

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

**Development Review Board – Panel B
Minutes– September 27, 2021 6:30 PM**

Approved
October 26, 2021

I. Call to Order

Chair **Samy Nada** called the meeting to order at 6:31 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: **Samy Nada, Nicole Hendrix, Jason Abernathy, and Katie Dunwell.** Michael Horn was absent.

Staff present: **Daniel Pauly, Barbara Jacobson, Kimberly Rybold, Cindy Luxhoj, and Shelley White**

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. Consent Agenda:

A. Approval of minutes of May 24, 2021 DRB Panel B meeting

Nicole Hendrix moved to approve the May 24, 2021 DRB Panel B meeting minutes as presented. Jason Abernathy seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

VI. Public Hearings:

A. Resolution No. 393. Villebois Village Center Mixed Use Development: Pacific Community Design – Representative for Costa Pacific Communities – Applicant and RCS Villebois Development LLC – Owner. The applicant is requesting approval of a Zone Map Amendment from Public Facility (PF) to Village (V) and adopting findings and conditions approving a SAP Central Amendment, Preliminary Development Plan (1) and Plan Modifications (2), Final Development Plans (3), and Type C Tree Plans (3) for a mixed-use development located in the Villebois Village Center. The subject sites are located on Tax Lots 2100 and 2800 of Section 15AC and Tax Lot 8600 of Section 15DB, Township 3 South, Range 1 West, Willamette Meridian, City of Wilsonville, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: **Cindy Luxhoj**

Case Files:

DB21-0008 Zone Map Amendment (PDP 12 C Lot 76, Bldgs A, B)
DB21-0010 SAP Central Amendment (PDP 12 C Lot 76, Bldgs A, B)

DB21-0011	Preliminary Development Plan (PDP 12 C Lot 76, Bldg A, B)
DB21-0012	Final Development Plan (PDP 12 C Lot 76, Bldgs A, B)
DB21-0013	Type C Tree Removal Plan (PDP 12 C Lot 76, Bldgs A, B)
DB21-0014	Preliminary Development Plan (PDP 2 C Lot 73, Bldg C)
DB21-0015	Final Development Plan (PDP 2 C Lot 73, Bldg C)
DB21-0016	Type C Tree Removal Plan (PDP 2 C Lot 73, Bldg C)
DB21-0022	Preliminary Development Plan (PDP 1 C Lot 12, Parking)
DB21-0023	Final Development Plan (PDP 1 C Lot 12, Parking)
DB21-0024	Type C Tree Removal Plan (PDP 1 C Lot 12, Parking)

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

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

Cindy Luxhoj, Associate Planner, announced that the criteria applicable to the application were stated starting 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 and on the City's website.

Ms. Luxhoj noted this was the final phase of Villebois to be reviewed by the DRB and included three new, mixed-use buildings and a supplemental parking area surrounding the Piazza in the Village Center. She presented the Staff report via PowerPoint, briefly noting the site's history and the project's location and surrounding features, and reviewing the proposed applications with these key comments:

- The project included three lots within the Villebois Village Center. Buildings A and B were proposed northeast and northwest of the Piazza on Lot 76, Building C was proposed for Lot 73, and the surface parking area was to the southwest on Lot 12. Key streets in the Village Center included SW Barber St, Villebois Dr, Campanile Ln, and Royal Scot Ln.
- Proper noticing was followed for the application. The notice included clarifying background information about the project and outlined adaptations for the hearing process and providing testimony that were adopted by the City in response to the Covid-19 pandemic.
 - The City received several public comments on the proposal, copies of which were in the D exhibits. Concerns raised included parking, traffic, safety, intensification of use, and added residential units, converting landscaped area at SW Villebois Dr and Barber St to parking, and removal of a previously preserved scarlet oak tree, Tree #333. Concerns were addressed under Discussion Topics in the Staff report and would also be addressed throughout tonight's presentation.
 - Following publication of the Staff report, additional comments had been received, many in support of the proposed project. Those additional comments were provided to the DRB earlier today in advance of the hearing.

- She described the planning and review process that had been designed specifically for Villebois, which is located in the area surrounding the former state-owned Dammasch State Hospital complex that operated from 1961 to 1995. Shortly after it was vacated, a master planning effort was launched, which resulted in the 2003 adoption of a concept plan ~~a plan~~ to establish an urban village on the site and surrounding properties, and the subsequent adoption of the Villebois Master Plan, most recently amended in 2013. The Master Plan adoption included zoning code language that guided how development was reviewed and defined what flexibility there was from the Master Plan as development occurred. (Slide 5)
 - Based on the Master Plan, four Specific Area Plans (SAPs) were approved, including South, East, Central, and North. The SAP approval included books guiding the details of the architecture and community elements, such as street trees and site furnishings.
 - All proposed development had a Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) and a Final Development Plan (FDP). The PDP was equivalent to a traditional subdivision review, which looked at the layout, streets, and other functional components of development. The FDP was the detailed review of buildings, parks and open space, and other amenities and features.
- Tonight, the DRB review would address the amendment of SAP Central and adoption of PDPs and FDPs for Lots 12, 73, and 76 in the Village Center. Adopted in 2006, SAP Central included 42 acres within and 13.2 acres outside the Village Center boundary. (Slide 6) The current application affects 2.02 acres of the 42 acres within the Village Center boundary surrounding the central Piazza on the northeast and west sides.
 - Master Plan Figure 2A (Slide 7) showed the SAP Central boundary and Village Center boundary within SAP Central, as well as the range of land uses envisioned for SAP Central in the Villebois Village Master Plan. The land uses were designed to create a vibrant, mixed-use Village Center within the Villebois community that would be comprised of residential, office, retail, and other related employment uses. The Village Center was designed to include higher density residential housing, mixed-use housing, opportunities for office, commercial, light industrial and civic uses, easy-access multimodal transportation opportunities, and parks and greenway features. It was intended to be a central hub of activities, services, and transportation that would serve the larger Villebois community and provide multimodal transportation opportunities that would facilitate pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and automobile access, while connecting residents to shopping, services, recreation, and homes.
 - As designated in the Villebois Village Master Plan, the center of the Village Center would feature mixed-use condos, shown in the medium-blue on Slide 8, and was roughly the location of mixed-use Buildings A, B, and C and the parking area on Lots 12, 73, and 76 of the current application.
 - Although the area surrounding the Piazza was designated as mixed-use condos, the Village Zone was flexible in that units could be for-sale units to be owned or for-lease units to be rented, such as the apartments proposed in the current application.
 - Additionally, the Villebois Village Master Plan defined land uses in the aggregate with specialty condos, mixed-use condos, urban apartments, Village apartments, neighborhood apartments, row houses, and small detached houses comprising one

- land use group, and it did not distinguish whether the residential units within those land uses were owned or rented by the resident.
- The current application proposed a mixed-use development that consisted of three buildings and a surface parking area that would surround the central Piazza in the Village Center on three sides. The Composite Site Plan indicated the locations of the proposed buildings in relation to the Piazza, as well as the parking area southwest of the Piazza that would serve the residents, visitors, and employees of the development. Renderings of proposed Buildings A, B, and C and the Landscape Plan for the parking area were also displayed. (Slide 9)
 - After publication of the Staff report, the Applicant submitted revised ground floor plans for the proposed buildings based on City Staff discussion points and conditions of approval. (Included in Exhibit A3)
 - The area of the Zone Map Amendment included approximately 1.19 acres in the two sites of Lot 76 and .22 acre of the public right-of-way connecting them, for a total of about 1.4 acres. The request was to change the zoning for Lot 76 from Public Facility (PF) to Village (V). As the former site of the Dammasch State Hospital, land in the Village Center kept the PF zoning from this previous use until a PDP was proposed for the property. The remaining project area for the current application was rezoned from PF to V in 2006 and 2007 when PDPs were approved for development of both lots.
 - The current PDP request was the first submitted for Lot 76, hence the request to change the zoning from PF to V, which was consistent with the Residential Village designation on the Comprehensive Plan Map, as well as with the zoning for the rest of Villebois. Approval of the Zone change would enable development of the property to include two mixed-use buildings as proposed in the concurrent PDP and SDP applications.
 - SAP Central Amendment. One component of SAP Central was the Village Center Architectural Standards (VCAS), which ensures that development within the Village Center boundary is consistent with the Villebois Village Concept Plan and Master Plan, as well as with the design principles and design standards in the Village Zone. Within the VCAS were several addresses, each of which was a special overlay zone that highlighted a unique area in the development and provided additional information for the definition of architectural character. The Plaza Address was one of six addresses in the Village Center, and all the proposed buildings in the current application must adhere to the VCAS for the Plaza Address since they all front the Piazza and its surrounding streets. The requested SAP Central Amendment would refine the VCAS to implement the proposed development and applied to Lots 73 and 76, the sites of Buildings A, B, and C.
 - The proposed amendment would also change provisions of the Plaza Address to modify exterior building material standards related to façade materials and percentage calculations. The current list of approved façade materials included brick, stone, cast stone, stucco or plaster, poured-in-place concrete or precast concrete veneer, and metal panel systems. The proposed modification would add, under stucco or plaster, the phrase, "...including stucco board composed of fiber cement reveal panels" and also reduce the percentage of each building façade required to be finished with one or more of the listed materials from 75 percent to 30 percent.

- As explained in the Applicant’s narrative, the proposed revisions would allow more design flexibility for façade designs and allow the proposed project to react to the current construction market conditions without sacrificing the integrity of the finished product. A prescriptive minimum of 75 percent façade coverage from a small list of finished materials would significantly impact the design opportunities for façade design, especially when pursuing a contemporary design aesthetic as proposed with the project. The price point of this small list of finished materials was significantly higher than the “additional” approved exterior finished materials, such as fiber cement lap siding, thereby forcing a higher construction cost without taking into account the overall design aesthetic. The proposed revisions to Plaza Address would not remove or revise the materials list. Instead, the proposed revisions allow more flexibility in achieving the approved materials in a cost-effective manner.
 - Staff agreed with the Applicant that the proposed changes provided design flexibility to accentuate the ground floor of each building and provide architectural consistency along the central plaza.
 - The materials defined each building space and distinguished it from the painted fiber cement lap siding above that was the primary finish material for private housing at the remainder of each building. The end result, including the already-constructed Domain at Villebois, would be four unique façade designs that would wrap the central plaza with complementary finish materials and color palettes. The brick veneer, storefront windows, and steel canopies would all reinforce the ground-level streetscape to make the plaza a vibrant pedestrian-friendly experience.
 - No other changes to the VCAS for the Plaza Address were proposed in the current application.
- Preliminary Development Plans (PDPs). (Slides 14-16)
 - Since SAP Central was approved in 2006, separate PDPs, as well as some modifications to the original approval, had been approved within the SAP. Since no previous PDP had been proposed for PDP 12 C Lot 76, the request for this PDP, DB21-0011, did not include a modification. The proposal for Lot 76 was to construct the two mixed-use Buildings A and B, which would include 94 apartments. Approval of this PDP by the DRB was contingent upon City Council approval of the Zone Map Amendment.
 - PDPs for 2 C Lot 73 and 1 C Lot 12 had been previously approved; therefore, DB21-0014 and DB21-0022, respectively, included requests for modifying those PDPs.
 - Modification of Lot 73 was proposed to increase the number of mixed-use condos from 24 to 30 units to 49 apartment units in Building C. The table on Slide 15 reflected the final and current approved unit counts in all other PDP approvals and modifications in SAP Central. The original SAP Central approved 1,010 units with a potential 10 percent increase or decrease over time. With approval of the proposed PDP modification to Lots 12 and 73, the density in SAP Central would be 986 units, resulting in a less than 10 percent change to the unit counts in SAP Central while continuing to meet the density requirement across Villebois. The proposal also resulted in a total of 2,568 residential units within Villebois, which met the refinement criteria.

- Proposed modifications for Lot 12 would eliminate the conceptual range of 8 to 12 mixed-use condo units previously envisioned and the three-unit residential development approved in 2018, to provide a surface parking area to serve the residents, employees, and visitors of the mixed-use development. This would result in fewer units, less density, and more parking than originally envisioned for the immediate area.
 - Because public comment had focused on development of a surface parking area on Lot 12, she believed providing background about the property would be helpful. The proposed parking configuration for Lot 12 was outlined in red on Slide 16. The 2006 SAP Central approval called for 8 to 12 mixed-use condo units on the subject site with access taken from shared alleyways. The property was never planned for park or open space.
 - The existing improved landscape on the site stemmed from the site's past use as a temporary sales office and information center for the Village Center. Such sales offices were typically heavily landscaped, even if temporary, to create a market-friendly aesthetic. The modular building used as the sales office and information center was removed some time ago. Based on public comment, it was apparent that the length of time the temporary landscaping had been in place had created the perception that the landscaping was the long-term approved use of the property.
 - In 2018, development plans were approved for Lot 12 for a three-unit residential development, including one mixed-use unit and associated improvements. However, the developer chose not to construct the approved units.
 - All proposed changes to the number of units were within the refinement thresholds identified in the V Zoning Text.
 - The proposed parking area on Lot 12 would not take access directly from SW Villebois Dr or Barber St, but rather through an existing alley, partially located on Lot 12, as well as Tracts G and H of the Villebois Village Center plat recorded in 2007. Per Note 4 of the plat, Lot 12 has an access easement over Tracts G and H. The three-unit development approved by the City in 2018 included access via the same alley, and parking added within the alley, on that portion of Lot 12. The current application proposed the same access and the same addition of parking in the Lot 12 portion of the alley as was previously approved.
- Traffic impacts for the project as proposed in the PDPs for Lots 12, 73, and 76 had long been included in the planning and construction of transportation infrastructure to serve Villebois. The number and density of units and trips had been anticipated and planned for in master planning and subsequent development proposals over the past couple decades, and the current proposal was consistent with the projections.
 - In May 2019, the City's traffic consultant, DKS, analyzed the residential trip generation of three buildings with 145 apartments proposed on Lots 73 and 76 as compared to residential trip generation estimates for all of SAP Central calculated in a 2013 Traffic Impact Study (TIS). The residential trip generation for the entire SAP Central, with the three proposed apartment buildings, was found to result in a lower trip generation than

previous trip estimates for the SAP. Therefore, no significant traffic impact was anticipated due to Buildings A, B, and C.

- In June 2021, the analysis was revised to reflect modified site plans for Buildings A, B, and C showing 11 ground floor residential units that could be converted to approximately 7,300 sq ft of retail space in the future. That analysis concluded that the proposed modifications to the buildings would result in a net increase of 22 PM Peak Hour trips, 10 in and 12 out, after conversion of residential to retail; however, the change would not cause the residential trip count to exceed those previously analyzed, and the total residential trips for SAP Central would be 578, less than the 594 trips that were analyzed in the 2013 TIS.
- Also in June 2021, DKS revised the residential trip generation analysis for Lot 12, which was approved in 2018 for three row homes, with one unit containing 711 sq ft of commercial office space on the ground floor. The current application, however, proposed a 24-space surface parking area to provide the supplemental parking for the mixed-use development. The revised analysis estimated that the parking area would generate 12 PM Peak Hour trips, 10 in and 7 out, of the parking spaces in the lot. Because parking in and of itself did not generate trips, all trips were assumed to be existing trips associated with the rest of the project.
- Villebois had specific parking standards that were listed in the V Zone for the proposed uses. The Applicant had worked with the City to follow the standards. With mixed-use development, parking demand was more intense than many typical developments in Wilsonville. The subject location had long been planned for mixed-use development with parking standards established accordingly. The City had carefully reviewed the parking proposal, and as detailed in the findings and outlined in the table on Slide 18, the City had found minimum parking standards were met or exceeded.
 - In summary, 167 vehicle parking spaces were required prior to the allowed offset for excess bicycle and motorcycle parking spaces provided, or 149 spaces were required with the offset. The proposal included 183 off and on-street spaces and exceeding the requirement by between 16 to 34 spaces.
- Ground Floor Spaces. (Slide 19) The area around the Piazza at Villebois was the very core of the community that called for the tallest buildings and most intense uses. The description of the Village Center in the Villebois Village Master Plan described the higher density development around the Piazza as multi-family and mixed-use development, such as ground-level retail or office and flex space uses with office or multi-family residential units above. The flex space was defined in the Master Plan glossary as ground floor units of a multi-family or mixed-use building that could be converted to office, retail, or residential uses.
 - Other language in the Master Plan that described this core area included Policy 5 under Village Center, which states, “The core area of the Village Center shall provide for mixed-use residential, retail, and employment areas that may include office uses and live/work housing opportunities.” This Master Plan language defined that the buildings around the Piazza have ground floor commercial space, which could include retail, office, flex space, live/work.

- Additionally, the Master Plan prescribed a building around the Piazza provided a mail room for the Village Center. The Master Plan did not prescribe the mix of those different ground floor uses, but a basic premise of mixed-use developments was no ground floor residential or live/work uses.
- The proposed project included a common area amenity for apartment residents, live/work units facing the Piazza, a leasing office, 2,460 sq ft of retail space, a mail center with over 900 mailboxes, and flex space residential units for potential retail conversion as uses on the ground floor of Buildings A, B, and C. Most of these uses qualified under the non-residential or live/workspaces identified in the Master Plan to occupy the ground floor of mixed-use buildings.
 - However, as stated in the Staff report and findings, City Staff did not support the ground floor units designed to accommodate future conversion for retail as flex space in Buildings B and C. Those units did not have exterior entrances, which limited the flexibility to transform the spaces. Any tenant improvements to convert to retail would be substantial. No evidence existed that market demand for retail would be greater than demand for residential so as to trigger completion of future tenant improvements to convert the spaces to retail or office.
 - The combination of financial burden of any future conversion, combined with the lack of anticipated market demand, created substantial hurdles that did not allow the units to be reasonably considered flex space. To address the concern, Conditions of Approval PDC-2 and PDC-3 required the spaces be converted to live/work units with exterior entrances and storefront treatments that included entry canopies, so that the ground floor was office, retail, or live/work. The conditions further stated that the Applicant could refine the location and mix of uses so long as other specified conditions were met. (Slide 19)
- After publication of the Staff report, the Applicant submitted revised ground floor plans for the proposed buildings based on City Staff discussion points and Conditions PDC-2 and PDC-3. The submitted materials were provided to DRB and posted on the project page on the City's website on September 20, 2021 when they were received from the Applicant.
 - The materials consisted of a memorandum, supporting Site Plan, and Building Summary Table that detailed the proposed changes, including the relocation of the retail space in Building C from the center of the building to a prominent corner of SW Villebois Dr and Barber St with an additional 760 sq ft of space; moving the Postal Center from Building C to Building A, closer to its current location at the corner of SW Royal Scot Ln and Villebois Dr; relocating the Community Room in Building A from the northwest corner to the southern corner; moving the fitness center from the southern corner to the northwest corner of Building A; distinctly-identified ground floor flex retail/residential spaces in Buildings A, B, and C; and reducing the flex space apartments from 11 to 10, resulting in an overall unit count of 142, rather than 143, apartments.
 - The updated Plan did not alter demonstrated compliance with applicable development standards, VCAS, or Community Elements Book requirements. No modifications to the circulation, utility, grading, or landscape plans for Buildings A, B, or C were proposed. The modified Site Plan did not impact or alter the Zone Map Amendment, SAP amendment, or Type C Tree Removal applications for development of Buildings A and

- B on Lot 76, or Building C on Lot 73, or impact or alter the PDP, FDP, or Type C Tree Removal applications for the surface parking area on Lot 12.
- Postal Center Restroom. When originally located in Building C, the Postal Center had a restroom interior to the space; however, in the Applicant's revised plan set, the relocated Postal Center did not have a restroom interior to or accessible from the space. The Parks Programming Matrix in the Villebois Village Master Plan included a condition of approval specifying that at least one restroom must be located in a ground floor location accessible by the general public from the Postal Center. To assure compliance, Staff recommended Condition PDC 4 be added to specify at least one restroom be placed in a ground floor location with access to the general public from the Postal Center. (Slide 21)
 - There were three Final Development Plan (FDP) requests for the proposed project. Approval of DB21-0012, the FDP for Lot 76, by the DRB was contingent on City Council approval of the Zone Map Amendment. FDPs provide details about architecture, landscaping, lighting, signage, and residential amenities consistent with the requirements of the SAP Central Community Elements book and VCAS. The submitted FDPs met all requirements of the applicable standards, or would with conditions of approval.
 - With respect to the landscaping and screening of the proposed surface parking area on Lot 12, the SAP Central Plan and Villebois Village Master Plan did not indicate any required community fencing within the subject site. The VCAS indicated that fencing was optional in the Plaza Address and where provided should be consistent with the architecture.
 - The Applicant proposed 6-ft high vine support fence, consisting of welded wire mesh fencing with cedar posts around the entire surface parking area with breaks for pedestrian and vehicle access points. Star jasmine, a blooming, broadleaf evergreen, was proposed to vegetate the fence and provide a visual barrier between the parking area and surrounding properties. A visual sample was provided on Slide 23.
 - With respect to solid waste and recyclable storage in Buildings A, B, and C, the storage requirement for the mixed-use development was based on the number of residential uses and retail square footage. The trash storage room, as proposed in Buildings A, B, and C, would serve both the residential and retail uses on the site. Per the Applicant, the required storage space was calculated assuming a 4-ft storage height for solid waste recyclables and no vertical or stacked storage.
 - Although the Applicant stated that the buildings provided adequate storage space for solid waste and recyclables as noted in the compliance letters provided in the submitted materials by Republic Services, the actual calculation was not included in their narrative or findings. Therefore, Staff was unable to determine whether the standard was met. Staff recommended adding Condition PDD 5, which required the Applicant to demonstrate the solid waste and mixed recyclables storage rooms in all three buildings met the required Code standards. (Slide 24)
 - Three requests for Type C Tree Removal Plan were also requested, though approval of DB21-0013, the Type C Tree Plan for Lot 76, was contingent on City Council approval of the Zone Map Amendment.
 - A combined total of 12 trees were on the sites of the proposed project, and trees in areas adjacent to the lots, as well as street trees, could be affected by construction. Lot 73 had

six trees, including one London plane, one red maple, one Oregon white oak, and two Austrian pines. The Oregon white oak was in poor condition, with dead and broken branches, crown decay, and top dieback. Lot 76 had four trees, including two pin oaks, one of which was identified as Important, but with blackberries surrounding the trunk that limited the arborist's assessment, and two scarlet oaks, both in poor condition.

- The two trees on Lot 12 included one red maple and one scarlet oak. Staff noted that Tree #333, the scarlet oak, had long been designated for retention as an Important tree, but the tree was not part of the City's Heritage Tree Program. Previous unbuilt approvals for the site preserved the subject tree; however, the tree sustained substantial damage during the February 2021 ice storm. According to the arborist's report, the storm's damage led to the loss of two very large scaffold branches and broken leaders along the smaller branches. The property owner discussed requesting removal separately, but elected to include the removal request in the current application.
 - The City acknowledged that recent damage to the previously important tree had impacted its long-term viability and supported the Applicant's request to remove the tree regardless of what development occurred on the site.
- All 12 onsite trees were proposed for removal due to conditions and unavoidable construction impacts. All trees adjacent to the site, and street trees, would be retained and protected during construction.
- Based on the findings of fact, information included in the Staff report, and information received from the duly-advertised public hearing, Staff recommended that DRB Panel B:
 - Add Conditions of Approval PDC 4 and PDD 5.
 - Recommend approval of the requested Zone Map Amendment to City Council and approval with conditions, contingent on City Council approval of the Zone Map Amendment, the PDP, FDP, and Type C Tree Plan for Lot 76; and
 - Approve with conditions the requested SAP Central Amendment, PDP modifications, FDPs, and Type C Tree Plans for Lot 73 and Lot 12.

Dan Pauly, Planning Manager, noted a correction to the Staff report on Page 9 of 113, which mentioned that Mayor Julie Fitzgerald had met with the Applicant; however, the meeting occurred before Ms. Fitzgerald had been elected as mayor.

Jason Abernathy asked if Lot 12 would only have 25 parking spaces, and who would maintain the vegetation on the wall, especially in the winter. It seemed like a temporary solution if the leaves would be gone part of the year.

Ms. Luxhoj replied there were 24 parking spaces onsite and an additional 4 on-street spaces. The proposed vegetation was evergreen and would not lose its leaves in the winter. Flowers would be seasonal, but greenery would remain year-round.

Mr. Pauly added the Applicant could clarify who would be maintaining the area, but it would either be the homeowners association (HOA) or the private owner of the parking lot.

Mr. Abernathy understood the application maintained the Oregon Rule of 1.7 parking spaces per unit. He noted in 2014, he had facilitated the Residential Parking Zone Permit because the 1.7 space requirement was a burden.

Mr. Pauly clarified that the DRB was not making parking policy or expressing preferences about parking policy tonight; the Board was only to apply the standards currently in the Code.

Mr. Abernathy noted the Traffic Analysis was conducted in June when children were home from school. He asked if that, as the lack of traffic due to the number of people working from home or staying home due to COVID-19, had been taken into account. He also expressed concern about ingress and egress to the area, noting the issues during the fire a few years ago.

Mr. Pauly replied that traffic in the area had long been anticipated and the latest traffic study was not the first one conducted. Through the master planning process beginning in the early 2000s and updates to the traffic data since then as Villebois was built out, Staff knew what the area was planned for, and what the level of density would be, and that had always been included in the assumption of future traffic and street cleaning.

Katie Dunwell asked if the parking lot was not developed into 24 spots, would Buildings A, B, and C still have met the parking requirements for the development per the Master Plan.

Ms. Luxhoj answered the requirement would still be met even without the surface parking area. The Applicant was able to take a reduction for the number of required bicycle parking spaces because they had provided more than required. That change would reduce the number required to 149 from 167 and the Applicant was providing 183 parking spaces.

Ms. Dunwell asked if the surface parking would be public or a mix of public and reserved, since one of the access points was via a private alley.

Ms. Luxhoj explained that the lot had cross-access easements over portions of the alley, which had been approved with the previous condo development. Although the development never happened, the access easement still remained.

Ms. Dunwell asked what the parking requirement would have been for the previously-approved condo that was never built.

Ms. Luxhoj replied she did not know, but believed the Applicant would provide more detail.

Nicole Hendrix asked if the 2013 Master Plan process and land use amendments had gone through a community outreach process to determine if community members were interested in mixed-use or a parking area.

Mr. Pauly replied the 2013 Master Plan update had nothing to do with the Village Center and 2013 was the last update. The last significant update to the Village Center was at or around the

original master planning in the early-to-mid 2000s. Each of those processes had gone through a full legislative process that included public outreach. All updates between 2003 and 2013 had also had full public review processes. Because most of the land uses for the Village Center were adopted by DRB in 2006-2007, nothing substantial had changed around the Village Center since 2003 or 2005.

Chair Nada asked for a description of a live/work space.

Ms. Luxhoj explained that a live/work space was a space with exterior access, like a storefront, and a tenant might use the first floor of a two-story space or the main part of a single-story space as a small office, meeting space, or for other business-related needs, and the remaining separated area was for residential use. Tenants would live and work from their apartment.

Chair Nada asked why the land was not zoned Village (V) to begin with if the Master Plan required it to be built in a specific way. When was the last time a PF Zone was converted to a V Zone?

Mr. Pauly responded that was the way it was always done in Wilsonville. The City had not rezoned any kind of vacant land. Land remained either in a holding or a prior zone pre-development until the time it was developed. That was intentional so Staff could understand how everything was interrelated and could get a full view of what was happening during rezoning. That approach tended to be more meaningful other places where there were more options for zoning. The subject application had only one option, and it was all consistent with the Master Plan, but the pattern was still followed that was used everywhere in the city.

- He confirmed the last approval from a PF to a V Zone on the Village Center was in 2016 or 2017. The neighborhood on the north end currently under construction went through a similar process; however, it was not a part of the Dammasch campus so it had County zoning, which was rezoned to the V Zone when construction started.

Chair Nada recalled applications being approved even though they were on vacant lands that were then converted. He asked if this was a standard City practice, noting there had been similar changes, but not from a PF to V Zone; there was different zoning, or some of the zoning was already the V Zone.

Mr. Pauly replied that might have been a single parcel that was brought in, which was typical. For example, Building C was a phased development, so the entire parcel was rezoned at that time, but one of the phases was never built, which left it vacant for the subject application.

Chair Nada asked if the City had a formal parking study similar to the formal study done for traffic impacts.

Mr. Pauly responded that parking studies were not typically conducted. For this particular area in the Village Center, data was collected in early 2020 on a Saturday afternoon during peak parking time and on a weekday evening to determine what percentage of on-street and other

parking in the Village Center were being used. That was data was collected and put into some draft documents, but never published in a final document.

Chair Nada stated he was unsure if what he saw in Villebois at present was what was actually planned. He asked when the study was conducted, how far off were the study's results from what was expected in the Code, or was the parking on track compared to what the Code suggested.

Scott Mansur, DKS Associates, replied that on behalf of Community Development Director Chris Neamtzu, DKS conducted an initial parking study in 2019 to evaluate the parking situation during a peak time Saturday midday and a weekday evening period. Some forecasting was also conducted for the current proposed development. In summary, there was adequate parking in the Villebois Village. In the core area, most of the on-street parking and parking in the vicinity of the proposed buildings was at 80 to 100 percent occupied, but in the Village itself, there was plenty of parking.

Chair Nada asked if he was reading the 45 or 48 on-street parking spaces correctly because he had driven by the area and did not believe he had seen that many spaces available. He asked if there were enough on-street parking spaces at present.

Mr. Abernathy interjected to add that because there were only one or two retail businesses in the area currently, he questioned how accurate the 2019 parking analysis could be. If more retail spots were added, would the area be able to handle the added parking demand without inconveniencing residents and visitors frequenting the businesses from outside Villebois.

Mr. Mansur asked Mr. Pauly if the assumptions related to retail space, office space, and units for each of the buildings in the parking study were consistent with the current application.

Mr. Pauly replied he had not looked at it in great detail in terms of how it compared. He cautioned that this was not evidence the DRB could consider because it was about policy and future operations. If the DRB were to deny an application based on an unpublished study or casual observation, it would not be defensible. The DRB needed to look at the current standards because that was the measuring stick under the law.

Chair Nada asked if the DRB knew 100 percent that the new development would cause a parking problem, the Board could not deny it because of the parking.

Mr. Pauly responded that was correct. Under State law, the current proposal was needed housing and there was clear, objective criteria that the DRB had to apply to it.

- He added that in terms of on-street parking, there was the concept of usable and accessible; however, the Code was written such that it gave the adjacent development first preference to that on-street parking. Even if it was used currently or had been used for years by nearby residents, new residents were also entitled to use those spots per the Code. The allowance

under the Code that entitled residents to use that on-street parking pushed some of the existing use elsewhere.

Chair Nada clarified his observations were by no means scientific, which was why he had hoped there was an updated parking study. He had not seen many other places where current residents could park once the proposed project was completed, unless they walked three or four blocks. He hoped at some point that City Council would conduct regular parking studies similar to how the City did traffic studies. He asked if the City or HOA would own the parking lot.

Ms. Luxhoj responded that it would be privately owned.

Chair Nada called for the Applicant's testimony.

The Board took a brief recess at 7:56 pm to allow the Applicant time to address technical difficulties. The meeting was reconvened at 8:05 pm.

Rudy Kadlub, President, Costa Pacific Communities, Villebois Master Planner, 9420 SE Lawnfield Rd, Clackamas, OR, gave a brief history of Villebois and the master planning process for new Board members. In the late 1980s, the State of Oregon closed Dammasch State Hospital on the site and in the mid-1990s sought to repurpose the 250,000 sq ft building into a women's prison. Wilsonville and its surrounding neighborhoods had a different vision for the property and commissioned a study which became known as the Dammasch Area Transportation Efficient Land Use Plan (DATELUP). That plan laid down the framework for a new urban village designed to correct the jobs/housing imbalance that existed in Wilsonville at the time. The State and the City teamed up to find a more suitable location for the prison and to solve the City's water shortage problem at the time by creating a state-of-the-art treatment facility to provide water for the city's anticipated growth.

- With the building moratorium lifted, the State and City instituted a nationwide search for a developer to execute the DATELUP, and in 2001 Costa Pacific was selected and negotiated the purchase of the property from the State. In 2002, Costa Pacific began planning what would become Villebois. In the fall of 2002, Costa Pacific hosted a series of six community-wide meetings, attended by hundreds of citizens. During that 18-month process, the developer listened to the wishes of the community and with them, created the framework that became the largest, non-resort master plan in Oregon.
- In late 2003, a joint application was submitted for the Concept Plan and Master Plan by the City and Costa Pacific. After dozens of public meetings in 2004, the Concept Plan and Master Plan were approved. Zoning Amendments, the first two Specific Area Plans, a PDP, and FDPs for the first neighborhoods were all unanimously approved by the DRB, Planning Commission, and City Council in 2006. Because the public had such a hand in creating the plan itself, there was virtually no public opposition to the project.
 - Since that time, no fewer than 12 PDPs and 18 FDPs had been applied for and approved within the SAP Central alone, all of which conformed to the approved Master Plan. In addition, SAP South, East, and North had been approved, and today nearly 6,000 people

called Villebois home. In 2010, Villebois was named America's best master planned community by the National Association of Home Builders.

- The application before the DRB tonight had been in the works since 2018. In the spring of 2019, the Applicant hosted a community meeting at the water treatment facility attended by over 50 Villebois residents, and, in the summer of 2020, the Applicant shared the Plan virtually with all of the SAP Central HOAs and listened to their feedback. That feedback included concerns about the lack of retail, increased traffic, lack of enough parking, and density, all of which were addressed in the application and would be explained tonight. Additionally, the application complied with the nearly two-decade-old Master Plan.
- He commended the City Planning Staff for its thorough review of the application. The Applicant accepted Staff's findings, recommendations, and conditions of approval and urged the DRB to approve the Plan as submitted.

Stacy Connery, Pacific Community Design, 12564 SW Main St, Tigard, OR, 97223 presented the applicant's presentation via PowerPoint. She displayed an aerial photograph of Villebois and Village Center area, and described the layout of the existing building, the Domain, as well as the proposed Buildings A, B, C, and the parking lot in relation to the Piazza. Per the original vision within Villebois, the Piazza would serve as a public room for the community with buildings on all four sides to serve as walls to create a community feeling of a third space for community members to spend their time. Villebois was intended as a multimodal community designed to serve pedestrians, bicyclists, and vehicles with a primary emphasis on walkable streets. As such, most of the parking was behind homes and accessed via alleys.

- All of Villebois received a Village Zone as development applications were approved and Buildings A and B were the last remaining pieces in Villebois to receive a Village (V) Zone. The Village Code that accompanied the V Zone allowed for refinements of plus or minus 10 percent to the Master Plan. The subject site carried the Mixed-Use land use category, which anticipated ground floor commercial units with residential units for several stories above.
- The original plan density target for SAP Central was 1,010 dwelling units. With the refinements allowed via Code, that density could have gone up or down by 10 percent, so the density could have potentially increased by up to 100 units over time. Within SAP Central, each block and each land use category were identified with a range of units planned to be located within that area. The original SAP density ranges together totaled 41 to 144 units. (Slide 4) The project proposed units in Buildings A, B, and C, for a total of 142 dwelling units, resulting in a total of 985 dwelling units in SAP Central, a 2.5 percent decrease in density from the original planning effort.
 - She noted the street systems and parking had anticipated this level of density; however, the application as proposed was 2.5 percent less in density than originally planned for.

Sam Sanderson, C2K Architecture, 1645 NW Hoyt St, Portland, OR 97209, described the architectural design and building details of the proposal with these comments:

- Buildings A, B, and C would be four stories in height to match the existing Domain building. Displayed the Site Plan on Slides 6 and 7 and pointed out where all the buildings would be located and what they would contain with these key comments.

- Building A would contain 36 apartment units, as well as a large Postal Center for Villebois on the ground floor, and a public restroom, both shown in green. Other common spaces, such as community rooms, all fronted the Piazza. The upper floor plans contained all residential units. The building façade for Building A would have a light brick veneer on the corners with dark fiber cement lap siding and fiber cement reveal panels with an accent color. (Slides 6, 7, and 8)
- Building B would have 54 residential units and a retail space at the street corner, as well as a lobby and leasing spaces that would also face the Piazza. The ground floor featured flex retail spaces that were apartment units structurally designed to easily be retrofitted into retail spaces or serve as live/work units. The typical upper floor plans contained residential units with an amenity deck on Level 4 at the street corner with an adjacent interior amenity space. The building's façade would have a dark brick veneer at the building's base with light-colored fiber cement lap siding and dark fiber cement reveal panels. (Slides 6, 7, and 9)
- Building C had 52 apartment units, a retail space at the street corner, and lobby spaces facing the Piazza. The flex retail spaces were also apartment units structurally designed to be easily retrofitted into retail spaces or to serve as live/work units. The upper floor plans were all residential units. The building's façade would have a medium-tone brick veneer at the building's corners with a dark fiber cement lap siding at the middle floors and a light-colored fiber cement board and batten panels at the two building corners. The roof would be sloped at the two bookends of the building. (Slides 6, 7, 10, and 11)
- Regarding new Condition PDD 5, the Applicant's design team had sized the trash rooms after discussions with the waste management company. Part of those discussions in right-sizing the trash rooms involved the frequency of trash pickup. The Applicant would comply with the requirement for trash sizing, but requested the condition of approval identify that the frequency of trash pickup could play a factor in right-sizing the trash room, which was how the Applicant had designed it to date.

Ms. Connery continued the presentation detailing the parking for the proposal as follows:

- Slide 12 outlined the various parking areas for the project, which included off-street parking (yellow) and adjacent on-street parking areas (blue) that had been anticipated for use or the development of the sites. The Code required 149 parking spaces. The Applicant had provided 183 spaces, 138 of which were off-street spaces with 45 on-street parking spaces. With that, the project exceeded the parking requirement by 22.8 percent.
- The parking area on Lot 12 would provide 28 spaces to serve the users of proposed Buildings A, B, and C, including residents, tenants, and retail shoppers. The parking area would be signed to that effect and owned and managed by the operating company of the mixed-use Buildings A, B, and C. The parking area provided 24 off-street and 4 on-street parking spaces and was not considered to generate traffic in and of itself because it was in association with the proposed new buildings. Trips that would occur as a part of the residential/commercial components would occur regardless of whether or not the parking area existed.
 - Previously, two detached row homes and a mixed-use row home had been approved for this site. That plan had included 18 proposed parking spaces with 6 within garages, 8 off-street in the alley, and the 4 on-street spaces. The property owner chose not to go

forward with developing residential or commercial uses on the site and instead proposed the parking area on Lot 12 in response to concerns voiced from the existing residents. If a development had gone forward implementing the 8 to 12 mixed use condos identified in the SAP Central Plan and Master Plan, there could have potentially been 24 parking spaces with that mixed-use condo project.

- The Landscape Plan for the parking area showed the lot would be surrounded by vine fencing. The vegetation was an evergreen species that would provide seasonal flowering and year-round screening of the parking lot. (Slide 14)
 - The four diagonal spaces accessed via the alley were shown on Slide 13 to demonstrate how vehicles would be parked in those spaces. Notably, a grade change existed between the parking lot and alley as the home adjacent to the alley sat up higher than the alley itself. Currently, there was a mounded area where the spaces would be, but when constructed, the parking spaces would be lower than the adjacent home. Low retaining walls with vegetation screening would be built to help define the parking spaces and address the grade differential. Vehicle headlights would shine into the retaining wall and a solid wood fence currently existed along the property line. For context, she also noted the four angled parking spaces were next to some existing head-in parking along the alley.
- She concluded with images of the four buildings that would provide the surrounding walls for the Piazza and of the view standing in front of the Domain and facing the Piazza, which showed a vacant space on the other side of the Piazza. The intention from the beginning was to provide walls to the Piazza via buildings surrounding it on all sides to create a vibrant, active space for everyone in the community of Villebois to enjoy. (Slides 15 and 16)

Chair Nada stated he wanted to provide the public an opportunity to offer any testimony since it was getting late. He asked the Applicant to answer any Board member questions and provide any rebuttal afterward and called for public testimony regarding the application.

Steve Abrew, 11410 SW Barber St., Wilsonville, OR stated he and his wife had lived in Villebois for 15 years. He displayed Staff's diagram of Lot 12 (Slide 16), noting that it was a very busy area. He lived in the Seville rowhomes in the second unit from the top, and the front of his home faced busy Barber St with the rear of his home on the private drive. He believed it would be challenging for him to back out of his garage and turn. The parking structure would move traffic in a single direction because of the four angled parking spaces. It would also pose a challenge to garbage and delivery trucks. Three homes across the alley from his home had children who played in that road and around the entire area, and he was concerned about safety due to traffic through the area. He asked what would happen if the four angled parking spaces were removed. He had walked across the Piazza to get a view of the area from afar, and an idea of what it would look like with a 6-ft fence, and believed it would not be as aesthetically pleasing as the rest of the area. He believed having a structure like that was unprecedented.

Garet Prior stated his address was in the record. He lived a few blocks from the Villebois Village Center and requested that the DRB stick to the Plan and support the neighborhood's center. All types of housing for all kinds of people were needed in the community. Housing was

needed for middle class and workforce near jobs, schools, and transit. Every piece and ounce of land and how it was used should be scrutinized and thought about. He thanked City Staff and the Applicant for taking the time to methodically work through a very dense presentation in going through each one of the elements.

- He reassured neighbors concerned about parking, safety, and traffic that the neighborhood had been planned to accommodate that. Crime prevention through environmental design made an area safer when more eyes were on the street, so more people moving into the Village Center was a positive. He believed if more people had lived there during the time of the Villebois Fire, someone would have seen something and reported it. He understood the parking concerns, but believed there was ample parking within the neighborhood and also that more people should use their garages. He had spoken to other neighbors, and they had all agreed they could easily walk just a few feet farther to accommodate new neighbors and the housing needs.
- He noted that he was Co-chair of the Wilsonville Alliance for Inclusive Community (WAIC), and the Villebois development was called for in the Equitable Housing Strategic Plan. The WAIC was in favor of the Equitable Housing Strategic Plan to meet the racial and income equity gaps present in the community. The Villebois development was a very key element of that, and he asked the DRB to approve the proposal. It would make the neighborhood safer. He believed it was their choice tonight, and the Board should stick to the long-standing plan for housing for all types and all kinds of people in the Center and not restrict it by denying the application, which would cause the community to be more expensive and exclusive.

Michele Sandlin, 29008 SW Villebois Dr., Wilsonville, OR stated that she was representing the objection letter submitted to the City on September 17th and signed by 40 Villebois' homeowners affected by the parking lot. The parking lot was their main objection. They were concerned the proposed parking lot would have a serious impact on their standard of living, the value of their properties, and have a detrimental impact on their residential community, as it was out of character with the community. The Master Plan stated that the Village Center was meant to be a pedestrian-friendly, walk-in area. The parking lot would eliminate open green space in the Village Center and add more black top.

- The 40 letter-signers believed the added congestion was the most egregious part of putting a parking lot in the Village Center, which was basically a private, narrow driveway. They were also concerned about safety and security, as well as the loss of a play area for Village Center children.
- The Friends of Trees organization that she and her neighbors had consulted during the process, as well as other conservation groups, stated that their biggest concern was putting a parking lot in the middle of a village center that already had an abundance of cement. It was a significant health concern and would create a heat dome. Ground stability was also a concern. Completely paving over that space would create a water runoff issue for everyone who lived directly around it.
- Appearance and maintenance was already an issue, and neighbors believed that would be exacerbated, particularly if the parking lot was owned by a private party. The private drive

already had high density, and she agreed with Mr. Abrew that backing out of their garages was difficult as it was. Loss of privacy was also a concern.

- She noted that none of the HOAs listed in the objection letter were consulted about the Applicant's proposal except the Villebois Village Master Association, which was controlled by the Applicant. She and her 40 neighbors who signed the objection letter found it difficult to believe that was anything but intentional.
- The homeowners who signed that letter and had purchased their properties had been given a copy of the Master Plan and had put their good faith in what was stated in that document as a quality place to live, raise families, and retire. The main attraction for many of them was that Villebois was pedestrian-focused, residents could walk to the Village Center, and it was a very green lifestyle. Approval of a parking lot in the middle of the center seemed like a betrayal of good faith to a lot of the residents. She asked why the parking lot was necessary if the minimum parking threshold had been met.
- She stated that it had been reported to her and other homeowners, from multiple reports, that the subject application was already a done deal and tonight's hearing was just a formality. She wanted to know if that was true.

Chair Nada replied those questions would definitely get answered by the Applicant, Staff, and the Board.

Tracy Gilday, 1341 Stonehaven Dr., West Linn, OR stated she agreed with a lot of previous residents' comments. She owned a rental property at 11507 SW Toulouse St, which was one of the three apartments next to the proposed parking lot. Her tenants had two children who rode their bikes down the private alleyway all the time. She knew children lived in the house adjacent to the four proposed slanted parking stalls. No water line was currently installed there and one would have to be added to put parking there. The homeowner on the end was using his own water to care for the existing vegetation, so the area would look decent.

- The alleyway was very narrow, and backing cars in and out was already difficult. Adding more cars parked in the lot would create even more congestion. She believed that because Lot 12 was not based on the area's density and not necessary, it should remain as a green space. These proposed changes would decrease, rather than increase, property values.
- She asked the DRB to use her extra time to answer Ms. Sandlin's question on whether or not the proposal was already a done deal.
- She also asked if the new lot would increase HOA fees and when residents would have a say in things.

Chair Nada noted that questions would be answered after public testimony.

Duncan T Sandlin, 29008 SW Villebois Drive, Wilsonville, OR stated he and his wife had been working on the Villebois petition and to date none of them had been invited to any meetings with the Applicant. He invited anyone listening who wanted more information about what they were working on to email villeboispetition@hotmail.com.

- As a financial person, he had been asked to go over the financial concerns related to the proposed parking lot that were mentioned in the petition but had not been addressed

tonight. He had ascertained that the addition of a parking lot would more than certainly depreciate the value of the surrounding homes. That included a reduction in the growth factor for the value of the homes over time, which would decrease the return on investment for homeowners by significant amounts of money due to a decrease in demand because people would rather live next to a park or green space than a parking lot. This was a big concern because usually people's homes were their largest asset.

- The Villebois petition group had spoken with an attorney who informed them that he was willing to help anyone who wanted it, but they could also redress loss of value due to the alteration of the covenant, which was the Master Plan in this instance. The Master Plan did not allow for a parking lot as a standalone feature. It did allow for mixed-use housing and condos, but not a parking lot. Any alteration to that covenant that the homeowners had purchased their homes under would be legally actionable to redress the grievance of loss in the value of their homes going forward.
 - He advised the DRB that liability of these things fell partially on the party that altered the conditions of the covenant, the Master Plan in this case. He advised homeowners, who would more than certainly suffer some financial loss due to the creation of a parking lot, that legal action was available and invited them to email villeboispetition@hotmail.com
- To Ms. Dunwell's earlier question, there was some confusion about the rezoning or the approval of the condos previously approved to be built on the proposed parking lot space. He had been told by a City Council member that had those condos been built, there would have been three condos with a maximum of 6 parking spaces in that area.

Sheri Walton, 11507 SW Toulouse St., Wilsonville, OR stated she was one of the three homeowners that lived on the private driveway alley being discussed. She had received no notification regarding development or anything else prior to tonight's meeting in her 4.5 years as a resident of Villebois. She agreed with everything the Sandlins had said. She worried about her property value. Her home was behind an apartment complex and across the street from the proposed parking lot. She did not want the parking lot to be built. There were children who played out there.

- She was concerned about safety, including fires. Her home had been affected by the fire via a hole in the roof and multiple cars in the area had blown up. A parking lot would impede firefighters' access to her and her neighbors' homes. Traffic was already busy, and the addition of a parking lot would affect not only how the alley was accessed, but also how residents were able to get in and out of their garages, which would be a huge problem if the parking lot was approved.
- She believed the parking lot would add to crime regardless of what Mr. Prior said earlier. The area already experienced car break-ins on a regular basis and a parking lot would bring more people to the area, which could potentially increase crime even more. Her main concerns were property value, children's safety, emergency vehicle accessibility, traffic, crime, garage access, and the fact that neither she nor her neighbors had been given information to support the proposed changes to the Master Plan. She agreed with Mr. Sandlin that they had had no say. Even though it had been stated that members of the public had been invited to meetings, they had not. Furthermore, they had had no say

through the HOA because the developer had control of the HOA, not the residents, and as a resident of Villebois who would be affected by the proposed changes, that was very frustrating.

Elaine Smith-Koop stated her address was on record but stated she lived on the corner of Valencia Dr and SW Costa Circle West. She was also concerned about parking, but since that had been addressed by numerous other speakers, she would focus on pedestrian safety. Even without the new development, she felt the area was not safe for pedestrians. She walked regularly, and even at the four-way stop at Barber and SW Costa Circle West, she had almost been run over when entering the intersection because cars failed to stop. She had adopted a habit of stopping at the corner and waiting for cars to pass because drivers just rolled through the stop signs. Drivers also did not stop at the stop sign next to her home on Valencia Dr and SW Costa Circle West. She often sat outside in the mornings and evenings during the summer and was amazed at the number of traffic violations she saw. There were no patrol cars and no enforcement of traffic laws in the neighborhood.

- There was no marked crosswalk to cross the street from her house to the park across the street. Dozens of people, including children, crossed the street there, and she believed a crosswalk should be installed. That corner was already dangerous, and the added traffic from the proposed development would make it worse and increase the safety hazards. She wanted to see a reduced speed limit in the neighborhood surrounding the Piazza, a couple of blocks around the Piazza, and at the park, and possibly the installation of speed bumps.

Kevin Swan stated his address was already in the record. He supported the Villebois Village Center and the proposal to complete the Master Plan for the Central Village. He believed it was crucial to see the completion of the Master Plan in the context of the overall community, what it added, and how it completed the community. Currently, there was vacant land with no proper or beneficial use and did not provide any value to homeowners. He had recently sold his home in Villebois, but had always hoped to see completion of the Village Center and had bought in to the community in reliance that it would be a crucial community center for his family and three children. That did not happen, but he wanted to see it happen for additional friends and family and believed it was crucial.

- He found it interesting that some speakers complained about parking, but also complained about a new parking lot. He understood a parking lot was not the ideal neighbor to have, but for the overall good of the community, it was a necessary evil. He believed it would help alleviate some of the impact that added residents could have in the Village Center. While it may be inconvenient or unfortunate for those living immediately adjacent to the parking lot, Master Plans were public record, and he had looked at it before he purchased his home in Villebois. To the extent that he could deduce what it contained, he wanted to ensure that areas of the community that he was purchasing next to were designated the same in the Master Plan as what he had been told. While those could adjust and change, a parking lot or higher-density residential facility was not [2:22:59] a substantial change in use, [inaudible] surprise as some of the existing residents, who had chosen to live in the highest density center of the community.

- He believed it was crucial to allow for housing diversity. He could not have afforded his first home in Villebois, if it cost what it did today, and he felt a lot of people were being excluded from the community on that basis, so a better housing mix needed to be provided for those of less means.

Marsha Davis, 29010 SW Villebois Dr, Wilsonville, OR stated she lived in the building immediately adjacent to the proposed parking lot. She asked why the extra parking lot was necessary or even being discussed if the minimum parking threshold had already been met by the parking spaces planned for Buildings A, B, and C. She also asked why access to the proposed parking lot had to be from the already congested alley where children play and not from the street.

- She was concerned about who would manage the parking lot after construction. In the experience of residents who lived in homes that were immediately adjacent to or surrounding the Piazza, there was no parking rule enforcement anywhere in the entire Village despite numerous parking restrictions. She was concerned that a new parking lot would exacerbate that problem.

Chair Nada thanked everyone for their testimony and assured everyone that their questions would be answered. He confirmed there was no further public comment and that the Board had no questions of those who provided public testimony.

Chair Nada called for the Applicant's rebuttal.

Ms. Connery stated that the Applicant appreciated all of the public testimony provided tonight and was happy to see so much interest in the project. The Applicant believed the proposed project would complete the community. It was one of the last components to be constructed in the Village Center. The construction of the buildings around the Piazza would help to address some of the residents' concerns regarding crime and speeding. The presence of the buildings and something filling the space along those streets affected behavior. It would have an impact on vehicular and pedestrian traffic flow and should enhance the safety along those pedestrian corridors. It should have the effect of slowing traffic speeds and making people more aware that they were entering a pedestrian-dominated area. The proposed project would help to define that space as something that was intended to be active with people walking around much more frequently.

- The proposed parking lot was a part of the overall mixed-use project and not a change in anything that was in the Master Plan for the area. The Applicant had been working on the project for the last three years or so, and over the course of that time, there had been a lot of conversations with different resident groups, and even though those conversations might not have reached the residents who testified tonight, there had been a lot of ongoing conversations with people who lived in the community. One concern the Applicant had heard early on regarded the availability of sufficient parking, so the Applicant decided to forego potential development on Lot 12 and add parking in association with the mixed-use buildings to try to address those community concerns.

- As the Applicant entered into the civil design phase, they would be addressing the details of how irrigation was provided to the landscape areas and how storm water management was provided. Villebois had rainwater facilities that were planned with the parking areas to treat storm water runoff and integrate it into the larger system, so it was part of the planned infrastructure system and would be constructed along with the parking area to address both irrigation for landscaping and storm water management.

Ms. Dunwell asked why the proposed parking lot was not designed to be accessible from the street as opposed to the private alley.

Ms. Connery displayed the Parking Area on Lot 12 (Slide 13) and stated that access could not be taken off of Barber St because it was a higher classification road, and the proposed parking lot was on the corner, so taking access off of Barber St would not be safe. Villebois Dr was a collector street, and vehicular access points were limited off of roads with that classification. It would also impact and remove the on-street parking that was provided. Villebois Dr had diagonal parking on the opposite side of the street and parallel parking on the proposed parking lot side. There would be challenges with the Engineering Department if the Applicant tried to provide an access point off Villebois Dr. Access to Lot 12 was always intended to be off of the alley, and with this proposal, instead of developing a mixed-use condo building, a parking area was proposed in association with mixed-use buildings that surrounded the Piazza. It had made sense to the Applicant to continue to utilize the access off the alley as had always been intended to serve the use on Lot 12.

The Applicant addressed questions Chair Nada had noted from the public testimony as follows:

- There were no plans to change direction of the ingress and egress to the alley as it already allowed two-way traffic. The diagonal parking spaces would likely result in people backing out of those and driving in a certain direction as opposed to residents who could go either way once exiting their garage.
- The parking lot would be owned, operated, and managed by the management company for the mixed-use buildings as it was associated with those buildings. To the Applicant's knowledge, the parking lot would not increase HOA fees. Furthermore, 148 dwellings would be added to the Master Association, all of which would contribute to the HOA, so it was possible dues might go down because more people would be paying for the maintenance of the alley. At present, the alley was maintained by the existing homes on the alley, but the owner of the mixed-use project would be contributing to the maintenance of that alley as well.
- Access to the parking lot from Villebois Dr was problematic because the sidewalk along Villebois Dr was a heavily used pedestrian access to and from the Village Center and postal area. An entrance to the parking lot would create a safety conflict with cars crossing the pedestrian pathway.
- Even though parking requirements were met without the proposed parking lot, the Applicant had included it based on earlier conversations with residents and community members, going back to 2018, in which concerns were repeatedly voiced about adequate

parking. Based on that, the developer decided to give up a mixed-use building on that site in lieu of a parking lot to address the parking concerns they had heard.

Chair Nada noted that answered all of the questions from public testimony except whether or not tonight's meeting was just for show, which he would address later.

Ms. Hendrix asked if there were any safety components included with the proposed parking lot such as lighting. The proposed walls were good for privacy, but also brought safety concerns as they could provide privacy for crime to occur.

Ms. Connery replied that the walls would have some openings in the vine fencing for pedestrian access along the frontage of Villebois Dr, so it would not be a solid wall. There would be view corridors at those access points into the parking lot. There was existing street lighting on both Villebois Dr and Barber St, which would be analyzed as part of the civil design process to ensure the parking lot was adequately lit. Additional lighting would be added if needed and would be designed in consideration of the surrounding residences.

Ms. Hendrix asked if there would be any signage to alert visitors to the available parking.

Ms. Connery replied there was intent to sign the parking lot that it was intended for use by visitors and residents to the mixed-use buildings. Likely there would be signage and wayfinding associated with the commercial entities to help orient visitors to the parking lot.

Ms. Hendrix stated that it seemed like the developer was flexible about what to do with Lot 12 beforehand because based on community conversations about the need for parking, the mixed-use condo had been changed to the parking lot. She asked if there would be flexibility or consideration about changing what was developed on Lot 12 again given tonight's public testimony.

Mr. Kadlub responded that the public testimony given in opposition to the parking tonight was understandably from the people who lived adjacent to the proposed lot. However, the Applicant had had overwhelming testimony in previous public meetings from residents of other areas within the Villebois Village Center who were concerned there was not enough parking. A lot of that stemmed from the fact that although every home in Villebois and SAP Central had designated off-street parking, not everyone used theirs and would instead park where it was convenient on the street, which created concern that there was not enough parking. Residents on Barber St, Campanile Ln, and Villebois Dr were all concerned there was not enough parking and that the proposed project would exacerbate the lack of parking around the Piazza.

- In response to that, the Applicant had taken the 8 to 12 two-bedroom condos out of the plan, which would have generated 24 parking stalls and would have also had access via the alley. The Applicant had decreased the intensity of the development there. He reiterated that the testimony against the proposed parking lot tonight was from residents directly adjacent to it. Without the additional parking, and with the lack of on-street parking throughout the

rest of the Village Center, there would be a lot of unhappy citizens. The Applicant believed turning Lot 12 into a parking lot was the best opportunity to help alleviate some of the long-term parking problems in Villebois.

Ms. Dunwell asked the Applicant if they had gone forward with the 8 to 12 condos, instead of a parking lot, would those condos have had parking assigned to them in a lot and if so, how many spaces would there have been.

Ms. Connery replied that assuming the higher end of the range with 12 mixed-use condos and ground floor commercial space, it would have likely been a four-story building at a minimum. The building would have been located toward the street, and probably close to the property line similar to the other buildings in Villebois. It likely would have fronted Villebois Dr and wrapped around to Barber St with parking behind it. The four diagonal spaces would also have been utilized for that building.

Mr. Abernathy asked the width of the private alley. He understood the purpose of the parking spaces that would have been provided with the 8 to 12 condos, but now there was the potential for 24 vehicles plus people trying to find parking. He asked if the alley would be safe with trash cans piled up on Thursday morning, people backing out of their garages on both sides, increased traffic, especially on a typical afternoon with people and new residents trying to find parking. He also asked if there was an area for people to walk to and from their cars in the four angled spots. He had a lot of safety concerns with the proposed parking lot, according to IRC, as far as putting more traffic into an alleyway.

Mr. Kadlub replied that no additional parking or trips were being generated from the proposed parking lot. He believed it would actually generate less traffic and parking than the 8 to 12 condos would have. The alley was a 22-ft right-of-way with an 18-ft paved surface and two, 9-ft travel lanes.

Mr. Abernathy stated that the addition of trash cans from the units would bring that down to 15-ft wide.

Mr. Kadlub clarified the number of trash cans would stay the same because none were being added to what already exist. He explained it was easier to navigate out of an angled parking space than it was to back straight out of a garage, so those spaces were a lot less dangerous than the perpendicular stalls located just to the south of the angled spaces, and he was not aware of any adverse events with those perpendicular parking spaces in the ten years they had been there.

Mr. Abernathy asked if the Applicant could have asked for a waiver to have accesses to the parking lot from Villebois Dr or Barber St as opposed to using the alleyway.

Mr. Pauly replied the road was already built. On Barber St, there were already trees and improvements, so there was no space for an entrance.

Mr. Mansur stated he agreed with the Applicant and their findings. In this case, it was about tradeoffs. He understood Mr. Abernathy's concerns about vehicles backing out of their garages into the alley and pedestrian safety, but the tradeoff if access was provided off of Villebois Dr or Barber St were the conflict points. The Village Center was a multimodal downtown area, and that was one of the reasons the design was for access off the alley as opposed to introducing additional conflict points. The idea was to create expectations of where driveways would be to avoid conflicts with bicycles and pedestrians.

- One finding of the Traffic Study was to also provide a pedestrian connection to the public street system to avoid pedestrians walking down the alley. The addition of the proposed parking lot for traffic loading on the alley was within the design assumption for typical Peak Hour and daily traffic levels. There were plenty of other examples of similar traffic loadings with this type of facility on a two-way alley.

Ms. Dunwell understood the logic behind the location of the proposed parking area on Lot 12 was due to the mixed-use nature of the new construction. She asked if traffic flow and the number of trips could be significantly reduced if those proposed parking spots were actually reserved spots committed to residents as opposed to open for public use.

Mr. Mansur stated that typically spaces reserved for office or residential use had approximately one-third the turnover of trips than a public lot, and if the proposed parking spots were deemed reserved, it would be similar.

Ms. Dunwell asked if the Applicant had considered designating the proposed parking spaces in Lot 12 as reserved with the mixed-use and retail spaces being located behind the building adjacent on Villebois Dr.

Ms. Connery replied the Applicant could work with the management company of the mixed-use to ensure that the proposed spaces were reserved for specific units.

Ms. Hendrix asked if security was considered when determining the location of the mail room because she had seen a lot of theft from mailboxes.

Mr. Jackson replied that there had been an issue with that on other projects recently. He did not know whether or not that was a new trend, but to ensure security, they had been increasing door hardware to secure the entrance to those spaces and had added cameras in some locations. More recently developed mail centers added Amazon Hub and other automated parcel lockers that kept larger packages safe and secure. These were strategies he had seen utilized on other projects recently, and the Applicant would address added security for the proposed project as it moved forward. Ultimately, the people who utilized the space should have proper access and access control. Even though it was a public space, the Applicant would look into how to make it secure.

Ms. Hendrix asked how many bike parking spots would be made available throughout Buildings A, B, and C.

Mr. Jackson replied that all the buildings featured bike parking, and it was per the zoning requirements with a total of 234 spaces.

Ms. Hendrix asked if the intention was to start the flex space units as apartments or wait and see if there was demand for retail and start them as retail.

Mr. Jackson responded that he believed the Staff report stated that if those upfront units were residential that they be live/work spaces with their own entrances and canopies, so that was the strategy the Applicant would undertake for any residential units that fronted the Piazza. At present that included Buildings B and C, and their ground floor units would comply with the Staff condition that they be live/work spaces.

Mr. Pauly advised Chair Nada it was getting late and asked if the Board wanted to keep going, hold the entire proposal over to the next meeting for a continuance, or make a partial decision on some items and hold the remaining items to the next meeting.

Chair Nada confirmed there were no more questions for Staff or the Applicant other than his own, after which the Board would discuss the proposed development and vote. The Board would power through with the meeting and re-evaluate the other options if necessary. He asked the Applicant how many meetings they had conducted to discuss the changes, who those meetings were with, and when those meetings occurred.

Ms. Connery replied that when the Applicant was initially considering the subject project in 2018, they had held a neighborhood meeting that all the residents of the Village Center were invited to. After that, the project was put on hiatus for a while followed by meetings with HOAs conducted by Mr. Kadlub.

Mr. Kadlub added that he had met with the boards of the other HOAs, besides the Village Center HOA. The Applicant had not turned over the Village Center HOA as of yet, but there was a Transitional Advisory Committee (TAC). There were two attempted TAC meetings in July and August, but none of the TAC members showed up. Last summer, he had met with four other HOAs in the Village Center to listen to their thoughts, and their biggest concerns were the lack of parking.

Chair Nada asked if the Applicant had met with any of the residents or just HOA Board members.

Mr. Kadlub clarified that the HOA Board members were residents. He confirmed the meetings were held via Zoom

Chair Nada asked how community members were notified of the meetings.

Ms. Connery replied that the first community meeting was held in person in the spring of 2018. Notices were mailed to all property owners within the Village Center. Although the Applicant normally posted signs on property as well to identify the date and location of a meeting, she could not remember if signs had been posted for that particular meeting. Information about the meeting was shared in a Facebook group. That meeting took place at the water treatment facility and was very well attended with standing room only.

Chair Nada asked what kind of feedback the Applicant had received at that meeting.

Ms. Connery reiterated that residents were very concerned about parking and confirmed that the meeting was held in 2018.

Mr. Kadlub clarified that he did not remember the exact date, but the meeting took place on a Monday exactly five days before the arson occurred in the Village Center.

Chair Nada asked Staff if the application was already a done deal and tonight's meeting was just a formality.

Mr. Pauly replied that tonight's meeting was not a formality, although some of the component applications did not have a lot of options. He believed some of the correspondence the public may have seen centered on the zone changes for Lot 76, where there was a menu of one option that followed a precedent that had been done dozens of times during the implementation of the Villebois Village Master Plan. The lack of options could be interpreted functionally as a foregone conclusion, but those formal steps already had a lot of history and support behind them.

- In terms of design, especially the SAP amendment, new policy was not being created. The applications and decision-making around that was still up in the air, and the DRB still had the power to vote that up or down based on review of the criteria. That said, there was a lot of history, as had been stated in testimony. There was a more robust history and record for this project than typical, including legislative history from the years of Villebois planning to assumptions of the number of units, as this was a thought out Master Plan. There had always been an assumption of multi-use buildings with this range of units at this location, and all of the infrastructure, traffic, and planning that had occurred over the last couple of decades.
- It was clear that the proposed project was an allowed use. As with all projects, certain things were clear and objective in the Staff report, items that either met criteria or did not. Other items were more discretionary, such as design, that the Board had to evaluate, and in that sense, there were still a lot of decisions to be made. Other items were more about double-checking Staff and any analyses that had been done to make sure nothing was missed.

Chair Nada confirmed there were no further questions and closed the public hearing at 9:52 pm.

Nicole Hendrix moved to approve Resolution No. 393 with the Staff report as corrected by Staff and the addition of Conditions of Approval PDC 4 and PDD5.

The following amendments were made to the record:

- Correct Page 9 of 113 of the Staff report to reflect that Julie Fitzgerald had not been elected as mayor when the meeting occurred with the Applicant.
- Add Condition PDC 4 stating, *“In the final configuration of the ground floor, pursuant to the Parks Programming Matrix in the Villebois Village Master Plan and Condition of Approval PDB 2 of Case File DB12-0057, at least one restroom shall be placed in a ground floor location with access to the general public from the postal center.”*
- Add Condition PDD 5, stating, *“The applicant shall demonstrate that the solid waste and mixed recyclables storage rooms in Buildings A, B, and C meet the requirements of Section 4.179(.06), which specify that multi-unit residential buildings containing more than 10 residential units shall provide a minimum storage area of 50 square feet plus an additional 5 square feet per unit for each unit above ten, plus an additional 10 square feet per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area (GFA) of retail use in each building.”*

Jason Abernathy seconded the motion.

Chair Nada called for discussion.

Ms. Hendrix appreciated Ms. Dunwell's comment asking if the parking spaces could be converted to reserved spaces. That could potentially reduce the number of trips, which would benefit the Village Center, as that was a concern, and be a good compromise for a solution. She hoped that would happen if the Resolution was approved.

Ms. Dunwell asked if that could be required as a condition of approval.

Chair Nada replied he believed that would require a new motion. He stated that he had two main concerns with the application. He was unhappy there was no way to survey existing parking. The City just followed the Code and kept adding parking. Every time he went to Villebois, it was busy with cars and residents did not use their garages or driveways to park. He had hoped for a more recent scientific parking study, but understood the City did not conduct parking studies, and therefore, he encouraged citizens to press City Council to add parking studies because a parking problem was developing in the community, and the City needed to stay ahead of it. He was also concerned with the lack of communication between the Applicant and the citizens. The Applicant should have reached out to more people than just the HOA Boards. It was concerning that neighbors close to the project were never contacted about the project.

Mr. Abernathy agreed with the need for a parking study. The Applicant had stated several times that community members were looking for parking solutions, but the City had no way to identify those issues. He believed that was something the City was missing out on. He still objected to the parking in the alleyway, as he believed it would create unsafe conditions. The community members who testified this evening had expressed great concern about the

proposed parking lot; even though it was clear they wanted to move forward with the Village Center. He believed it was a great project that took care of housing concerns and livability. However, there was a big stop on the proposed parking lot and he wanted to acknowledge that the Board heard the concerns of the community members who testified tonight. He thanked everyone who worked on the project, adding it was a step forward in finishing Villebois.

Chair Nada acknowledged the hard work of the Staff and Applicant, and thanked the citizens who attended tonight's meeting.

Ms. Dunwell stated she echoed the concerns of Mr. Abernathy and Chair Nada. The DRB had not necessarily received a full outline. Although she understood the individuals who were near or within the Village Center were notified of a meeting, the number of objections and the surprise about the parking lot indicated more meetings should have been conducted and more citizen input gathered before proposing a surface parking lot that would change the complexion of the area.

Ms. Hendrix stated she still struggled with DRB's role, if Board members should focus on whether or not something met the Code, and whether there were certain design requirements the DRB could look at and potentially make recommendations on. She asked if Board members could incorporate public testimony into how they voted, or if it was strictly based on whether or not something met Code.

Chair Nada replied that as he understood it, denying an application was different than asking for more information or delaying the decision. Deferring a vote to receive and evaluate more information, give the Applicant time to make changes, or have City Council decide some issues, could be done.

Mr. Abernathy asked if the Board could just vote on the zoning change now, and revisit the Lot 12 proposed parking lot at another time.

Chair Nada replied they could, but first they had to vote on the proposed motion, and then another motion could be proposed. He noted that the zoning change and proposed parking lot were interconnected.

Motion failed 0 to 4.

Chair Nada asked Staff for guidance on how to proceed.

Mr. Pauly replied the Board could move forward with the zoning portion and continue the parking lot portion of the hearing to further consider the matter. If the Board decided to continue the hearing and wanted further public input, the Board would want to reopen the hearing as part of the motion.

Barbara Jacobson, City Attorney, advised that someone should make another motion on how the Board wanted to proceed, whether that was to separate and address the zoning application or to reopen and continue the entire public hearing.

Jason Abernathy made a motion to recommend approval of the Zone Map Amendment from PF to V to City Council. Katie Dunwell seconded the motion.

Mr. Pauly stated since the Board had already made a motion and voted it down, they could consider the application denied at this point. The Board could leave it where it was if they wanted.

Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director, City of Wilsonville, clarified that the Board had several options as the options on motions were not just limited to separating out the zone change, although that was one option. The Board did not vote in favor of adopting the resolution tonight with the motion that included all the Staff-added conditions and corrections. The Board could make a motion that would consider all of those applications again with an additional condition or look at additional changes that were being discussed and have different motions on the application at hand. If the DRB chose to deny it, it would have to be its own motion. She wanted to be clear that there were multiple paths the DRB could take this evening, and just because the DRB did not vote at this time on that specific motion, there were options in terms of what motions they could make.

Chair Nada asked for clarification between keeping the hearing open until the next meeting or pushing the issue to the City Council.

Mr. Pauly stated the application in its entirety could be continued to the next meeting on October 25th, or the Board could move forward with the Zone Map Amendment, so City Council could take action on that and everything else in the application could be held over to the October 25th meeting.

Jason Abernathy restated his motion, recommending approval of DB21-0008 Zone Map Amendment to City Council. The motion was seconded by Katie Dunwell and passed 3 to 1 with Samy Nada opposed.

Mr. Pauly stated that the City was up against the 120-day land use clock to approve the application, and the Applicant would need to agree to extend the 120-day clock.

Shelley White, Administrative Assistant, confirmed that Page 20 of the Staff report stated, "Planning deemed the application complete on June 25, 2021. The City must render a final decision for the request, including any appeals, by October 23, 2021."

Mr. Pauly stated the Board could see if the Applicant was open to extending the timeline, or the Board could move to call a special meeting. He clarified that Staff would confirm with the Applicant now and see if they were open to either of those options.

Chair Nada called for a brief recess at 10:12 pm and reconvened the meeting at 10:22 pm

Mr. Pauly recommended that the hearing be reopened temporarily to get the Applicant's response in terms of how they wanted to proceed.

Ms. Jacobson clarified that because the public hearing had been closed, if the DRB was going to delay its decision, the public hearing had to be reopened to get the Applicant's authority to do so and then discuss whether the hearing was being reopened for additional testimony or to give the Board time to give more consideration to what had been presented and deliberate at the next meeting. She recommended the latter option. She reiterated that the Board had to reopen the public hearing if it wanted to ask for additional time from the Applicant.

Nicole Hendrix moved to reopen the public hearing. Jason Abernathy seconded the motion, which passed 4 to 0.

Chair Nada called for comments from the Applicant.

3:37:35

Mr. Kadlub stated the Applicant was willing to extend the land use clock 30 days. In response to the Board's concerns about safety, the Applicant offered to forego the four diagonal parking spaces in the alley. He offered to gather more information or address it this evening.

Chair Nada thanked the Applicant. He said he wanted to give the Applicant more time to reach out to the immediate neighbors and hear them out before the next hearing. He asked Staff if it was feasible to find a more formal way to assess parking conditions in the area. Ideally, he would like to see a formal parking study by a professional that evaluated the parking situation at the Village, including whether people parked where they were supposed to or not.

Ms. Bateschell stated a parking study was conducted two years ago, prior to COVID-19. Staff was happy to share that study, although she was not sure about its relevance in the decision-making process.

Mr. Pauly noted that criteria could not be added.

Ms. Bateschell explained that parking rates were driven by national parking studies that generated an IPE trip generation rate associated with different land use types. That information was what drove parking ratio requirements in the Wilsonville Development Code, so those were the requirements. That was also what all of the traffic modeling was based on as well as all long-range planning for Wilsonville when Villebois was initially planned. The Villebois Village Master Plan considered the number of households and the trips that would be associated with them. That information was also used in the consideration of parking needs, which why certain housing types could take advantage of on-street parking and others could not and why different parking ratios were established for each. While a parking study could be provided, it would not necessarily inform the overall criteria and decision-making for the Village Center.

She asked if Scott Mansur wanted to added anything based on the parking study or the relationship between parking, IPE, and his traffic analysis.

Mr. Mansur reiterated that based on the parking study that evaluated all of the parking within the Villebois Village, there was available parking for this development. There were no concerns with available parking supply being provided with the Applicant's proposed development, including their parking count. In the general area where the development would occur, there was a lack of convenient parking, the ability to park right in front of one's home or destination, but there was available parking within a few blocks. That was the key finding. The development in the parking study was not inconsistent with what was proposed in this development. There was adequate parking within the Village with this application.

Chair Nada asked if there was any problem with sharing that information with the DRB. He understood they could not use the information as a basis for denial, but he wanted the DRB to look at it so long as doing so did not violate any City rules, etc.

Mr. Pauly responded that Staff would have to speak with the Committee Development Director because there were a lot of drafts in that memo at present, but he would find out if there were any components that could be shared.

Chair Nada thanked Mr. Pauly and reiterated that he hoped the Applicant would speak with the immediate neighbors about their thoughts on the project, and possibly identify other changes that could be made. Communication with impacted residents should be recent, not from two years ago. Some of those people could have moved away by now.

Mr. Pauly added that additional communication with neighbors was not a review criterion. The Applicant could propose something without speaking to any neighbors at all; that was not a great practice, but it could be done. Whether they communicate further with neighbors or not could not be used as a basis of the Board's decision.

Chair Nada replied that he totally understood that.

Mr. Pauly noted that the timeline extension was only one month, and it took time to get word out for a meeting. Experience showed that it was tough to do, and Staff did not recommend pursuing it. Certainly, ongoing conversations were encouraged, but to engage in outreach and get input within a month was a short timeline.

Chair Nada responded that he hoped it was possible but understood the situation. Removal of the four diagonal spots might be sufficient, as the Applicant had offered to do.

Mr. Kadlub stated he could contact all of the residents who spoke tonight, the ones that lived within 50 yards of the proposed parking lot, but to be fair to everyone., they would need to speak with the other 700 or so people who lived in the Village Center that needed that additional parking. That would be very difficult to do in the next 30 days.

Chair Nada understood the Applicant's concern and that the Applicant was not obligated to do so, but he wanted to encourage communication.

Mr. Abernathy thanked the Applicant for offering to remove the four diagonal spaces from the alleyway. He believed the extension would allow the Board members time to go back and evaluate what the alleyway might look like to see if they might feel better about that area. He asked if the amount of retail space was the same as discussed in the original 2003 Master Plan.

Mr. Kadlub replied that earlier in the Plan, much more retail was envisioned than at present. Back in 2002, the real estate market was such that anything could be built and people would come and buy it. The Applicant and City had great visions and excitement about having a vibrant Piazza area with shops, restaurants, and people living above, overlooking the Piazza. However, in the last decade or so, retail had begun to shrink as online shopping increased, and even more so during the pandemic. That put more pressure on brick-and-mortar retail space, so the current vision called for less retail than originally planned. Those were the realities of the marketplace today.

Ms. Jacobson explained because the Applicant had granted the request for a timeline extension, the Board now had two choices. They could close the public hearing again and think of further motions they wanted to make or continue the application to the next meeting and leave the hearing open to allow more time for deliberation or public testimony.

The following exhibits were entered into the record:

- Exhibit A3: Staff Memorandum sent via email including revised materials from the Applicant.
- Exhibits D10-D24: Additional public comment received after publication of the Staff report.
- Exhibit D25: Public comment received via email from Tracy Gilday during the hearing.

Chair Nada called for the Board members to discuss how they wanted to proceed.

Mr. Abernathy agreed it would be difficult to communicate further with neighbors with only 30 days and suggested the hearing be kept open to allow more public testimony, with a 90-second speaker cap to allow more speakers. Although the Applicant insisted that a lot of people really wanted the parking lot, the Board had only heard the opposite, so he wanted to hear that for himself.

Mr. Kadlub pointed out that it was always harder to get people to come out if they were in favor of something as opposed to those who were against something.

Chair Nada suggested they could also write letters for the DRB to read.

Ms. Dunwell understood the Applicant had also discussed her idea of making the parking spaces reserved as opposed to open to the public, as that could potentially reduce traffic by two-thirds. She asked if the Applicant was open to seriously entertaining that so the DRB could take it into consideration.

Mr. Kadlub responded they were absolutely open to that. There was no retail near that space, so it could be limited to only residential use.

Ms. Hendrix agreed with continuing the hearing in order to hear more public testimony.

Jason Abernathy moved to continue the hearing to October 25, 2021 date certain, leaving the record open for further public testimony. Nicole Hendrix seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

VII. Board Member Communications:

A. Recent City Council Action Minutes

Nicole Hendrix noted it seemed more people had submitted cards than had provided public testimony. She suggested including time estimates for presentations and public comment on the agenda to help inform those waiting to give public testimony.

Dan Pauly, Planning Manager, noted some people submit public testimony cards in order to receive notice of decision and other notices regarding the agenda item.

VIII. Staff Communications

Dan Pauly, Planning Manager, welcomed Katie Dunwell to her first hearing as a DRB-Panel B Board member.

IX. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 10:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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