

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

Approved
June 10, 2013

**Development Review Board – Panel A
Minutes–May 13, 2013 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, Ken Ruud, Jerry Greenfield, Simon Springall, and Councilor Liaison Susie Stevens.

Staff present: Blaise Edmonds, Michael Kohlhoff and Amanda Hoffman

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

City Councilor Stevens reported that City Council:

- Directed Staff regarding the upgrade and reconstruction of the Memorial Park parking lot after determining which concept design plan they preferred, so the project was now moving through engineering and planning and would be completed in the fall. The parking would be completely reconfigured while saving as many trees as possible, though several diseased trees needed to be removed anyway.
- Would discuss and formally adopt the Council’s goals resulting from the City Council retreat at next Monday’s Council meeting. She briefly highlighted the goals involving the Development Review Board (DRB), noting the fairly aggressive plan to move forward with the future development of Coffee Creek and the completion and adoption of the Basalt Creek Industrial Area Concept Plan within the next 18 to 27 months. Completing formal concept plans for Advance Road and Frog Pond residential areas were also Council goals.

Jerry Greenfield asked when the parking lot project was expected to come before this DRB.

Blaise Edmonds verified the Memorial Park project would come before the DRB Panel A on June 10th.

Councilor Stevens confirmed the project was the first parking lot coming down into Memorial Park, not the one by the dog park. The lot was having a lot of storm drain problems. The goal was to maximize as many spaces as possible, but make sure they were wide and long enough to accommodate the larger vehicles typically parked there, such as vans, SUVs and buses. The project would also make safer for pedestrian circulation.

Simon Springall inquired about the timeframe for the Advance Road/Frog Pond development.

Michael Kohlhoff, City Attorney, stated the timeframes for those developments were discussed at the Staff retreat and should be available either at this meeting or the first meeting in June. The timing for a concept plan must allow for developing a request for proposal (RFP) to select a consultant, which would

take a few months, and then after bringing on a consultant, the process would probably take about nine months to a year. Developing a major concept plan for the 500 plus- acre residential area, about the size of a Villebois, would be time consuming because all the facilities must be master planned as well.

- The concept plan has been completed for Coffee Creek Industrial Area, so the question was how to structure the financing for it and City Council has created a work plan for that, as well a strategic plan for urban renewal to determine whether that would be a financing option. The City was working with some initial developers, so it would be planned in phases. Coffee Creek was much farther along, obviously, than Frog Pond to the east.
- He clarified that Advance Road was not yet in the urban growth boundary (UGB). The City would next have the chance to add Advance Road in 2015, so Staff wanted to have the concept planning started. Wilsonville was number one in the second tier last time, so that should move the City to the first tier in 2015. Additionally, the school district is advancing its own UGB for 40-acres of Advance Road for some new grade schools and that area is separate from the larger area. The district would move forward a bit faster and the City has done the master planning on that particular 40 acres, so the general layout was somewhat known. But again, the City must install a big sewer pipeline to address the sewer situation because while a little bit of capacity still exists, there was not enough capacity to serve the full area. Part of the sewer treatment plant bond provided for the engineering and design of that pipeline. Another issue involved the pump station for that particular line and its location within the park. The existing pump station must be removed from the flood plain. So, there were lots of moving parts but the Council was working on all of them.

Ken Ruud inquired if Council discussed anything about a goal for a community center or swimming pool.

Councilor Stevens replied one of the first goals that Council agreed on and Staff has been directed to do was to complete a feasibility study for a community recreational/aquatic center in Wilsonville. They acknowledged that the work done by prior volunteers and tasks force had been put on the back burner, but the desire for a facility kept bubbling to the surface. City Manager Bryan Cosgrove stated at the retreat that Council would receive quarterly reports regarding Council's goals.

Mr. Kohlhoff noted the City had hired a new Parks and Recreational Director who would be of the feasibility study, which was also part of Staff's work plan. Some key dates have been discussed, but Staff needs to work through the process of the feasibility study, which would also require a scope of work, and then an RFP and eventually a contract. Staff hopes to put the RFP out in the latter part of the summer.

Councilor Stevens added the goals also included a section identifying what success would look like so they would know whether the goal had been met. For example, having a completed feasibility study presented to Council by July 1, 2014 would indicate that goal had been met. It was not a set date, but a target.

VI. Consent Agenda:

- A.** Approval of minutes of March 11, 2013 DRB Panel A meeting

Lenka Keith moved to approve the March 11, 2013 DRB Panel A meeting minutes. Simon Springall seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

- B. Resolution No. 252. Athey Creek Temporary Use Permit: Athey Creek Christian Fellowship –Applicant; Robert Lanphere, Jr. And Bit Holdings Fifty-Seven Inc. - Owners.** The applicant is requesting approval a Temporary Use Permit to allow Athey Creek Christian Fellowship to continue the use of the main church building until May 17, 2015, and to establish a new youth space across the street from the main church building for 24 months until May 17, 2015. The subject sites are located at 27520 SW 95th Avenue and 27501 SW

95th Avenue, Stes 955 & 960 on Tax Lot 702 Section 11D and Tax Lot 400 Section 11C, T3S-R1W, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Amanda Hoffman

Case Files: DB13-0007 – Temporary Use Permit

Mr. Kohloff noted the initial Staff report should be replaced with new Exhibit A1, a revised Staff report dated May 6, 2013, which had been distributed to the Board. He explained that the new exhibit was simply indicating that the DRB was exercising its authority to grant two temporary use permits. One was a short-term renewal of the existing temporary use permit, DB09-0057, to allow Athey Creek Christian Fellowship to continue using the main church building until May 17, 2015. The Applicant had a five-year temporary permit that expires in January 2015 and this renewal would allow all the timing to line up with the second renewal, which was a 24-month temporary use permit to establish a new youth space expiring on May 17, 2015. The new youth space was located across 95th Ave from the main church building. The uses were all permitted and so the application was just brought before the Board on consent. The only change was to renew the existing temporary use permit, DB09-0057, which was the reason for the change in the Staff report.

Jerry Greenfield stated that after visiting the site at about 10:30 am he was a bit concerned about the high volume of traffic on 95th Ave. A couple people were directing people where to park and assisting pedestrians crossing the road, which might become more problematic with the addition of the property across the street

Blaise Edmonds noted Assistant Planner Amanda Hoffman would have to address that concern and if it could not be resolved, the Board might need to open the item to a public hearing.

Amanda Hoffman, Assistant Planner, stated the problem would be alleviated by the church's attendants that direct traffic and also help pedestrians cross before church services. If there was a youth group function in the evening, then the parents or children, if they were old enough, would actually park on that side of the street, so they would not be crossing.

Mr. Greenfield stated he wanted to register his concern and asked about the possibility of at least adding a marked crosswalk at that point. There were no intersections along that stretch, so there was no implied crosswalk.

Ms. Hoffman noted that as a temporary use, it was not intended to remain for a long period of time.

Mr. Edmonds noted no engineering staff were present, but explained that a marked crosswalk is not typically installed on a public street for temporary use, unless there was an engineering reason. He understood that the youth Christian fellowship is only held in the evening on the west side of 95th Ave, so there would be no reason to cross to the east side of the street.

Ms. Hoffman reiterated that the church has people helping pedestrians cross during the Sunday service.

Mr. Greenfield stated that informally, he would like to have his concern conveyed to the congregation.

Mr. Kohloff replied City Staff would talk to the church and work with them to see if any crossing monitors beyond what they already have are needed. He doubted that a crosswalk could be installed given this was all outside the PM peak hour, but Staff could certainly monitor it and work with them.

Simon Springall commented that it was kind of interesting that the City did not consider walkability in the business area of the city. He asked if everybody was expected to come and leave their work by car and never walk around in the area.

Mr. Edmonds explained that 95th Ave is unique. It was designed primarily as an industrial park in the early 1990s so the intent was mostly freight and industrial traffic, warehouse, and manufacturing. There is a sidewalk on one side of the street for a good distance and then up the road, there are sidewalks on both sides of the street. Appropriate crosswalks exist at the intersections, but not mid-block; it was not designed as a residential area. The thinking back then was not as advanced as it is today.

Jerry Greenfield moved to approve Resolution No. 252 with Exhibit A1 replacing the Staff report provided in the meeting packet. The motion was seconded by Lenka Keith and passed unanimously.

VII. Public Hearing:

- A. Resolution No. 253. Fox Center Townhomes: Seema LLC – Applicant.** The applicant is requesting approval a Site Design Review for fifteen (15) townhome units known as Fox Center Townhomes. The site is located at 30625 SW Willamette Way East on Tax Lot 100, Section 22AC; T3S R1W; Clackamas County; Wilsonville, Oregon. Staff: Blaise Edmonds

Case Files: DB13-0006 – Site Design Review

Chair Fierros Bower called the public hearing to order at 6:55 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.

Simon Springall stated that he had attended many of the City Council meetings where the earlier planning on the project was discussed last year. He did not believe that influenced his opinion on the design review in any way.

Blaise Edmonds, Manager of Current Planning, announced that the criteria applicable to the application were stated on page 2 of the Staff report, which was entered into the record. Copies of the report were made available to the side of the room.

Mr. Edmonds presented the Staff report via PowerPoint, briefly reviewing the site's location and overall history as well as the recently approved Zone and Comprehensive Plan Map amendments. He noted the Applicant also obtained a Stage II Final Plan and a Type C Tree Plan, but chose to return at a future date for the final review, which would be the Site Design Review, presently before the Board. He displayed the Approved Stage II Final Site Plan and Proposed Revised Site Plan, noting that all the site planning issues had been resolved through the DRB and City Council. His key comments regarding the Site Design Review via PowerPoint were as follows:

- The development was still targeted for age-restricted occupants, age 55 years or over. While the occasional boomerang college student might move back and live with a parent, the primary renter would have to be age 55 and over. Residents would not own but lease or rent the units.
- Initially, the Applicant proposed 16 townhome units but now 15 units were proposed.
- Originally, a host of waivers were proposed for setbacks on the three-sided corner lot. The Applicant chose to redesign the site plan so that no waivers were being requested except for the small trellis-type structure next to the park at the corner of Wilsonville Rd and Willamette Way East. This was the only waiver the DRB approved.

- The revised Site Plan was basically the same as the Stage II approval. The buildings were pushed farther back to comply with all the minimum setbacks of the zone, and one, four-unit building was reduced to three-units to create a neighborhood raised-bed vegetable garden.
- Another challenge was that the original conceptual plan showed building elevations with a saw tooth-type of roof pattern, as shown on Page 4 of 23 of the Staff report. Feedback received during public testimony, from the DRB, and even from Council members through the public hearing process indicated concern about having a very contemporary saw tooth pattern. So, the Applicant returned with more of a traditional, gable roof design that was more compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. He believed the Applicant had done what the City had asked by returning with a design that fit into this neighborhood more appropriately.
- The only entrance into the site was on Willamette Way East and it aligned with the entrance opposite of the Valley Christian Church, so no conflicting turning movements existed.
- The project was very well parked, which had been an issue in the beginning. The Applicant now proposed 29 surface parking and 15 garage parking spaces for a total of 44 spaces, resulting in about 2.93 parking spaces per unit. While nothing precluded people from parking along Willamette Way East, the idea was that with adequate parking on site that should not occur unless some special event was happening. Chantilly is a one-way road with no street parking and Wilsonville Rd has a bike path so no parking is allowed. So, any overflow parking would probably be at the east side of the property.
 - The Applicant worked very closely with Steve Adams, the City's Private Development Civil Engineer. Concerns were expressed about creating a safe route to schools on the east side of the property. The sidewalk was actually a 10-foot wide, shared, multi-modal path, a pedestrian/bike facility, that would take school-aged children or anybody going to the middle and primary schools across Wilsonville Rd where a signal exists. Eventually, this multi-modal path would continue south along the power line easement, over to the water treatment plant and beyond as part of the Tonquin Trail System. The sidewalk would be built this summer.
 - City Council expressed concerns about having a safe crossing to get to the east side of Willamette Way East, which was why the bulb out was designed at the southeast corner of the property.
 - Council also wanted a ramp for people to access the sidewalk at the very south side of the property, as no sidewalks exist along Chantilly on either side. The Applicant worked hard to create internal pedestrian sidewalk systems, which he noted continues to the common open space.
- The Colors Materials Board, Exhibit B17, was circulated to the Board. He understood the buildings would all be painted in the same color scheme, not in an alternating pattern. He offered to circulate the exhibit in the audience.
- He noted the location of the covered trash enclosure, which was proposed with concrete block walls. A condition of approval would require the Applicant to match the siding of the enclosure's 6-ft high walls with the siding colors of the apartment units. Although planting shrubs next to it would have softened the enclosure, matching the siding would make it more compatible, especially near the main entrance.
- The adjacent neighbor on the west side had some concerns about his privacy. The Applicant proposed planting Juniper and Wax Myrtle, a broadleaf evergreen shrub that provides coverage year round, to create a substantial hedge in a very short period of time. Wax Myrtle grows really fast. He believed the Applicant was also coordinating with the neighbor on building a new fence between the two properties. These neighbors testified that they were comfortable with the project next door and satisfied with the site design being presented tonight.
- Displaying the Landscape Plan, he noted that 50 percent of the site is landscaped, far exceeding the City's Development Code requirement of 15 percent. The existing pine trees at the north end of the site were preserved where the trellis arbor place for meditation would be located along with some additional raised bed yards. He reviewed the trees proposed to be planted, noting that the Katsura trees within the project met the minimum requirements for shade trees within a parking lot.

- He indicated the trellis feature, which would be a nice, attractive feature seen when approaching the project from Wilsonville Road.
- Homeowners of the Fox Chase and Rivergreen Subdivisions were concerned about the two existing signs on the post and plank fence along Wilsonville Rd. A section of the fence would be removed and probably refurbished. The Applicant intended to keep the signs and put them back on the fence, which would be a bit farther away from the entrance to Willamette Way East. No other signage was being proposed at this time for the project, but the Applicant could return for a monument sign, which the Development Code would allow to identify the project.
- He noted that the Board's role tonight regarded the Site Design Review, not the parking requirements, setbacks, or land use. All those issues have been resolved and decided upon with the Development Review Board last year and the City Council. He believed the Applicant had compromised tremendously to try to fit in with the community architecturally, and listen to a lot of the public testimony from both citizens and decision makers. He highly recommended approval of this project.

Ken Ruud inquired about any special modifications for the trash enclosure considering it was for people age 55 and older?

Mr. Edmonds replied that unfortunately, most of the dumpsters furnished by Republic were standard trash enclosures. They did not design them for special needs people. The enclosures do have gates. The Code requires at least a 10-ft opening to the gates and that an inside portion of the trash enclosure be used for recyclables as well as regular trash. This enclosure would have a roof. There's been quite a controversy as of lately with the City Council as to requirements in terms of roofing over trash, but this particular design had a roof. He briefly described how the residential truck picks up trash, but deferred to the Applicant, who might have had better communication regarding what Republic would require as far as trash collection for the 15 units.

Chair Fierros Bower called for the Applicant's presentation.

Dan Vasquez, Architect, Mildren Design Group, PC, 7650 SW Beveland, Tigard, OR, stated that Mr. Edmonds did a good job explaining the process, which has been long and not easy, but many times this type of process makes a project as good as it can be. He appreciated Mr. Edmonds' comment about the alternate roof design. He believed the Applicant had come up with a solution that was comparable and compatible with the surrounding environment, and that the project would reflect well for both the users as well as the neighborhood. He offered to discuss any of the specific details of the project.

Mr. Kohloff asked for the record if the Applicant agreed with all the conditions, including the condition that would change the exterior of the garbage area.

Mr. Vasquez answered that was correct. With regard to the trash enclosure access, he stated there would be an on-grade opening on the backside by the sidewalk as well, so one would not have to open the heavy gates to get in.

Mr. Ruud asked how high residents would have to reach to put garbage in.

Mr. Vasquez replied that he would need to do a little research on that; the typical wheel-out garbage receptacles were four or five feet high. He believed it might vary according to the different trash companies.

Mr. Greenfield stated it was not clear from drawing how that extra receptacle would be accessed without going through the doors. He assumed the doors opened out into the common parking lane.

Mr. Vasquez answered that was correct. He displayed a rendering of the trash enclosure, noting the access gates and clarifying that there would also be an opening at the midpoint in the back wall of the enclosure.

Mr. Greenfield commented it was probably four or more feet high.

Mr. Ruud asked if the firm had much experience with developing housing communities for those age 55 years and older. Did they have much experience with alternatives for the height of trash receptacles?

Mr. Vasquez replied that the Applicant dealt with the ANSI Standards for accessibility. They had done a lot of research and were very familiar with the various elements of the accessibility code, but he did not recall anything related to trash receptacles. He agreed it was an important aspect to research.

Mr. Edmonds noted another apartment under review was using trash compactors as an alternative because they are more accessible with the doorways lowered for residents.

Greg Close, Wise Investment Services Company, stated he was the real estate representative for the Applicant, who sees the trash enclosure issue as a property management issue. His particular firm was the development agent and not be the management company for this building. The firm would retain a residential professional property management company and inside that company's portfolio, there are age 55 and over projects. So the company would be well versed in how to handle this kind of issue. For this project, he understood that wheel-out trash bins would be used for recycling and trash and the trash collector would simply wheel out and load into their truck. He believed the trash bins would be the individual lightweight plastic bins and were no taller than four and a half foot, so a person could have a bag of trash, simply lift the lid and deposit it. These were not at all like a commercial bin, which is more of a metal container that is a little taller with a bigger, heavier lid to pick up. For this size and scope of project, the plastic roll about bins would be easy for the residents to access. He noted the Applicant was not targeting any special needs population, just age 55 and over. A residential base of folks not much older than himself was expected who are physically capable of many things, like planting in the garden. Although there could be some quite elderly and frail people, they would still be independent from the program at Fox Center Townhomes.

Chair Fierros Bower asked if any units would be wheelchair accessible. It looked like the restrooms on the second floor were wheelchair accessible.

Mr. Close replied the second floor would not be wheelchair accessible.

Chair Fierros Bower said the restrooms on the second floor look like they are designed much bigger than those on the first floor.

Mr. Close responded they could be.

Mr. Vasquez noted that by Code, due to the quantity of the units proposed, no units were required to be accessible. Given the program that they have and quantity and type of units proposed with the dual floor, as Mr. Close stated, accessibility requirements were very limited for this type of unit so no accessible restrooms exist in these facilities.

Mr. Greenfield complimented the Applicant on the siting, which was done very well.

Mr. Vasquez added that the units were designed with a restroom on the first floor, and by nature of the grading; every unit is accessible, especially when considering access to the garage and the front grade and steps to the building.

Mr. Close stated the entrance thresholds are all flat to grade, so there would be no barriers between the hard surface areas and the entrance to the ground floor of the unit. Anyone in a wheelchair could gain access to the ground floor of any unit, all of which have restroom facilities on the ground floor. If such a person were spending the night, for instance, they might have to use a hide-a-bed on the ground floor or something but they are restricted on the second floor.

Mr. Kohlhoff asked if the stairways go straight up or have a big turn.

Mr. Close believed the stairs go straight up.

Mr. Vasquez believed there is a turn, but no floor plan was available.

Mr. Kohlhoff noted that a number of adaptive chairs and mechanized units exist for stairways. Quite a process is involved as the State must approve it, but that option was available although a little expensive.

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

Mike Thompson stated he was the homeowner adjacent to the property in question. He thanked the people doing this project, noting they had been very easy to work with and very responsive to most of their requests and things. He stated he wanted to address the street parking issue, which, as he understood from the last meeting, would be discussed at this meeting. He noted that anytime there was any traffic, Willamette Way East can back up past those driveways, and there is barely enough room for two cars if anybody parks on one side, especially near the streetlight where people are turning and stuff. He has lived in his house since 1985 and as traffic and homes have built up, he has seen a lot more close calls so he has a real concern about the parking, if any, along that stretch. He wanted to bring that to the Board's attention because it is a real issue. Anytime that school is happening, kids are coming and going. He often parks his car there to get the mail out of the box, but never when the kids are there because it's just a zoo.

- He wants there to be no parking until past Chantilly, but he did not know if that was possible. There is just about enough room for three cars on that street. So parking at any rate, should only be on one side at the very least, because with parking on both sides only one car could fit down the middle.
- He concluded that their main concern was mostly for the kids.

Nancy Thompson stated the mail was the big issue and asked if any kind of indented pull out could be installed at the end of Chantilly for people picking up their mail from across the street as this would resolve some of the traffic issues.

Mr. Edmonds recalled this topic had considerable discussion at City Council and the DRB. While he could not fairly represent the City Engineering staff, he did recall that the street is wide enough for parking on one side of the street, but the question was on what side of the street because getting the mail on the east side of Willamette East was an issue for many residents. Additionally, there was concern about parking on the west side of the street, because drivers might not see kids or people getting their mail crossing that street. He believed the bulb out was designed at the southeast corner of the project to try to get pedestrians out least a little bit so they were more visible.

- The traffic engineer discouraged any parking along the first 250 or 300 feet along the very north side of Willamette Way East because of vision clearance issues, so the only parking allowed along Willamette Way was three or four parking spaces between the driveway and that bulb out.

- Installing No Parking signs was a challenge because the City did not have any parking enforcement mechanism. The Applicant proposed a lot of onsite parking which would hopefully discourage parking along that street, but nothing in the Public Work Standards would preclude an occasional driver from parking on one side of the street.
- He confirmed that even temporary parking in those three or four spaces would not be enforceable by the sheriffs.

Mr. Thompson reiterated that his biggest concern was safety because with one or two cars parked there and kids running across the street he was fearful that somebody was going to get hurt. Though his kids were all older and grown, he has seen some real close calls over the last 25 years.

Mr. Greenfield noted that danger was already present; it was not a particular consequence of the proposed apartments.

Mr. Thompson agreed the development would not add to it, other than people parking there.

Ms. Thompson added that cars would be coming in and out.

Mr. Springall asked if the bulb out would be matched on the opposite side of road.

Mr. Edmonds replied that he did not think so; considering the width of the street, another bulb out on the other side would create a choke point. He understood it would slow traffic, but the road was too narrow for two-lane traffic.

Mr. Thompson inquired about installing a speed bump. The safety of the children was a real issue for him.

Mr. Kohlhoff stated the City has had real issues with speed bumps. Some California Highway Patrol studies indicated that speed bumps give families a false sense of security. He recalled that the City Engineer was going to do something on the west side and bring down either some striping or yellow paint or something along there, then the cutout for the bulb would allow maybe one to two parking spaces maximum. While the additional parking would obscure, it also might slow traffic. He believed the City Engineer wanted to keep the east side clear because of the mailboxes and that was the side where traffic backed up, generally, because of Wilsonville Rd. The kids could cross at the light on Wilsonville Rd.

Mr. Thompson explained that traffic does back up from Wilsonville Rd as far as Chantilly, and then the kids cross Willamette Way East wherever they can, not necessarily at the corners, at least until they get to Wilsonville Road.

Mr. Kohlhoff noted the development was age 55 and older, so no children would be coming from the development, so this was the existing condition.

Mr. Thompson understood it did not have anything to do with the project as such, but the City should consider a plan to make it safer for the kids.

Mr. Edmonds believed City Engineer Steve Adams has gone through that entire analysis because he was asked by the City Council at the time to find a solution. He offered to provide Mr. Thompson with Mr. Adams' business card.

Mr. Kohlhoff added that once the project goes in, everyone could see how things operate and Mr. Thompson's observations could be very helpful and might affect some decisions. He encouraged him to talk with Mr. Adams, Mr. Edmonds or himself.

Lenka Keith understood that speed bumps were a concern with fire and rescue because they cannot just fly over them.

Mr. Edmonds agreed, stating their number one priority is getting to the scene as quickly as possible and every 3/10s of a second spent at each another speed bump down the road added time to an emergency response. Speed bumps throughout the city could prevent them from responding in a timely fashion.

- He reiterated that City Engineer mentioned painting about 250 to 300 ft of the curb along Willamette Way East from the Wilsonville Rd intersection yellow to deter parking. This would limit parking to two or three cars at the south end of that block. He agreed that the parked cars might slow traffic.
- He explained the City Engineer concluded that the safest route to school was on the west side of Willamette Way East, on the frontage of the Applicant's property because that was the side of the controlled, signaled pedestrian crossing on Wilsonville Rd going to the school. As that pathway continued south, it eventually crossed to the east side of Willamette Way East, providing access to the Autumn Park Apartments and beyond.

Mr. Ruud asked if the inability to install No Parking signs was certain.

Mr. Kohlhoff stated he would review it with the City Engineer. The City has and could post No Parking signs; at the same time, sometimes a yellow curb is a better situation. The City could get enforcement for parking violations as well; the City just did not do a lot of it, although enforcement is done within neighborhoods.

- The solution City Engineer Steve Adams came up with was to install the bulb out to provide a crossing for pedestrians and also some indentation for the vehicles parked south of the driveway. Parking would also be restricted in some manner north—on the west side, leaving the east side of the street open due to the mailboxes location and people stopping to get their mail.
- He reiterated this is kind of a living thing, so if what has been proposed proves to be insufficient, the City could try other things. Basically it was a balance between pedestrians, vehicle turning distances, the ability to queue a bit because of the busy road and light, and the need to get kids safely to school.

Mr. Greenfield noted this was not part of the design review phase, but an issue to be addressed by the City Engineer.

Mr. Edmonds agreed, noting it was appropriate to address during a public hearing given the public testimony from concerned citizens. The issue was extensively discussed at Council, even more so than at the DRB. He clarified that the Board was considering the site, not what was in the public right-of-way, which was the City Engineer's purview, being a licensed engineer. He agreed this was something Staff would keep working on to determine the best solution.

Mr. Kohlhoff added the neighbors have a lot of common sense, too, which the City would take into consideration.

Ms. Thompson believed the 10-ft sidewalks would be a huge improvement. The only times this was an issue was when Boones Ferry School releases because almost every child within a mile of the school walks, bikes, or rides scooters home; some parents do drive and then the traffic backs up forever.

- One problem was that this nice 10-ft sidewalk would go to Chantilly and then there was no sidewalk, so the kids bounce back and forth across Willamette Way East to be on sidewalk, which was a concern if drivers could not see the children. She asked if putting in a sidewalk would be considered.

Mr. Edmonds answered yes, that sidewalk along Willamette Way East would be extended as part of a project by the engineering staff, but it was not part of the subject project. That connection to the rest of the sidewalk improvements was in the budget, because they realized that gap was a dangerous situation.

Ms. Keith noted that she appraises proposed apartments and the Applicant's proposal provided almost 3 parking spaces per unit, which was more than anything she had seen. Many complexes have 1 or 1.5 spaces for three-bedroom units. The Development Code required only 1.5 spaces per unit. She could not imagine needing that much parking for age 55 plus, or that there would be a need to park along the street.

Mr. Greenfield asked if the development would have a homeowners association (HOA).

Mr. Close answered, no; the units would be for rent. The property would be professional managed with leases and covenants, parking rules, regulations, etc.

Chair Fierros Bower confirmed that the Applicant had no rebuttal and closed the public hearing at 7:50 p.m.

Jerry Greenfield moved to adopt Resolution No. 253. Ken Ruud seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

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

VIII. Board Member Communications

A. Results of the March 25, 2013 DRB Panel B meeting

B. Results of the April 22, 2013 DRB Panel B meeting

Mr. Edmonds noted the material was included in the meeting packet.

IX. Staff Communications

Mr. Kohlhoff announced that the compaction on Boeckman Rd was going well, so construction is planned for this summer and hopefully would be completed by fall.

X. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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