

Approved
May 13, 2019

**Development Review Board – Panel A
Minutes– February 11, 2019 6:30 PM**

I. Call to Order

Chair Fred Ruby 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: Fred Ruby, James Frinell, Joann Linville, Daniel McKay, and Angela Niggli

Staff present: Daniel Pauly, Barbara Jacobson, Kim Rybold, Steve Adams, and Miranda Bateschell

IV. 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. Election of 2019 Chair and Vice-Chair

A. Chair

Jennifer Willard nominated Joann Linville as the 2019 DRB-Panel A Chair. Daniel McKay seconded the nomination. Joann Linville was unanimously elected 2019 DRB-Panel A Chair.

B. Vice-Chair

Fred Ruby nominated Jennifer Willard as the 2019 DRB-Panel A Vice-Chair. Joann Linville seconded the nomination. Jennifer Willard was unanimously elected 2019 Vice-Chair.

VI. Consent Agenda:

A. Approval of minutes of August 13, 2018 DRB Panel A meeting

Joann Linville moved to approve the August 13, 2018 DRB Panel A meeting minutes as presented. Jennifer Willard seconded the motion, which passed 3 to 0 to 2 with Angela Niggli and Daniel McKay abstaining.

VII. Public Hearing:

A. Resolution No. 360. Frog Pond Meadows: Li Alligood, AICP, Otak –

Representative for West Hills Land Development – Applicant. The applicant is requesting approval of an Annexation and Zone Map Amendment from Rural Residential Farm Forest 5-Acre (RRFF-5) to Residential Neighborhood (RN) and Public Facility (PF) for approximately 23.9 acres of property located on the west side of Stafford Road just north of Boeckman Road, and adopting findings and conditions approving a Stage I Preliminary Plan, Stage II Final Plan, Site Design Review of parks and open space, Tentative Subdivision Plat, Tentative Partition Plat (Church property), Tentative Partition Plat (School property), Type C Tree Plan, Waiver to Minimum Lot Size, Waiver to Minimum Front Setback, and Abbreviated SRIR Review

for a 74-lot single-family subdivision. The subject site is located on Tax Lots 1800, 1902, 1903, 2000 and 2200 and portion of Stafford Road right-of-way of Section 12D, Township 3 South, Range 1 West, Willamette Meridian, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Kimberly Rybold

*Case Files: DB18-0060 Annexation
DB18-0061 Zone Map Amendment
DB18-0062 Stage I Preliminary Plan
DB18-0063 Stage II Final Plan
DB18-0064 Site Design Review of Parks and Open Space
DB18-0065 Tentative Subdivision Plat
DB18-0066 Tentative Partition Plat (Church Property)
DB18-0067 Tentative Partition Plat (School Property)
DB18-0068 Type C Tree Plan
DB19-0002 Waiver – Minimum Lot Size
DB19-0003 Waiver – Front Setback
SI18-0006 Abbreviated SRIR Review*

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

Chair Ruby called the public hearing to order at 6:39 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.

Kim Rybold, Associate Planner, announced that the criteria applicable to the application were stated on page 2 and 3 of the Staff report, which was entered into the record. Copies of the report were made available to the side of the room.

Ms. Rybold noted this was the third application the City had reviewed within the Frog Pond West area. She presented the Staff report via PowerPoint, briefly reviewing the background regarding the 2015 Frog Pond Area Plan and key components of the Frog Pond West Master Plan. She described the subject site's location and surrounding features, along with the proposed applications, and proposed traffic and street improvements with these key comments:

- The proposed Frog Pond Meadows development was currently in Clackamas County, adjacent to the northeastern portion of Wilsonville.
- On Slide 2, the larger outlined portion indicated the entire property that was subject to annexation and the Zone Map Amendment. The area outlined in blue was the property subject to the subdivision applications and the various components related to the proposed subdivision.
 - The area was generally developed with rural/residential uses. The Stafford Meadows subdivision, approved last spring, was located south of the site, Morgan Farm was to the west of the site. Farther south were the subdivisions of Arbor Crossing, Wilsonville Meadows, and Landover, all of which were located within the City of Wilsonville.
 - The Frog Pond West Master Plan set the framework for development in the area and guided Staff's review of the submitted proposals to ensure they were consistent with the Master Plan, which represented the vision the community had bought into for future land use in the area. The proposed Frog Pond Meadows was generally consistent with what had been previously put forth in the Master Plan for Frog Pond West.

- The area proposed for annexation was just less than 24 acres in size. It was within the urban growth boundary (UGB), contiguous to the City's existing boundary, and had been master-planned for residential development.
 - The annexation area included the existing church property, which would remain, as well as a portion of the West Linn-Wilsonville School District Property to the west. The parcels were included because the Applicant was acquiring portions of those properties to be brought in to the overall Frog Pond Meadows application, so the annexation covered the entire area.
- Concurrent with the annexation request was a Zone Map Amendment to apply City zoning to the entire area. With the adoption of the Frog Pond West Master Plan, a Development Code category was created, called Residential Neighborhood, to implement the recommendations of the Frog Pond Master Plan. The portion of property proposed as a part of the subdivision would have the Residential Neighborhood zoning applied.
 - The remaining church and school district properties would have a Public Facility designation applied. The school property would be designated for use as a future school and a city park, as shown in the Master Plan as Public Facility (PF) on the Comprehensive Plan Map, so the zoning category was consistent. The church was also an allowed use within the PF District, which was the district that would be applied.
- The Stage I Preliminary Master Plan only applied to the smaller area that was a part of the subdivision, which was approximately 15.5 acres. This application addressed land uses, the overall proposed density, and the general provisions of open space and street layout.
 - The land use within the Frog Pond West Master Plan was broken down into different subdistricts and each subdistrict had different corresponding minimum and maximum dwelling units and different minimum lot sizes depending on whether it was a small, medium, or large lot area.
 - In looking at the overall amount of proposed residential development and whether it fell into the categories, Staff had to look at what proportion of each subdistrict was being represented in the subject application and then project whether full build-out of that number of units could be achieved with future development in the remaining parts of that subdistrict. That information was analyzed for the four different proposed subdistricts highlighted in the table on Slide 13, and the amount of proposed residential units in each either fell within or would fall within, the minimum-to-maximum range recommended for each of the areas.
 - She noted four units were proposed in Civic Subdistrict No. 12 with a footnote because, per the Development Code, medium lot, single-family regulations would apply to any dwelling units in the subdistrict, which served as the guide when looking at things like minimum lot size and other lot dimensions.
- The Stage II Final Plan focused on the function of the subdivision and the overall layout. The proposed lot layout and size demonstrated consistency with the development standards in the Residential Neighborhood Zone and the Master Plan with the exception of a few lots as specified in the waiver requests.
- The scope of the Site Design Review of Parks and Open Space was limited to the design of common tracts, streetscape, and open spaces within the subdivision. Overall the design of these spaces was consistent with Wilsonville's Site Design Review Standards and the Frog Pond West Master Plan, matching the street tree and street lighting standards to achieve the envisioned streetscape called for in the Master Plan. The design also included some enhanced plantings in one of the Significant Resource Overlay Zone (SROZ) riparian areas west of Willow Creek Dr, as well as site furnishings for some of the open space tracts, which included benches, play structures, and landscaping.

- The Tentative Subdivision Plat met all technical platting requirements and demonstrated consistency with the Stage II Final Plan request. It was consistent with the Master Plan and did not create any barriers to future development on adjacent sites in the area.
- The two separate Tentative Partition Plat requests regarded the noncontiguous school and church parcels and would facilitate the transfer of the portions closest to the subdivision for inclusion within the subdivision.
- The Type C Tree Plan considered the existing trees onsite and some of the proposed site work and grading that would occur. A substantial number of trees had been planted fairly close together in the southwestern portion of the site. Many of the trees outside of the mapped SROZ were proposed for removal as it was an overgrown grove of trees, many of which were Douglas Firs, and because the proposed Willow Creek Dr. extension would be located there. The construction of the road and the necessary grading for the lots drove the proposed removal of many of the trees.
 - Trees that would be preserved included a number of Oregon White Oaks in the large grove in the northeast portion of the site, as well as a notable 34-inch Oregon White Oak, around which a median would be constructed in Willow Creek Drive to facilitate its preservation. Some other trees on the periphery of the site would be preserved as well.
 - The Type C Tree Plan required a one-for-one mitigation. The Applicant's current plan showed 160 trees would be planted, but 235 trees were proposed for removal. When mitigation requirements could not be met onsite, Staff looked offsite for locations where the City wanted trees planted; however, no sites were currently identified for plantings, so the Applicant would pay into the City's Tree Fund in lieu of planting trees. (Slide 20)
 - The Applicant had proposed a cost of \$300 per tree as mitigation, which was consistent with the figure used in the Stafford Meadows subdivision to the south, resulting in \$22,500 paid into the City's Tree Fund.
 - Staff added some conditions, recognizing the number of trees might vary as construction proceeded and any adjustments to the total would be determined at the time of final occupancy.
- Two waivers were requested for four of the lots in the northwest portion of site to accommodate preservation of the 34-inch Oregon White Oak.
 - One waiver request was to reduce the minimum lot size for Lots 70 and 71 to slightly under the minimum 6,000 sq ft requirement to accommodate construction of the median in Willow Creek Drive.
 - To add flexibility, a setback waiver to reduce the front setback by a few feet was also requested for four lots to account for the loss in lot depth to accommodate the median.
- The Abbreviated Significant Resource Impact Report (SRIR) reviewed development activities that might impact the defined SROZ or the 25-ft impact area associated with it. Proposed development that could impact the area included minor grading for Willow Creek Dr and Brisbane St, as well as stormwater outfalls. That analysis was included in the Applicant's materials and reviewed by the City's Natural Resources Manager.
 - Some mitigation plantings of native plants were also proposed to help support the creation of a more natural drainage way in the area.
- Traffic & Street Improvements. The transportation study identified five intersections to review for impacts. Table 5 represented the current proposed project as well as other projects that had reached Stage II approval within the City even if they were not yet built, including both the Stafford Meadows and Morgan Farms subdivisions. (Slide 24)
 - All of the studied intersections would continue to perform at an acceptable Level of Service (LOS) or better at the PM Peak Hour, which met City standards for transportation impacts. One caveat to the study was the currently unsignalized intersection at Boeckman Rd and Canyon Creek Rd, which would fall below the acceptable LOS with development. However, a project to improve the intersection was

anticipated to start within the next couple of years that would add a signal, improve traffic flow during the PM Peak Hour, therefore, negating the failure of the intersection.

- Slides 25 and 26 showed the intersections studied along both Wilsonville Rd and Boeckman Rd, the overall aggregate performance with the Stage II approvals plus the subject project, and the distribution of the trips at the PM Peak Hour.
- The City would be responsible for the reconstruction and improvements of the section of Stafford Rd adjoining the development according to the cross section shown on the Frog Pond West Master Plan. (Slide 27)
- With regard to funding, once a number of building permits had been issued for individual homes and funding was available, the City would undertake construction of the project. In the meantime, the Applicant had proposed dedicating sufficient right-of-way along Stafford Rd for the City to make the improvements. All other roadway improvements included with the application were the responsibility of the Applicant to build.
- Willow Creek Dr was shown in the Master Plan as being a collector with a couple different designations. The Master Plan showed a Collector Gateway cross section design from the south at Boeckman Rd for the first couple of blocks. (Slide 28)
 - The Applicant requested a slight modification around the southernmost section to allow for some on-street parking for residents and visitors adjacent to the homes that would front Willow Creek Dr because no driveway access points were allowed along that street.
 - To the north Willow Creek Dr became an internal collector. While the cross section design would change driveway access was still limited for this section of the road, which would become narrower and the median no longer required.
 - However, there were waivers to that cross section due to the preservation of the 34-in Oregon White Oak. The street section would maintain a small median with a 44-ft median that would ultimately go around the tree in the final build-out.
 - The general standard for local street cross sections would be followed for the other local streets in the subdivision. (Slide 30)
- The Subdivision Design included two different subdistrict types. The yellow area was the small lot subdistrict and the green area was the medium lot subdistrict. Generally speaking, the small lot subdistrict featured narrower lots at 4000 sq ft and the medium lot subdistrict featured slightly wider lots with a minimum lot size of 6000 sq ft. Four attached, single-family units were proposed in the small lot subdistrict on lots that were just over 8000 sq ft combined and would have rear access from the rear on a private tract. (Slide 32)
 - For subdivisions or small lot areas that were ten acres in size, the Master Plan required that 10 percent of units in the small lot subdistrict be attached or duplexes. Although the subject property was not quite ten acres, the Applicant went along with the spirit of the recommendation and provided slightly less than 10 percent of attached housing.
 - For the other detached units, the minimum size for a medium lot was 6000 sq ft, but Lots 71 and 72 were just less than 5600 sq ft and were the subjects of the minimum lot waiver request. All other lots met the minimum standard.
 - One aspect of the small lot subdistrict was the open space requirement. With the medium and larger lots in Frog Pond, a larger land area per lot was assumed. However, the individual small lots did not have as much open space so 10 percent of the overall developable area was required to be open space and half of that had to be considered usable for playing, running around, etc. The Applicant proposed two open spaces, including a pocket park so the Frog Pond Master Plan open space requirements were met.
- The Street Demonstration Plan in the Master Plan was meant to demonstrate the desired level of connectivity to be provided in a subdivision with well-connected pedestrian, multimodal, and vehicular spaces; however, that plan was intended as a guide, and not

binding. Slide 33 showed the small variations proposed to the Street Demonstration Plan illustrated on the left. The Applicant illustrated how the modifications could still meet the overall connectivity goals of the Frog Pond Area.

- The Applicant removed one east-west pedestrian connection to meet the required minimum number of lots in that subdistrict; however, some east-west connections were still provided onsite or would be provided in an immediately adjacent development in the future. An additional pedestrian connection was also added to connect the subdivision to Stafford Rd.
- The proposed connections still provided a substantially equivalent level of connectivity throughout the subdivision, which was the Code standard required for any variation to the Street Demonstration Plan.
- Interim Street Connectivity. The subdivision had a few streets that ran north-south and did not appear to connect to anything, but a future connection could be seen on the Street Layout. (Slide 33) An interim street connection across one tract and one lot would ensure access for emergency and service vehicles to serve the neighborhood in the meantime. Once development of the street connections to the north took place, the temporary connections would be removed. (Slide 34)
- Street Trees. The Master Plan includes a street tree plan and different lists for street trees to provide a consistent feel along the different streets within the overall Frog Pond neighborhood and would ensure that a variety of street trees were provided.
 - The Applicant had proposed primary street trees on the collector streets, which were more visually prominent and intended to connect through and weave together the different subdivisions within Frog Pond as a whole. All the other trees fell into a neighborhood street tree type. In the subject subdivision Willow Creek Dr and Brisbane St were the two streets with primary street trees and all other streets would have neighborhood trees. (Slide 35)
 - The Street Tree Plan illustrated that Red Oaks were proposed along Willow Creek Dr, as they were the street trees approved along Willow Creek Dr as a part of Stafford Meadows. Likewise, American Linden were proposed along Brisbane St to continue with the same street trees approved for the Morgan Farm subdivision to the west. These two street segments would ultimately be connected so this plan would provide continuity of street trees throughout the larger Frog Pond area. (Slide 36)
 - All the other proposed trees had been approved as a part of the street tree list within the Master Plan; therefore, the proposal met the Street Tree Plan requirements for Frog Pond.
- Street and Pathway Lighting. No specific or special requirements existed in Frog Pond for gateway entrance lighting or key intersection lighting. All streetlights would be required to meet the City standard for street lighting in the Frog Pond West area. The photo on Slide 37 illustrated the approved street light design.
- Usable Open Space Tracts B and G were being considered for usable open space. Tract B was between two lots along Marigold Terrace and the dead end of Alder St. A pedestrian pathway would connect through from Marigold Terrace to Alder Street. There would also be a pavilion area, some tree plantings, and some benches. Even though it was a part of the Small Lot subdistrict requirement, this pocket park would serve the larger Stafford Meadows neighborhood, as well as the remainder of Frog Pond Meadows, by being well connected.
 - Tract G to the north was close to the Oregon White Oak grove and would contain a small tot lot play area, benches, and tables as a part of the proposed usable open space. As with Tract B, although located within the Small Lot subdistrict area, it would be accessible to the larger subdivision as a whole.
- The requirement for a landscape wall along Stafford Rd was consistent with the other two subdivisions previously reviewed and similar to the requirement along Boeckman Rd. The

wall was about 6 ft high with 4 ft of brick and a 2-ft decorative metal railing on top. That was proposed along the length of Stafford Rd where houses were proposed to be located.

- In the open space farther north, the Applicant proposed a cedar split rail fence similar to a split rail fence used in the Stafford Meadows development along the riparian area.
- The Master Plan required a 12-ft landscape area along the wall and due to the presence of power lines, no tall trees could be planted in the area, so the Applicant proposed a mix of shrubs and other ground cover plantings consistent with what had been approved for the Stafford Meadows subdivision.
- As encountered in other Frog Pond applications, balance was required to position stormwater management facilities, planting strips, houses, street trees and utilities in the subdivision. The Applicant proposed a variety of stormwater management methods, including some street-side LIDA facilities within the planting strips and larger rain gardens and stormwater tracts to provide a mix of stormwater management facilities to serve the subdivision. In doing so, the Applicant was still able to provide the required street trees and stormwater management and also hook up the utilities that would serve the individual lots.
- She entered the Planning Division memorandum dated February 11, 2019 into the record as Exhibit A3 that identified some minor changes to the Staff report related to alley access for Lots 63 to 68 along Larkspur Terrace with an attached Alley Access Plan and Section diagram. In consultation with the Applicant, questions were raised about whether a certain garage access standard would apply to the lots, so Staff wanted to clarify that those lots could take access off of Larkspur Terrace, and that the condition in the Staff report requiring alley access did not apply.
- Staff recommended approval of the Annexation and Zone Map Amendment to City Council and that the DRB approve, with conditions, the other component applications contingent on the City Council approval of the Annexation and Zone Map Amendment.

Daniel McKay asked if the change regarding the garage access standard was within the spirit of the Development Code.

Daniel Pauly, Senior Planner, replied the Code language was not great, adding the requirement was under the Garage Standards and not necessarily referring to access, but where the garage was oriented. If the building was moved up towards the alley, the garage would need to be on the alley, which seemed self-explanatory. The standard tended to have more applicability in the smaller lot districts where fitting a two-car garage on the width of the lot was a challenge. The subject 6,000-plus sq ft lots had room for backyards, so it made sense that the houses would be oriented towards the adjacent street. Overall, alleys were optional. The condition for the alley was driven by the fact that the homes on Willow Creek Dr could not take access from Willow Creek Dr and needed some sort of vehicular access into the lot, otherwise having an alley was optional.

Joann Linville noted the request for an abbreviated SRIR review and requested clarification about the SRIR Impact Area, noting the Applicant's documents stated a 50-ft area would normally be required and had requested 15 ft on either side, while the Staff report stated 25 ft.

Ms. Rybold explained when the Master Plan was adopted the Willow Creek drainage way was shown with a very generalized buffer. The drainage was perennial but it might not always have water in it. The default condition when SROZ was identified was a 50-ft buffer on all sides, which came from recommendations associated with Metro and how different areas with sensitive riparian impacts were reviewed. With the adoption of the Master Plan, the SROZ was mapped with the 50-ft buffer. Typically, more detailed site analysis was done as development progressed to identify where the sensitive habitat might be and what part of that buffer should have the SROZ designation. The 15-ft area shown in the Applicant's materials was based upon

observations that were done to look at the drainage way itself, any slopes associated with the drainage way, the existing vegetation, and to determine if it met the criteria of being SROZ. All of the City's SROZ areas had a 25 ft impact area. The impact area was meant to serve as a buffer around the mapped SROZ, so it was on both sides.

- The subject SROZ area was very narrow and essentially followed the line of the drainage way. With an abbreviated SRIR, Staff knew that some kind of activity could impact the SROZ, so the Applicant's information was reviewed by the Natural Resources Manager to determine that the use would not have a negative impact on the SROZ. For the subject property, there was the generalized 50 ft shape in the Master Plan. The SRIR showed it should not be 50 ft, but 15 ft, which left the remaining 25 ft buffer around the smaller impact area.

Ms. Linville stated on Page 17 of 74 of the Staff report, Request L, the Abbreviated SRIR Review, stated that it was contingent on City Council approval and "no conditions for this request." There were a lot of different numbers, 50, 15, 25, but no Staff recommendation stating that a review had been done and that Staff's condition was a certain kind of buffer.

Ms. Rybold replied that on Page 71 of the Staff report there were findings of fact that the Natural Resources Manager made to the requirements of the SROZ. Essentially, he said that because there were no conditions, what had been mapped and submitted by the Applicant was acceptable. There was no additional condition involved in his approval; what was mapped and in the submitted documentation was approvable as the SROZ boundary.

- She confirmed the Natural Resources Manager recommended 15 ft on either side, which had been approved, and that was also about what the buffer was in Stafford Meadows.

Ms. Linville stated the building height was addressed on Page 47 of Applicant's document. She believed the standard required larger or more mature trees for structure sizes that were 24 ft or 50,000 sq ft. The Applicant's rationale was that some buildings would be greater than 24 ft, but not 50,000 sq ft. She asked why Staff would not require larger, more mature trees for any structures over 24 ft, since the Code standard stated 'and' and not 'or.'

Ms. Rybold responded that standard was generally applied for more commercial/industrial uses when larger buildings were proposed. She did not know if it had been applied with individual residential units. It was also worded as 'may' and not 'shall.' If, for example, Staff evaluated a large industrial building with a big footprint, a larger, more mature tree, or a tree that could grow taller, would be pursued as it helped to break up the façade. There were conflicts with that type of tree immediately adjacent to a residential house because they would grow too big to be next to a house.

Mr. Pauly added that onsite landscaping was not subject to DRB review. The standard was applied when Staff looked at site design review for commercial, industrial, or multifamily buildings.

Ms. Linville noted the Applicant indicated that 348 trees would be removed, and the Staff report indicated less than that. Condition PDI-1 stated, "The approval for removal applies only to the 235 trees identified in the Applicant's submitted Tree Maintenance and Protection Plan." She asked where 235 had come from.

Ms. Rybold believed the narrative number provided by the Applicant was incorrect. They had done a larger tree survey that encompassed a greater area. Appendix F of the submitted materials included a Tree Table that showed 289 trees had been analyzed. Of those, some

trees were dead and some were merely a notation that a stump had been removed. The final number of onsite trees proposed for removal was 235.

Ms. Linville noted five areas were identified in the Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA). ODOT had recommended analysis of Elligsen Rd and I-5 at Wilsonville Rd and Staff's assessment was that the majority of traffic would be at Stafford Rd rather than at those two intersections. She asked why Town Center Loop and Wilsonville Rd, which was two blocks away from I-5, was not addressed as one of the five areas analyzed by the TIA.

Ms. Rybold responded that Mr. Adams worked with the Applicant to help scope the intersections studied within the Transportation Study. The Elligsen Rd interchange was not studied because it had been included in the larger Frog Pond Master Plan study.

Steve Adams, Development Engineering Manager, elaborated that the study for the entire Frog Pond Master Plan had looked at everything, both interchanges and a lot of the intersections. Base counts were taken at that time, so progress moving forward could be tracked. The intersections that were chosen depended upon what else was happening in the city. If another development had done a study within the past two to three months, he would use that same information for another project, as it was recently obtained and there was no need for a restudy. To date, both Morgan Farm and Stafford Meadows had been required to study different intersections, and the subject development had been required to study intersections not studied by the other two developments. This allowed Staff to keep track of what was happening at various intersections. Some were closer to experiencing problems, and he watched those more closely to see if needed improvements were triggered. Intersections at the freeways were looked at in the initial study and, as each new development came up, Staff anticipated X amount of impact would occur. Every three or four years a Transportation Modeling Study was conducted in the city. Currently, money was available in the budget to hire a transportation consultant to again, look at all of the key intersections, including Elligsen Rd/I-5, Wilsonville Rd/I-5, and approximately 8 to 10 other intersections throughout the city. That periodic study was used as a backup to ensure Staff was tracking traffic impacts correctly based on the developments that occurred. That information would be available in 6 to 8 months, but that was not stated in tonight's meeting packet.

Ms. Linville asked what led Mr. Adams to suspect that most of the traffic from the subject development would use I-205 at Stafford Rd.

Mr. Adams replied DKS Associates had a citywide traffic model and had been tracking traffic for approximately 20 years. He relied on DKS to tell him how traffic patterns were developing. Metro wide models showed in what areas people worked, lived in, and how many people would go from one area to another. All of that information was plugged into the model. DKS believed 50 percent of the traffic from Frog Pond would go up Stafford Rd to I-205 and then split either east or west from there. He relied upon their professional judgment and that their model of the city was accurate.

Jennifer Willard asked when the Boeckman Rd/Canyon Creek intersection would be upgraded to a signalized intersection and if it met the City's concurrency requirement.

Mr. Adams responded he had been working with Capital Projects Manager Zach Weigel and Mr. Weigel's staff member, Dominique Hoffman, had been assigned to that project. Both were made aware that signaling that intersection was critical as Frog Pond developed because it could fail in the PM Peak Hour. The City had money budgeted both this year and next year for the design of that intersection, the bridge, and Boeckman Rd. He understood the intersection

could get moved up as a separate package. The City wanted to design all of the projects at the same time so they were integrated and would work well together but construction might be split up as different pieces required different amounts of building time. It was likely that once design was completed later this year or early 2020 that the City could go out to bid for that intersection early, get it done, and then build the bridge and Boeckman Rd. All of the projects were anticipated to be completed within a couple of years.

- He believed the Boeckman Rd/Canyon Creek Rd intersection did meet the City's concurrency requirement, as the project was planned and funded. The intersection would only fail once all of the homes were built, 42 homes in Stafford Meadows, 77 in Morgan Farm, and all of the homes in the subject subdivision which would take a couple of years.

Ms. Willard understood, explaining she was concerned because this was the third application and she assumed a fourth and fifth application would follow, which would worsen the issues at that intersection.

Mr. Adams replied the intersection should be fine throughout 2019. He understood most homebuilding was completed for the year with nothing more being built until next year. The builder was present this evening and could speak more to that if necessary.

Mr. McKay stated that Condition PDI 3 required 160 trees; however, PDI 5 implied that less than 160 trees might be planted. He asked if a minimum number of trees needed to be specified for the development.

Ms. Rybold responded that the fee is paid when applicants apply for Type C Tree Removal permit. Sometimes this happened when Staff was in the process of reviewing other subsequent construction plans which gave Staff a better sense of what might be planted as a part of the SROZ mitigation or in a stormwater facility because those details were reviewed as a part of the Public Works (PW) permit. If Staff had documentation providing certainty that there were additional approved trees above the 160, Condition PDI 4 allowed Staff to take that into account at that point. Condition PDI 5 recognized that although the DRB approved a set of plans, as construction occurred and PW plan sets were reviewed, sometimes a water line might change or a street tree might get shifted or moved. Condition PDI 5 allowed the City to add or subtract trees but asked for an accounting of how many trees were actually planted. If 160 trees were approved, the final number might be 162 or 158, but the City would have know that number and adjust the mitigation payment accordingly.

Mr. McKay asked what happened if Condition PDI 3 was no longer met.

Ms. Rybold replied that a condition generally applied to DRB approvals that allowed Staff had to do a minor administrative review for changes consistent with the DRB approval but reflected minor changes that might come up, such as during the PW review process. Typically, for projects of this nature that usually happened at some point. That condition was how Planning accounted for those minor changes and kept them on file. Once that was done, if the number of trees changed, there was an action that accounted for that so the Applicant was still in conformance with the condition.

- She confirmed that a significant drop in the number of trees to be planted would not be a minor administrative approval because it would not be generally consistent with the DRB approval. There would have to be a very understandable reason why the number would change so drastically and a higher level of review would be required; whether it would be a Class 2 administrative review or return to the DRB would depend.

Chair Ruby confirmed that duplexes, but not multifamily housing, was permitted in Frog Pond.

Ms. Rybold added that different types of housing were envisioned in the Area Plan, but within the subject Frog Pond West area, the duplex was the highest level of density that was envisioned.

Mr. McKay noted it appeared that Lots 7 through 10 on Marigold Terrace had no street trees.

Ms. Rybold clarified that was not the case, noting Exhibit B4 recognized that the street trees for those lots were approved as a part of Stafford Meadows. Staff had Exhibit B4 because some of the proposed utility locations that would serve those lots had conflicts when compared to the street trees on the Stafford Meadows plan, so the Tree Plan the Applicant submitted with that exhibit reflected where they had modified the tree locations for those lots.

Mr. McKay noted the picture of Stafford Rd showed a significant increase in traffic on that road. In the picture, Stafford Rd appeared to be one lane in each direction. He asked if Staff's analysis had demonstrated that one lane in each direction would be sufficient once the full development of Frog Pond was complete.

Mr. Adams clarified there would be one lane in each direction and a median turn lane, and those three lanes could handle up to 18,000 vehicle trips per day. Of the City's three-lane streets, the highest volume street, Wilsonville Rd, saw 10,000 vehicle trips per day, most of which was local traffic. DKS projected that through 2040, a three-lane street was sufficient in that location. The City went with DKS's recommendation and kept the three-lane road as opposed to a five-lane road as there was nowhere to take a five-lane road into the city itself down Wilsonville Rd.

Chair Ruby called for the Applicant's presentation.

Mike Robinson, Land Use Attorney, Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, stated he was present on behalf of the Applicant, noting that Otak had done the planning and civil engineering for the application. He requested that any additional questions be asked before the hearing was completed tonight so they could have an opportunity to answer them. He agreed with the entire Staff report and the conditions of approval, but they had one change. The Applicant had spoken with Mr. Pauly and Ms. Rybold before tonight's hearing, who agreed with the Applicant's proposed change on Page 2 of Exhibit A3. The Applicant was fine with adding Condition PDD 9, but wanted to change the 4-ft landscape and non-vehicular access easement to a 2-ft landscape and non-vehicular access easement. The easements provided those who used the 20-ft-wide alley with an 18-ft driveway a little more width in the rear to back up and maneuver in the alley. The Applicant believed 38-ft between the garage and the rear of the alley was plenty of space, and had no objection to providing 2-ft in that easement, which would also provide enough room to do some landscaping, but a 4-ft easement would start to impinge on the desire to have a usable rear yard to those lots. He welcomed questions, adding it was very important that the easement depth be reduced to 2 ft.

Li Alligood, Planner, Otak, began presenting the Applicant's proposal via PowerPoint with these comments:

- She displayed the existing site conditions noting Frog Pond Meadows was the second project by West Hills in the Frog Pond area with the first being Stafford Meadows, located adjacent to the proposed subdivision. (Slide 4)
- The site plan demonstrated how the block patterns and street connections worked and joined with streets coming from adjacent properties. In Morgan Farms, Brisbane would

connect a few streets across the entire Frog Pond West area, so the Applicant planned for that future connection when developing their street plan.

Steve Dixon, Urban Designer/Landscape Architect, Otak continued the PowerPoint as follows:

- The Applicant's arborist inspected the 34-in Oregon White Oak and deemed it in excellent condition, probably due to the blackberries that surrounded it. The recommendation was to provide a preservation area with a 22-ft to 24-ft radius around the trunk. The actual diameter would be closer to 45-ft which the arborist determined was needed to preserve the sensitive area around the tree.
- The Frog Pond Master Plan cross section for this portion of Willow Creek Dr was the internal collector without a median. Preserving the tree clearly required the creation of a median. There would also be a slight median at the southern end to funnel traffic into the southern gateway portion of Willow Creek Dr, where the street transitioned from a median to no median based on the Master Plan. It made sense to continue the median and the gateway collector cross section up into the subject area. The Applicant had worked closely with City Staff and Engineering on lane width in the area and came up with a reasonable design.
 - One challenge was that the Applicant was only building half of the median, as the remainder was not on their property. Therefore, the single lane that would be provided through the area had to be wide enough to accommodate two-way traffic until the western portion was constructed. Northbound, the street transitioned back to an internal collector cross section and then entered an intersection on the next adjacent property.
- Another challenge was grading to limit cuts and fills around the tree, and he believed the Applicant had done a good job with that.

Ms. Alligood continued the presentation, noting that while the Future Street Connections illustration (Slide 9) was still conceptual, it gave a sense of how the final block pattern and street connectivity in Frog Pond West would work, and gave some basis for the stubbing out of the streets at the property lines. She noted this was probably a year out, but the DRB would see it again in the future.

Mr. Dixon added it would be subject to refinement. He explained that the pedestrian connection from Stafford Rd through Marigold and Larkspur, and the center of those blocks was removed for a few reasons. The connection did impact the minimum density, and the Applicant felt that combining a portion of that with a widened green space on the next street up in the next development, and centering that corridor visually on the grove of Oak trees and Ponderosa Pine, would make a really strong statement. Additionally, the Master Plan alignment of that pedestrian access ended up running right into an existing wetland along Stafford Rd. Since it was clearly intended to provide access through that area, moving it up and providing the major access through that Oak grove and significant open space seemed to make a lot of sense.

Mr. McKay stated that 2 ft seemed small, and asked what kind of landscaping could be done in 2 ft.

Mr. Robinson replied that internal conversations on that subject had taken place prior to tonight's meeting. The Applicant did not yet have a landscaping plan as the discussion had just begun on Friday, but 2 ft was more than sufficient to do some type of landscaping, such as ground cover or something that might be vertical.

Mr. McKay noted according to the diagram in Exhibit A3 there appeared to be a significant grade on the suggested easement. He apologized, stating he had overheard some of the

conversation about the movement to 2 ft, and asked what would be lost it remained 4 ft as proposed. It seemed that 2 ft would be terrible usable space for the property owner.

Mr. Robinson replied that people wanted rear yards. It was already fairly narrow, but further reducing the back yard due to a 4ft landscape easement would be a concern for prospective homeowners. As always, the Applicant wanted to work cooperatively with the City, and believed 2 ft could be properly landscaped. They were confident that the grading could be done in a way that would result in usable rear yards.

Mr. Dixon stated the grade did vary from north to south along the alley, and it was fairly substantial on the northern end. The opportunity exists to grade it down slightly and possibly steepen the slope. From a landscape buffering standpoint that planting would be visible on whatever that sloped edge was on the home side of the fence with the point being to buffer those homes from the alley uses as opposed to vice versa. In some cases, a small landscape wall might be required, or an opportunity might exist to terrace it a bit, but that would depend on the individual lots.

Mr. McKay confirmed the 2 ft would be measured on a flat plane, not sloped.

Mr. Robinson added the easement would be dedicated to the homeowners association (HOA), who would collect reserves from the property owners and would be responsible for maintaining it. Easements with a landscaping requirement maintained by an HOA had a high likelihood of better maintenance overall as opposed to when an individual homeowner had that responsibility.

Mr. Dixon added that constructing an alley with only single-sided access was not typical; however, the Applicant had been involved in projects in North Bethany where that was the norm. In that case, there was attached residential against a neighborhood collector street with single-family homes on the other side that were screened and buffered with a fence.

Ms. Linville asked if the property line would remain the same if the 4-ft easement was reduced to 2 ft. She asked if the fence would move out farther, giving the property owner the 2 ft.

Mr. Robinson clarified the property line would not change with the easement, which meant another entity had interest in that property. The property owner would continue to own that area but it was used by the HOA for landscaping.

Ms. Linville asked why a homeowner would give up 2 ft of yard space so the alley would look pretty.

Mr. Robinson replied the Applicant wanted to minimize the reduction of rear yard space as much as possible and they were comfortable with 2 ft.

Ms. Alligood noted the Applicant had cooperated with the City on that requirement. It was not a Code requirement, but something the Applicant had agreed to provide.

Ms. Linville understood that the homes with the easement would still have front doors on Larkspur and the alley was to access the garages.

Mr. Robinson confirmed the alley was for garage access for the lots on Willow Creek Dr, which was a collector and could not have driveways, so it was alley-loaded, but that was not the case for the lots that fronted on Larkspur.

Ms. Willard asked if it was normal to have only six spots of street parking for all 74 homes. No street parking was shown on the P2.10 and P2.11 cross sections.

Ms. Alligood replied there was street parking on the local, internal streets. The only street that did not allow onstreet parking was portions of Willow Creek.

Ms. Willard said it could be one of the section lines that showed only a buffered bike lane and usually a planter of some type, adding it seemed excessive.

Ms. Willard agreed having no parking on the street would be an issue. Parking on Brisbane was limited as it got closer to Stafford Rd, but all of the local, internal streets had onstreet parking. She confirmed the only nonlocal streets were Willow Creek Dr and Brisbane St.

Chair Ruby confirmed there was no public testimony, and therefore, no Applicant rebuttal. He asked for any further questions of Staff or the Applicant.

Ms. Linville asked Staff to respond the request to change the easement from 2 ft to 4 ft in Condition PDD 9.

Ms. Rybold replied the 4-ft easement was based on a meeting Staff had with the Applicant's design team last week. She believed the Applicant had wanted to have room for a narrower columnar tree. She had been given 2 ft as a minimum to ensure a safe buffer between alley travel and the fence to prevent cars potentially hitting the fence. If that space was wider it could provide an opportunity to buffer the homes from alley use, but the 4-ft was really considered only to provide a wider variety of vegetation.

Mr. Pauly added there was no specific standard that mandated 4 ft. The space confirmed that the dwelling did not abut the alley, but had a physical separation of the dwelling from the alley. The space needed to be functional, so if the DRB believed 2 ft could be functional, it would be allowed.

Mr. McKay asked if 2 ft was the standard strip found along sidewalks.

Mr. Pauly responded a narrow street median was 4 ft with 6 ft to 8 ft being the typical space between the sidewalk and street. For perspective, a typical sidewalk was 5 ft wide.

Mr. McKay asked if any parts of the city had a smaller section, like 2 ft.

Mr. Pauly responded not that he knew of, adding that in Villebois a fence was required to be setback 2 ft from the sidewalk.

Mr. Adams stated that 2 ft from face of curb was a minimum for fire hydrants, signs, and streetlights, which created a bumper protection zone to prevent infrastructure from getting potentially hit. The 2 ft distance was used quite a bit in engineering.

Mr. Pauly stated 2 ft would accommodate some shrubs or climbing vines.

Mr. McKay asked if Staff had sought counsel about the definition regarding the dwelling and lot or was it the opinion of the Planning Department opinion.

Mr. Pauly replied it was Staff's professional opinion that it was a reasonable interpretation. If the Code was clear about mandating the lot access, it would state that all lots abutting alleys shall take access from the alley, but the Code did not say that, it said a dwelling that abuts an alley. Where the language was located in the Code also pointed to that. It was under the Garage Standards in the same section that discussed where the garage was put on the house, rather than any actual access to the garage. He had spoken with the Community Development Director who had helped develop the Frog Pond Code and said the intention was for alleys to be optional in Frog Pond. Including an access alley for the homes along Willow Creek made sense. Planning Staff agreed that from an urban design standpoint, it made design sense to have that type of home mirrored across Larkspur rather than having a different product type across the street to provide a more consistent look all the way down the street. In terms of newer development, 6,000 sq ft was a fairly large lot and would typically have a backyard. It was larger than the typical mid-size alley-loaded lot in Villebois, for example.

Mr. McKay stated the Master Plan seemed to prefer lots with the garage facing the alley, as it discussed not having garages dominating the façade and having the front area for pedestrian access and not vehicle. He asked if that was envisioning smaller lots, or if the four or five lots were a poor placement with an odd orientation.

Mr. Pauly confirmed it regarded small lots, adding that otherwise, the garage would have to be split from the house. Garages facing the alley were typically seen on smaller lots. In a traditional neighborhood, homes had detached garages in the back and the house in the front. The overall approach to Frog Pond was quality design, but a menu option was used as opposed to a mandate. There was a list of items that had to be checked off to make a nice-looking product, but one option was not necessarily mandated over another.

Ms. Willard stated the drawings, specifically Sheets P2.10, showed no street parking and asked if street parking could be added as a condition.

Mr. Adams clarified the Frog Pond Master Plan had all of the street details shown by the Applicant, and the 28-ft wide standard for Frog Pond allowed parking on both sides and the 24-ft wide standard allowed parking on one side. The minimum width was 20-ft wide and had no parking on either side. All of the subject details came from the adopted Frog Pond Master Plan.

- He clarified that the street details were from the Frog Pond Master Plan, which were unchangeable without approval of the City Engineer.

Ms. Linville noted it did say parking on both sides.

Ms. Willard responded that was only one section. That section was not called out on Sheet P2.00, except in one location.

Mr. Pauly stated from a Code perspective, if there was an option and a developer selected a local street that did not have on street parking, but they provided the minimum parking on the lot, there would be no legal standing to compel them to do onstreet parking as long as they met the Code parking minimum per dwelling unit. He confirmed the Code minimum of one space per unit would take precedence.

Mr. McKay understood the design, including the number of units and parking, was not being approved tonight.

Mr. Pauly responded with regard to the Lot Plan, Staff had clear and objective criteria to review the building plans. In this case, he believed the lots were big enough and he had no concern

that the Applicant would not put parking either in the garage or on the lot. If there was concern about being able to provide one space on the lot, a condition could be added that the Applicant provide at least one space on the lot, if no adequate street parking was available. He believed the Applicant's narrative indicated that at least one space would be provided on each lot.

Mr. Adams clarified that the local roads section on the right side of Sheet P2.10 stated that each one was 28 ft and that parking was allowed on both sides.

Ms. Willard thanked Mr. Adams and stated that she felt much better. She confirmed for Mr. McKay that there was parking on both sides of the local streets, which was specified in the text and not in the diagram.

Mr. McKay noted that would cover more than the minimum parking requirement because at least one car would fit in front of each house.

Chair Ruby closed the public hearing at 8:22 pm.

Staff advised how to best phrase the motion to capture the changes discussed.

Joann Linville moved to accept the Staff report with the addition of Exhibit A3 and modifying new Condition PDD 9 (Page 2 of Exhibit A3) to provide "a four two-foot landscape and non-vehicular access easement..." Jennifer Willard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Joann Linville moved to approve Resolution No. 360. The motion was seconded by Jennifer Willard and passed unanimously.

Chair Ruby read the rules of appeal into the record.

VIII. Board Member Communications

- A. Results of the August 27, 2018 DRB Panel B meeting
- B. Results of the October 22, 2018 DRB Panel B meeting
- C. Results of the November 26, 2018 DRB Panel B meeting
- D. Recent City Council Action Minutes

There were no comments.

IX. Staff Communications

- A. Welcome Daniel McKay and Angela Niggli!

Daniel Pauly, Senior Planner, thanked Fred Ruby for doing a great job as Chair in 2018, adding he looked forward to working with Chair Linville in 2019. He noted the lighter work load was expected in 2019, but the Board would meet quarterly, if only for training, discussion, and policy updates when there were no items on the agenda. He invited the Board to reach out to him with comments or ideas.

- He welcomed Angela Niggli and Daniel McKay as new DRB members, adding it had been a pleasure getting to know them as they had done some training and he believed they would be a great addition to the Board. He invited the Board members to introduce themselves and share some of their experiences on this Board and other Boards.

Mr. McKay stated he was happy to be on the Board. He was born and raised in Oregon, and had lived in Wilsonville for about 4 ½ years in the Village at Main Street. He loved the city. He

had studied economic development, but did not do that currently, so he hoped his service on the Board would help him hone back in on that skill set. He had a passion for public service. He attended a good amount of Wilsonville events and liked to get to know his neighbors. He hoped to be a productive member of the Board.

Ms. Niggli stated that she had grown up in Wilsonville. She and her husband knew they wanted to raise their family in Wilsonville and had just moved back last year from Tualatin when her son started kindergarten. She had four children and stayed home with them, but her educational background was in architecture with residential design as her major focus. Serving on the Board was a way to give back to the community, volunteer, and put her design background to use.

Chair Ruby stated was a retired attorney and a City Councilor in Beaverton from 2000 to 2006. He had lived in Wilsonville for the last few years and was impressed with the way the City operated. Being on the Board had been a good experience.

Ms. Willard stated that this was her third year on the Board. Currently, she was an Engineering Manager for Intel and most of her career had been on the project management side for construction. She had never served on a Board quite like this one before, but she had presented to such boards and this gave her an opportunity to see the other side.

Ms. Linville stated that she was probably the least qualified person to be on the Board from a planning and architecture standpoint. She grew up in the Portland area. Her undergraduate degree was in nursing and her master's and doctorate were in educational leadership and policy studies. Most of her career had been in nursing education and college administration. She had tried to retire three times, with her most recent stint had been at Rogue Community College. She considered herself basically retired, but helped where necessary. She had more experience in Boards than she did in planning and architecture, having started serving on boards in the 1970s on HOAs, as well as a health systems review board, and as President of the Regional Medical Board of Trustees for a number of years with lots of other boards and a lot of board training in between. She had served as an officer in the Charbonneau Women's Association, and was currently the Vice President of the Charbonneau Women's Golf Association. She also golfed and volunteered as a Rules Official for the Oregon Golf Association. She lived with her cat and poodle.

Mr. Pauly announced that a new associate planner was starting tomorrow.

X. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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