

**Wilsonville City Hall  
29799 SW Town Center Loop E  
Wilsonville, Oregon 97070**

**Development Review Board – Panel A  
Minutes–December 9, 2013 6:30 PM**

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Approved</b> Jan. 13, 2014</p>
--

**I. Call to Order:**

Chair Mary Fierros Bower called the Development Review Board (DRB)-Panel A meeting to order at 6:25 p.m.

**II. Chairman’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, Ken Ruud, and Simon Springall. Jerry Greenfield and Council Liaison Susie Stevens were absent.

Staff present were: Blaise Edmonds, Mike Kohloff, and Steve Adams.

**IV. Citizens’ Input:** This is an opportunity for visitors to address the Development Review Board on items not on the agenda. There was none.

**V. City Council Liaison Report:**

No report was given due to Councilor Stevens’ absence.

**VI. Consent Agenda:**

- A. Approval of minutes of September 9, 2013 DRB Panel A meeting

**Ken Ruud moved to approve the September 9, 2013 DRB Panel A meeting minutes as presented. Simon Springall seconded the motion, which passed 3-0-1 with Lenka Keith abstaining.**

**VII. Public Hearing:**

- A. **Resolution No. 266. Large Lot Tentative Subdivision Plat (Villebois Village Center No. 3): RCS-Villebois Development LLC – Owner.** The applicant is requesting approval of a nine (9) lot tentative subdivision plat in SAP-Central of Villebois. The subject property is Tax Lot 100 of Section 15AD, T3S, R1W, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Blaise Edmonds

Case Files: DB13-0043 – Tentative Subdivision Plat

**Chair Fierros Bower** called the public hearing to order at 6:31 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 Page 1 of 21 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** presented the Staff report via PowerPoint with the following key comments:

- He corrected the date of the memorandum from Development Engineering Manager Steve Adams in Exhibit C1 on page 7 of 21 to read, “November ~~20~~ 22, 2013”, adding that the memorandum dated November 20 had been Mr. Adams’ original memorandum; the memorandum dated November 22 was his revised memorandum.
- Using an aerial map, he noted the location of the 24.88-acre subject project site, which was northeast of the newly completed Piazza and mixed-use building, and south of a Polygon residential project being constructed along with the streets on the peripheral edge. Lot No. 3 would be a future Hilltop or Montague Park, which would be developed as part of the Villebois Master Parks Plan.
  - The Applicant was proposing a nine lot subdivision. Key streets going through the project would be SW Orleans Lp, SW Villebois Dr, and SW Costa Circle West.
- He read the Applicant’s submittal stating, “The whole purpose for the large lot subdivision was to create lots for convenience and purposes intended for future land division site development. The configuration of the proposed lots and the design would be consistent with the SAP Central and Villebois Master Plan so that future development would be able to occur in the accordance to the plans and policies of Villebois Master Plan and the City of Wilsonville Development Code.”
  - He explained the Applicant did not intend to develop the large lots with actual development permits; the subdivision plat was intended strictly for the conveyance of large property to other prospective developers. Those developers would come back through the public hearing process for a Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) and Final Development Plan (FDP) to fine tune what would ultimately be put on the large lots. A substantial public hearing process would be held for any development of the lots.
- The City Engineer was requesting to acquire right-of-way for SW Orleans Lp, SW Villebois Dr, and SW Costa Circle West. There would be internal streets, as seen around the Piazza, that would be included in the development of the lots, but the Applicant wanted to have some latitude and flexibility with regard to the internal structure of those lots. The Applicant could provide further explanation, but he believed it was because the Villebois Village Plan was 10 to 12 years old and market conditions had changed.
  - No utilities would be extended and the actual construction of the streets would not occur at this time. The City was requesting right-of-way and the dedication of that right-of-way was shown in the half gray-toned areas on the slide.
- The conditions of approval were on pages 5 and 6 of 21. He noted Condition PD2 further emphasized that, “No development should occur on the proposed lots which would have a significant impact in use of the adjoining right-of-way and existing public facilities prior to recordation of the subsequent subdivision partition plats (See Finding 8).” He added that Mr. Adams had stated in his memorandum that “Per the Applicant’s statement, no public works construction would occur with this subdivision application.” He was sure the Applicant was working with potential investors to convey the property.
- He concluded that this part of Villebois was where the highest density of residential would occur, such as the Garden Apartments, Village Apartments, as well as more row houses; no single family would be included. The core area of Villebois was designed for the highest density and that would not change; it was just a matter of the placement and design of the units that would come in the subsequent PDP and FDP applications.

**Chair Fierros Bower** asked what was being proposed in the Piazza area.

**Mr. Edmonds** confirmed that Piazza had already been built; the opening ceremony was held a couple months prior. He encouraged the Board members to visit as it was a beautiful park with wonderful features.

**Ken Ruud** asked if Staff had any idea of what the impact this project would have on Wilsonville’s multi-family housing percentage once the area was built.

**Mr. Edmonds** replied this area was factored into the Master Plan about 10 years ago, and when the Villebois Master Plan was adopted, the Comprehensive Plan was also amended to embody that kind of density, so it had been on books for a long time. SAP Central was designed for 1,011 total units in the core area, which was designed to be the critical mass of density and then the lower density spread out in concentric rings outside the Village Center to the peripheral edges along Grahams Ferry Rd where larger lots would be located.

- He believed the current and previous Councils, the decision makers, understood that was the master plan for Villebois. He believed the issues of the additional increased multiple family residential was from what had been recently seen outside of Villebois, as there was a huge, unprecedented surge of apartment activity. A considerable amount of single-family construction has started, primarily with Polygon Residential, Lennar Homes, and Matrix. The potential for about 500 to 600 new single-family detached homes had been approved in the last two years in Villebois, which would bring that percentage down in terms of the balance of residential single-family and multiple-family, so it would not look so uneven in three years. However, there would be more apartments in the Villebois Village Central area, depending on the economic demand for multiple family housing. The current trend is single-family homes because interest rates are still low. If the interest rates go back up and people could no long afford to buy homes, they would look for apartments to rent. This is the ebb and flow of residential marketplace in which developers find themselves in.

**Mr. Ruud** asked if there was a projection of where the City would end up once these lots were built.

**Mr. Edmonds** responded that Villebois was approved for more than 2,500 homes, which included includes apartments, town homes, condos and single family homes. He believed the current range is between 2,600 or 2,700 units. More density had been added over the years with smaller lots and smaller single-family houses. He reiterated that this core area alone had approximately 1,011 units.

**Simon Springall** believed Ravenna Lp was missing from the engineer's request for right-of-way, noting it could be seen on the top left and bottom center of the pictures displayed and asked why that street was not included.

**Steve Adams, Engineering Development Manager**, replied that in discussions with Nancy Kraushaar, Community Development Director, Staff decided to push for the three streets that were locked in on both sides: SW Costa Circle, SW Orleans Lp, and SW Villebois Dr, which were either constructed, being constructed, or had been previous DRB approval to those locations on either end; therefore, those streets could not move much. Ravenna Loop was not as locked in as those other streets. A Villebois Master Plan had showed a street coming through, however with the changes in Central, Staff believed that if the developers needed to shift it north or south, there was a long enough gap to make the connecting points. Staff did not feel Ravenna Lp needed to be locked into its location at this point. There were several other streets in the Villebois Master Plan that were not included, because Staff did not want to lock it in so tight that there was no opportunity for adjustment as the applications were submitted.

**Mike Kohloff, City Attorney**, referenced Condition PFA6, which addressed the dedicated right-of-way necessary for SW Villebois Dr North, stating it appeared from the diagram that dedication was needed on Lots 1, 4, 7, and part of Lot 8, which Mr. Adams confirmed. He asked if that had changed because it only stated Lots 1 and 2. He read the condition adding he assumed Mr. Adams was referring to Villebois Dr North.

**Mr. Adams** clarified that the dedication from Lots 8 and 7 had already been shown on the early application and that he should have written it to state Lots 1 and 4 because those were the two lots not shown at the time, but it would be for all four of those lots. In the original application that was submitted, the Applicant only showed a half-street dedication from Lots 7 and 8.

**Mr. Kohloff** asked whether all of it should be shown in the presentation.

**Mr. Adams** responded he did not include it because it was already shown, but he should have worded it differently because Lots 7 and 8 were already addressed. The dedication was still needed from Lots 1 and 4 as shown, however it should have stated that Lots 1, 4, 7, and 8. He agreed Mr. Kohloff was correct.

**Mr. Kohloff** confirmed SW Costa Circle was Lots 2 and 3 and SW Orleans Lp was Lots 3 and 4. He asked if there was an offset for each of those two streets, because it appeared from the drawing that Costa SW Circle was offset from the existing street or right-of-way to the north.

**Mr. Adams** confirmed there was a bit of an offset there. He explained that in Villebois, depending on the type of adjacent lot, whether a regional park, commercial, or residential, street widths varied based on where the sidewalk was located, on-street parking, etc. and the right-of-way would move in and out depending on what it bordered. That was why SW Orleans Loop narrowed by several feet adjacent to the future park on Lot 3; whereas prior to that, on-street parking was allowed adjacent to the residential area. Villebois' whole philosophy was to not allow on-street parking next to parks so people would have a nice visual background of the park as they drove by, not a bunch of parked cars. SW Costa Circle would be the same way; Lot 2 would be housing with on street parking so the street right-of-way would be a bit wider, but on the south side, next to Hilltop Park, there would be no parking. Villebois Dr would get wider as it approached Lot 4. Again, the Villebois Master Plan showed a slightly different street section adjacent to Lot 7 as opposed to where it crossed over to Lot 4. He had discussed his concerns with Pacific Community Design, and Staff chose to leave the streets as shown currently, with the agreement that the right-of-way widths would be adjusted more precisely, based on sidewalk widths, parking, etc. at the time of individual lot development.

- He confirmed these adjustments would be made when reviewing the PDPs as the different lots coming in for development would each have more specific requests for regarding right-of-ways, location, product type, etc.

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

**Rudy Kadlub, President, Costa Pacific Communities, and Developer, Villebois Village Center, 11422 SW Barber St, Wilsonville, OR 97070** said he did not have much to add to the presentation but wanted to clarify the application in the simplest terms.

- He explained that currently, the nine lots were just one lot, and in order to develop or sell any portion, he would have to create a subdivision; therefore they proposed dividing the one lot into nine parcels, one which would be a future park, so the eight parcels were in approximate locations for the types of zoning and development that might occur in the future.
  - For example, Lot 1 was mostly a row home area. Moving forward, Costa could develop it as row homes, or sell it to another builder who could come in with a PDP on that specific lot without having to delay to go through this current process. The Applicant wanted to be in a position to get the subdivision plat out of the way, so they were ready to move forward on any of the lots.

**Chair Fierros Bower** confirmed there was no questions for the Applicant and called for public testimony in favor, opposed and neutral to the application.

**Les Modell, 11342 SW Barber St, Wilsonville, OR** said that his residence was approximately a block and a half southwest of Piazza Park. He noted that while his card stated he was neutral to the proposition, he clarified was personally in favor of the proposal, but wanted to discuss the right-of-ways.

- He noted a pedestrian was hit on Barber St that week at the corner of SW Orleans and Barber St. Luckily, the 16-year old boy was not seriously injured. Speed was not a factor, but he believed the

visibility, cars, and the fact that SW Orleans Loop, which was part of the approval process, had heavy pedestrian traffic were factors in the accident. The two collectors in the area were Barber St and Costa Circle, which was also a part of tonight's approval process. He understood a speed study was completed, but he did not believe that was actually relevant to the accident.

- Villebois was a pedestrian-friendly neighborhood. Barber St was a major collector from the Costa roundabout to Grahams Ferry Rd and Costa is a minor collector in the section actually being discussed. Villebois Dr was currently a dead-end, but after approval, it would connect to Costa Circle and Boeckman Rd as a collector of some kind.
- He distributed some graphics, entered into the record as Exhibit D1, he created to better explain his point.
  - He noted the Street Plan, Figure 7 in the Master Plan showed Villebois Dr as a major collector between what would be a traffic circle, shown as a half circle at Costa Circle, and Boeckman Rd where Villebois Dr would apparently connect to a stub of a traffic circle on Boeckman Rd.
- His issue was that although the manual for Uniform Traffic Control Devices, which was part of Oregon Law under ORS 810.200 and OAR 734.020.0005, [The City is not sure if Mr. Modell had quoted the correct OAR for 734.020.0005] as amended December 21, 2011, stated when and where traffic signs, street markings, and road symbols could be used, it did state that four-way stops could not be used for speed purposes. However, there were a couple of places where multi-way stops were an option. He noted Subsection 2B.07 Multi-way Stops, Option 05, listed four criteria that might be considered in an engineering study. Criterion B stated, "The need to control vehicle-pedestrian conflicts near locations that generate high pedestrian volumes." Criterion D stated, "An intersection of two residential neighborhood collectors, thru streets of similar design and operating characteristics where a multi-way stop control would improve traffic operational characteristics of the neighborhood."
- He contended that the cost of the traffic through Barber St, which was totally uncontrolled from its beginning at Kinsman Rd to its end at Grahams Ferry Rd, was an attractive nuisance. During the daytime, it was not so bad, but there were a number of cars that speed through the area because it was a totally unregulated, unrestricted road. Once the subject large lot subdivision was developed and the 1,100+ homes were built, the pedestrian traffic would grow quite considerably, along with the traffic on Villebois Dr, Barber St, SW Orleans Lp, and Costa Circle.
- He recognized no engineering study could be done or traffic counters used because the roads did not lead anywhere or have any traffic; but since the Board was considering opening those roads up as part of this subdivision, he suggested including in the approval four-way stops and crosswalks at the following three Barber St intersections, at Costa Circle, Villebois Dr, and SW Orleans Lp.
  - He clarified there were already crosswalks at Villebois Dr across Barber St and a stop sign on Villebois Dr, but not on Barber St where he believed stop signs should be added. Stop signs should also be added at the intersections of Barber St at Costa Circle and SW Orleans Lp. These were not terribly expensive propositions and could be easily included at a relatively low upfront cost.

**Mr. Springall** understood that the application did not involve any direct change to Barber St.

**Mr. Modell** agreed it did not, but it would very specifically include the roads that crossed Barber St and the proposal would increase the volume on those cross-streets as a result of the development.

**Mr. Springall** did not believe making the recommendation that Mr. Modell was requesting was within the Board's jurisdiction. He asked what avenue Mr. Modell could use to make his recommendation.

**Mr. Kohloff** stated if the Board believed it was appropriate, the Board could make a recommendation as part of its decision that the City Engineering Department study the situation when the PDPs come forward because that would be when pedestrian issues were involved. He understood the accident that occurred

was in a crosswalk area at the intersection.

**Mr. Modell** interjected it was at an intersection but there was no crosswalk.

**Mr. Kohloff** continued that the person was traveling at about 7 miles per hour according to the police report, and he understood that the boy was on a bike, so it was more of an issue of not paying attention, but by who was uncertain. It was worth having the Engineering Department look at, but often there was concern about crosswalks creating a false feeling of security, so they had to be very careful. The crosswalk design was also a factor; a simple crosswalk that was painted would be much different than one with lights, which are very expensive. He agreed safety came first so Staff would look at it when the PDPs came forward and Engineering could take a more studied look along with the traffic consultants.

**Mr. Modell** asked if he was referring to the PDPs on the eight individual lots as they come up.

**Mr. Kohloff** responded that was correct, noting that at this time, there were no pedestrians and no one knew what or when anything would be built there, so there was a timing issue. The PDP would be the appropriate time to look because more would be known about the other configurations, such as where the internal roads would cross and intersect, etc. He explained that instead of a condition as part of the approval, the Board would make it a recommendation.

**Lenka Keith** asked whether that would be covered under Condition PFA3.

**Mr. Modell** noted Section 4.262 WC Road Improvements.

**Mr. Kohloff** clarified that basically stated that no traffic impact report was necessary at the tentative approval, but a traffic impact study would be required when the Applicant returned. He advised adding a recommendation under specific comments, and then making the recommendation part of the motion, because they would be adopted as conditions.

**Chair Fierros Bower** called for the Applicants rebuttal or response. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing at 7:10 pm.

**Simon Springall** moved to amend Resolution No. 266 as follows:

- **Amend Condition of Approval PFA6 to state, “Lots ~~1 and 2~~ 1, 4, 7 and 8.”**
- **Revise the date on Exhibit C1 to read, “November 20 22, 2013”**
- **Add new Exhibit D1 provided by Les Modell via public testimony**
- **Add a recommendation to the application that the City Engineering Department look at or study adding safe pedestrian crosswalks and four-way stop signs at SW Costa Circle, Villebois Dr, and SW Orleans Ave off of Barber St during the PDP process.**

**Lenka Keith** seconded the motion.

**Mr. Springall** said he wanted to clarify the wording of the recommendation. He agreed there should be some recommendation, but was not sure about specifically stating that there “must be” new crosswalks or stop signs at all three intersections. He wanted to clarify the Board was only recommending that it to be considered as it really needed to be a part of a traffic study Mr. Adams or his staff would address. He was also concerned that with the eight subdivisions coming in one by one, the traffic study would need to take a more realistic view as described by Mr. Modell.

**Mr. Kohloff** replied that generally if DKS was going to take a look at the intersections, they would look at the different PDPs that would be going in the area. He did not know how they would divide the lots, but the Master Plan showed row houses condos or specialty condos going in, so DKS would have to look at the whole thing.

**Mr. Adams** confirmed the City had an early application in for Lot 1 that Staff would be discussing this week and they would be also be talking with DKS about some traffic and street related issues as well. He noted that as a whole, as each lot came in, Staff would have DKS look at the impacts to the nearest intersections that would be affected by the last development. He and Ms. Kraushaar discuss the choices available; if they believe development on Lot 1 would impact Villebois Dr and Barber St, they would have DKS look at that particular intersection to account for the current traffic and estimate what the increased traffic would yield; the same would be done at SW Orleans Lp and Barber St. He added it was always a moving target as different phases come through with different developers. Villebois Dr. was scheduled to connect to Boeckman as early as next year or possibly 2015. He was unsure of the exact time because it was all developer driven, but he believed they had enough demand to make the lots develop. Staff always looked at each new application that came in to see what was happening and ensure that they had a good handle on the situation.

**Mr. Kohloff** clarified the question was when looking to develop Lot 1, Staff might have to consider what the developments might be on Lots 4 and 7 as that could effect when something might be needed as well; although the specifics might not be available, some general information could be used.

**Mr. Adams** replied Lot 1 would have specific information, depending on what was being proposed by the developer, and Staff would refer to the Villebois Master Plan to see what was anticipated for Lots 4, 5, 6, and 7. There had always been a range of between 15 and 20 or 30 and 35 different housing types that were anticipated within the different areas of Villebois that would also be taken into consideration by DKS when they did their traffic modeling of the area.

**Mr. Kohloff** understood Staff would have enough general information to make those projections even if only one lot was being developed at a time.

**Mr. Blaise** noted there was a motion and now, perhaps, a friendly amendment to the motion.

**Mr. Kohloff** replied there was a clarification made directing the City Engineers to study stop signs and crosswalks at those three areas at the time of the PDP applications.

**Mr. Springall** asked if a friendly amendment could be made to expand it to be a traffic study for the collectors and the major streets in the Villebois area because he was particularly concerned about the through traffic between the school and Grahams Ferry Rd on Barber St and then between wherever it was on the south and Boeckman Rd along Villebois Dr. These streets going through these residential areas would become major connections.

**Mr. Kohloff** stated some limits existed on what the Board could request under the Code. The Code discussed what the impacts would be at the intersections that would be mostly used, and that would determine the level of service, whether an F or D level, for instance. Mr. Adams indicated he was aware that other areas would be developed that would immediately impact the intersections, so he would scope it appropriately with DKS. The traffic studies should provide the general traffic on the major thoroughfare, so it would be more than what one or two lots would produce.

**Mr. Adams** responded that was correct. The Future Study Area, which was the old Living Enrichment Center, went through the Planning Commission and a fairly extensive traffic study was completed



because it was a major new phase being added to Villebois with more than 100 lots. No overall view had been done on the intersections in a number of years, so Staff went back and looked at seven major intersections, including Grahams Ferry Rd/Tooze Rd, Boeckman Rd/Tooze Rd, Barber Rd/Grahams Ferry Rd and Brown Rd/Wilsonville Rd, to see what the impacts would be from the Future Study Area development plus all the changes that had occurred in Villebois over the last several years. At the same time, Staff has had some early indication of additional development in Villebois North, which was the area adjacent to Tooze Rd, and if that came forward as an application Staff would review those major intersections again to see what was happening. City Staff kept a good handle on what was happening with the major intersections and would continue to watch them, but that they would most likely focus on the internal sections for this particular area. For infill lots like those being discussed, Staff would not go out as far as Boeckman Rd and Villebois Dr because information had been collected on those in the last three months. Staff would focus more on the internal intersections in the subject area.

**Mr. Springall** believed the concern was on the internal intersections; he was just noting that more traffic would be going through those streets as they became more connected.

**Mr. Adams** added that historically, as traffic becomes more dense, traffic slows down because with more cars on a street, people slow down because they did not feel as safe. In Villebois when construction slowed for a few years, some streets were built that had no homes on them, so east of Costa Circle, people tended to drive faster because there was no visual need to slow down.

**Mr. Edmonds** added the Villebois Master Plan identified SW Villebois Drive as a Woonerf, with the idea of the street being a shared road way for pedestrians, cars, and bicyclists. This was a different type of street than a public street.

**Mr. Kadlub** corrected the Woonerf was actually Monte Blanc Dr which would extend down toward the school. He reiterated that the concept in the Master Plan was to have the density higher in the middle and easing as it went to the edges. Not a lot of the infrastructure was in today, and obviously Barber St was a major piece of infrastructure and was one of the main, if not the only entry from the south and southwest part of Wilsonville. Currently, there were two ways to get out of Villebois with Barber St and Surrey St, but completed, there would be more than 14 different ways to get in and out of Villebois, so a lot of the traffic now concentrated on Barber Rd would be diffused. The concern would not be as great because a lot of the people would head north across the new Boeckman Rd Extension once Villebois Dr was built and Coffee Lake Dr would be another strong north-south connection as Barber St extended across the wetlands to Kinsman Rd and connected to Barber St near the WES line. He agreed a lot of people cut through on Barber St now, but even though the density would be increasing, the number of ways in and out of the community would also increase. He confirmed that DKS was involved with the entire traffic and engineering study of the Master Plan, so if done correctly, it would get better as the area developed.

**Mr. Kohloff** added that Villebois was a very walkable community, so it was important to have engineering look to ensure that the pedestrian crossings were safe ways to get to the parks, trails, etc. as the community builds out. Areas with longer runs between crosswalks along major streets, for example, might need to be broken up.

**Mr. Kadlub** agreed that should always be considered, adding he would support a crosswalk at SW Orleans Lp and Costa Circle with the precaution that they did not want it to be a false sense of safety either.

**Mr. Kohloff** believed it was appropriate that the Board make the recommendation so Staff could take a look at it and resolve some of the issues that were raised, which he liked from a liability point as well.



**Chair Fierros Bower** restated the motion and called for the vote.

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Simon Springall moved to approve Resolution No. 266 as amended. Ken Ruud seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.**

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

**VIII. Board Member Concerns and Communications:**

- A. Results of the September 23, 2013 DRB Panel B meeting
- B. Results of the October 28, 2013 DRB Panel B meeting

**IX. Staff Communications**

There was none.

**X. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paula Pinyerd, ABC Transcription for  
Shelley White, Planning Administrative Assistant