because of the banner signs, which the DRB believed made good architectural sense.

**Mr. Edmonds** added banner signs were typically seen at museums or venues where the displays changed. The World of Speed had a need to change the banners, which were very professionally done and not the cheap type of banners seen on SE 82<sup>nd</sup> Ave in Portland. The banner signs were museum-quality and would be located on the west entrance on 95<sup>th</sup> Ave, not facing the freeway because the Applicant did not want people to go through the wrong entrance.

#### **IX. Staff Communications**

**Mr. Edmonds** announced the work retreat with City Council and all City commissions and boards was scheduled for this Saturday, May 17<sup>th</sup>, between 9 am and 3 pm at City Hall. He was sure lunch would be served, but he had not seen the agenda yet. He did not believe anyone needed to bring anything other than questions and comments.

**Ms. Akervall** thanked her fellow board members for being patient as she got caught up to speed.

**Chair Fierros Bower** responded Ms. Akervall had good questions that triggered new discussion and new questions, which was very good.

#### **X. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 7:50 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

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