

**Development Review Board – Panel B  
Minutes–August 27, 2018 6:30 PM**

---

---

**I. Call to Order**

Chair Richard Martens called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

**II. Chair's Remarks**

The Conduct of Hearing and Statement of Public Notice were read into the record.

**III. Roll Call**

Present for roll call were: Richard Martens, Samy Nada, Aaron Woods, Shawn O'Neil, and Tracy Meyer

Staff present: Daniel Pauly, Barbara Jacobson, and Steve Adams

**IV. Citizens' Input** This is an opportunity for visitors to address the Development Review Board on items not on the agenda. There were no comments.

**V. Consent Agenda:**

A. Approval of minutes of the May 31, 2018 meeting  
Shawn O'Neil moved to approve the May 31, 2018 DRB Panel B meeting minutes as presented. Tract Meyer seconded the motion, which passed 4 to 0 to 1 with Aaron Woods abstaining.

B. Approval of minutes of the June 25, 2018 meeting

*Note: Due to a lack of quorum to approve minutes from the June 25, 2018 minutes in the normal fashion, staff has attained signatures of approval from all attendees. The board is asked to recognize those signatures as valid and therefore adopt those minutes as approved.*

Richard Martens noted June 25, 2018 meeting included both DRB A and DRB B members and no quorum of DRB B members was available to approve the minutes, however, the DRB B members in attendance had signed the minutes; therefore, the minutes were adopted as approved.

**VI. Public Hearing:**

A. **Resolution No. 357. Yorkshire – Three (3) Row House Development: Pacific Community Design, Inc. – Representative for RCS–Villebois LLC –Applicant / Owner.** The applicant is requesting approval of a SAP Central PDP 1 Preliminary Development Plan Modification, Final Development Plan and Tentative

Subdivision Plat for development of three (3) detached row houses in the Villebois Village Center. The subject property is located on Tax Lot 8600, Section 15DB, Township 3 South, Range 1 West, Willamette Meridian, City of Wilsonville, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Daniel Pauly

Case Files:	DB18-0040	SAP-Central PDP 1, Preliminary Development Plan Modification
	DB18-0041	Final Development Plan
	DB18-0042	Tentative Subdivision Plat

**Chair Martens** called the public hearing to order at 6:35 p.m. and read the conduct of hearing format into the record. All Board members declared for the record that they had visited the site. No board member, however, declared a conflict of interest, bias, or conclusion from a site visit. No board member participation was challenged by any member of the audience.

**Daniel Pauly, Senior Planner**, announced that the criteria applicable to the application were stated on page 2 of the Staff report, which was entered into the record. Copies of the report were made available to the side of the room.

**Mr. Pauly** presented the Staff report via PowerPoint, briefly noting the project's location and surrounding features, with these comments:

- The Applicant's specific requests included a Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) modification, as Yorkshire had been a part of a previous PDP, refinements to the Specific Area Plan Central, review of the Final Development Plan (FDP), particularly with regard to architecture, which was required because the site was in the Village Center, and a Tentative Subdivision Plat to subdivide the lot in question.
- The Yorkshire site would be where the former temporary sales trailer had been located. The modular building had been removed but much of the hardscape, and landscaping, as well as some benches that were still present from the prior temporary use. All of the streetscape in the area was developed, including the retention of a mature tree on Barber St and a large Oak tree at the southwestern edge of the property, which was proposed to be preserved. Other, smaller trees in the central part of the site were not significant and would be removed in conjunction with the development.
- He addressed a citizen's concerns expressed in Exhibit D1, noting that unlike other undeveloped sites, the subject site had some nice hardscape and landscaping installed, so it was likely perceived as an amenity to the neighborhood overtime; however, as the DRB was aware, developing this site had long been a part of the Villebois Master Plan.
- He reviewed the proposed Site Plan (Slide 5), noting Building 3 was a mixed-use row house with ground floor flex space, potentially a commercial space, with commercial storefront type windows and doors. The property was within the Plaza

Design Overlay within the Village Center, which was the same design overlay applied to the apartments just to the north that had ground-floor retail as well as to the other vacant sites around the Piazza. The overlay had very specific requirements in terms of the ground floor, building height, and other architectural features.

- The portion of the property further along Villebois Dr fell under the Courtyard Address Overlay, the same address overlay applied to other row homes in the area, called Officers Row, along Villebois Dr south of Barber St, as well as to the condo building south of this project site.
- None of the proposed project was required to comply with address overlay applied to the Seville row homes on Barber St, only with the Plaza and Courtyard addresses.
- Rear access from a small, new alley off the existing alley in Tract B would service the three proposed homes.
- Parking. Many concepts for the Villebois Village Center had been difficult to enact over the years due to the density of the site and parking challenges. However, Buildings 1 and 2 of the proposed row houses only required one space apiece, for a total of two minimum, and the mixed use building, Building 3, required one parking space for each residential unit, and two spaces for the commercial flex space for a total of five required parking spaces for the three buildings.
  - Each proposed row house had a two-car garage for a total of six spaces. There were also eight parking spaces off the alley, and four spaces along Villebois Dr that could be counted for a total of twelve parking spaces. The proposal far exceeded the five parking spaces required with a total of 18 spaces provided.
- Traffic would be less intense than what had been previously conceptualized for the site. There was actually a reduction of 34 PM Peak trips from what was originally forecasted resulting in only five more trips added, which was a minimal impact, so traffic was not a concern.
- As mentioned, the streetscape had been complete for years, so only the onsite landscaping was being reviewed as part of the Final Development Plan. The Applicant had chosen Vine Maples, understory trees, and a number of other shrubs to accent the buildings. There were no concerns. The landscaping looked professionally designed and met City Standards, including the Villebois Community Elements Book.
- SAP Refinements. While the Code allowed some variation from previous approvals, including the Master Plan and Specific Area Plan (SAP), through the refinement process, it was very specific that those changes could not be significant in terms of an objective number or more subjective standards. (Slide 9)
  - A refinement of the project's density was proposed. Originally, 1,010 units had been approved for the central part of Villebois, called SAP-Central. The subject project would result in a total decrease in density for the Central SAP of 6.73

percent, which met the numeric standard of 10 percent and still allowed some flexibility for the few remaining parcels to be developed around the Piazza.

- Regarding the change of unit types, the Code essentially had two buckets for housing units; one was small-lot, single-family homes and all the attached units, and the other was medium-lot, single-family homes and larger single-family homes. From a numeric standpoint, movement within the buckets was allowed. Since both the originally-planned mixed-use condos and the detached row houses were within the same bucket, that change was a nonissue. It came down to the qualitative urban design sense and whether the proposal met the transect of going from the densest core out to the less dense edges.
  - Staff had a lot of conversations with the Applicant about how to approach that and the end result was the taller, mixed use Building 3 at the corner, which had a lot more of the bulk similar to the mixed use buildings around the Piazza, meeting the Address Overlay. The project then transitioned down to the three-story homes that were closer in size to the other row houses along Villebois Dr. The roof forms would transition from a flat roof on the second home to a gabled roof on the third home that was similar to the remaining row houses. (Slide 11) The idea was to be thoughtful about the context and make a smooth transition from the core of Villebois to the rest of the homes along Villebois Dr and the condo project.
- Architecture. He described the features of Building 3, including the mixed-use, commercial flex space on the ground floor, residential units on the second and third floors, and the various entrances to the building. (Slide 12) Some late changes were made after Steve Coyle, the consultant architect who worked with the City and designers throughout the history of Villebois, suggested that the brick on the deck structure on the second floor's exterior be broken up with a different material. Originally, the brick had extended to the 2<sup>nd</sup> story.
  - The longer side of Building 3 faced Barber St, and the building met the design standards regarding the amount of brick and stucco as well as the number of windows required. All of the windows were vertical or square in proportion. Although a single-family home, the building had a storefront window and a strong brick base that created the commercial feel intended for the intersection.
  - The side that faced Villebois Dr featured more of the narrow, row house style already present on the street with outdoor space on both the first and second floors, and the flat roof look consistent with buildings across the street and around the Piazza.
  - The garage would be viewed from the alley as well as the side that faced the adjacent row house.

- The sides of the Buildings 1 and 2 did not need to be as architecturally enhanced as they would not be visible from the street. He explained that the front façades transitioned into the rear of the homes, noting Building 1 transitioned to a more gabled look with the gabled roofline at the back.
- The Tentative Plat would create a tract that included the parking and alley, as well as a tract that preserved the large tree onsite and the lots for the individual homes.
- He reviewed the corrections to the Staff report and additions to the record as described in Exhibit A3, Staff's memorandum dated August 27, 2018, which had been emailed to the Board.

**Samy Nada** asked if the Applicant had to come back to the City for approval before they decided if the mixed use Building 3 would be commercial or residential.

**Mr. Pauly** responded it could go back and forth over time as it was the owner's preference. He clarified that Building 3 would be built to commercial building standards, but if the owner wanted to use it as a residential space, nothing prohibited that. It was truly a flex space to allow flexibility for the homeowner over time, while maintaining the urban design look along the street. The first floor space could be leased out and utilized for a variety of uses including a home office, home business, music studio, coffee shop, or a residence, but the exterior could not be modified in terms of the doors or windows.

**Tracy Meyer** confirmed one person would own the entire building.

**Mr. Pauly** added that potentially, someone could get creative and sublease it, but his understanding was that builder, David Weekley Homes, planned to market Building 3 to an individual owner who would purchase it with a typical residential mortgage or cash.

**Ms. Meyer** noted the tallest building was 47 ft and asked the height of the other two buildings.

**Mr. Pauly** replied that the other two buildings were approximately 35 ft, a similar height to the other row houses along Villebois Dr. It did step down, but that was a part of the transition from the different addresses, and there were specific height requirements related to those addresses.

**Ms. Meyer** asked if the three buildings would have their own homeowners' association or if they would be joining one.

**Mr. Pauly** replied they were required to be a part of the Village Center Master Association, an established association. They could have their own association for specific issues, such as if they wanted to maintain the shared parking on their own. He understood that the rest of the David Weekley Homes homeowners had joined as full members of the Village Center Master Association and that was expected for these three buildings. If the future owners did form their own association, they would have to contribute equally to the shared amenities, such as the

Piazza, the joint mailboxes, and a number of other amenities that were part of the Village Center.

**Ms. Meyer** asked who paid for maintenance of the alleyway.

**Mr. Pauly** responded that he understood the existing alleyway was the responsibility of the Master Association, and it would be up to the new building owners whether their own association would take care of the additional alley or if it would be put under the Master Association, which was subject to agreement between those two parties.

**Shawn O'Neil** inquired when Staff sent out an email with an attachment and the email explained certain things or commented on the attachment, should that email be a part of the exhibit. He asked if there was an issue with public meeting laws. No one had responded to it, but there was an explanation that went into it, and an interpretation, he wondered if it should also be part of the exhibit.

**Barbara Jacobson, City Attorney**, responded that it would not hurt for it to be, she did not believe it had to be. She added that he could call and ask the question, but typically when the answer got sent out to everybody, it was preferable to keep it as a part of the record.

**Mr. Pauly** responded that typically, Staff tried to simply point out the attachment, but for the email in question, he had copied the text of the same memo to make it easier to read on digital devices.

**Mr. O'Neil** clarified that that was not the email he was talking about, he was concerned about commenting on the person who wrote the note, who gave the explanation.

**Mr. Pauly** agreed Staff's response should be added to the exhibit.

**Mr. Jacobson** said she did not believe the exhibit had been added to the record yet.

**Mr. Pauly** replied that it was Exhibit D1, which was noted in the memo. Exhibit D1 would include the email that had that document attached to it, which essentially said what he already stated on the record; that it did exist as a model home complex and had improvements so it would not be perceived as a typical vacant lot. The improvements would be removed as part of the proposal.

**Aaron Woods** asked whether there would be bicycle parking, noting that Finding A3 on Page 14 of the Staff report stated no bicycle parking, but Page 43 of the DKS report recommended two bicycle parking spaces.

**Mr. Pauly** explained that sometimes DKS had recommendations that went beyond the Code. For this application, the expectation was that bicycle parking would be the residential standard. Bikes could be put in the garage or home, and because it was only a recommendation and not a

Code requirement, no bike racks would be installed. There was flexibility to add a bike rack if a commercial tenant chose to do so.

**Chair Martens** called for the Applicant's presentation.

**Stacey Connery, Pacific Community Design, 12564 SW Main St, Tigard, OR**, thanked Mr. Pauly for his thorough Staff report. She provided some context regarding the history of the site with the following key comments:

- The site was platted in 2005, and given that the nature of its intended use included commercial use, it was set aside with a sales trailer on it to allow the residential development to occur around the project. Within that interim time period, the Master Planner had worked with a number of different developers and evaluated different scenarios for potential commercial development on it, including mixed use. The Applicant had worked with a large number of clients to come up with something that would work for the site.
- Given the nature of the economy and how the project had developed, the commercial area had gotten smaller as that was what appeared to be supportable within the project. The Applicant tried to adhere to the intent of preserving the ability for commercial uses to occur within that corner and facing Barber St, which was a significant corner as it interacted with the Piazza and future mixed use areas around the Piazza. The design of the proposed project provided for that opportunity; for something to go into that ground floor space at a time when the market would support it.
- She displayed a slide that featured the elevation of Barber St at Villebois Lot 12 – Plan 1 and noted that a range of color schemes could be selected, so the project could ultimately look a bit different than the picture displayed.

**Steve Puls, Division President of Oregon, David Weekly Homes** stated the company was the current builder in Villebois and that he was available to answer any questions.

**Ms. Connery** explained that there was adequate sidewalk space on the Barber St frontage for the addition of a bicycle rack in the future if a use went in that required bicycle parking.

**Mr. Woods** noted the traffic study showed that if the Building 3 flex space was, for example, a coffee shop, the number of potential peak trips would increase by 26 trips. He asked if the actual use of the ground floor space had been considered by the Applicant, as well as the subsequent traffic different uses would generate.

**Ms. Connery** responded that one of the intents with Villebois over time was to provide the opportunity for multi-modal travel. Even though there would be some people driving past and stopping, it was designed for a lot of pedestrian and bicycle travel internal to the project. There was ample parking available on Barber St, Villebois Dr had some perpendicular parking, and there was some parking in the alley that could be utilized. If a coffee shop was proposed at some point in the future, she believed the City had a process for a site plan review for a

commercial use proposed in a structure, such as Building 3, to assure that parking was addressed.

**Mr. Pauly** said he would defer that question to Steve Adams upon his return.

- He entered the two additional slides displayed by the Applicant showing the project's color palette options and colored elevations of the building on Lot 3 into the record as Exhibit B6.

**Mr. Pauly** advised Mr. Adams that Mr. Woods had asked if the commercial space in Building 3 were converted into a coffee shop, for example, was there anything that would trigger a review by the City to assess what the increase in traffic would be.

**Steve Adams, Development Engineer Manager**, responded that the traffic study had already looked at it as a commercial business with X amount of trips. If those trips turned out to be substantially higher, he imagined there would be a chance to bring the project back before the DRB, but he was not sure exactly what the Planning Code stated in that regard. Typically, as long as the number of trips came in under the approved use, it was not reviewed again. However, a change of use in the building would open it up to review.

**Mr. Pauly** stated that was standard procedure for other projects as well. Generally, food and beverage establishments generated higher traffic and higher parking requirements. If a commercial space was approved for the minimum parking requirement for a non-food and beverage use and the tenant wanted to change it to a food and beverage use, the City would require the tenant to prove the increased parking and traffic requirements could be met. So, there was a chance to do that review through the land use process.

**Chair Martens** asked what portion of Building 3 could be dedicated to commercial use.

**Mr. Pauly** responded 575 sq ft.

**Chair Martens** observed that would generate only a small impact on traffic.

**Mr. Woods** stated he did not know if that was the case or not because a coffee shop would generate a lot of traffic, as well as a food outlet, especially at lunch time, which was why he had asked. The size of the space had not prompted his question, but the type of business that would be there.

**Mr. Pauly** affirmed it was a flex space and if it went beyond what it was allowed under the traffic study and Parking Code, there were provisions in the Code to revisit the traffic impacts or deny the usage request.

**Mr. Nada** asked if there was a list of businesses or commercial uses that would be allowed before a new traffic study was triggered.



**Mr. Pauly** responded that generally speaking, for flex space usage in a retail development, parking was the trigger; it was ten parking spaces per 1,000 sq ft and about four for food and beverage. A broad variety of commercial uses, basically anything not food and beverage related, fell under the general commercial parking guidelines. The most likely use would be an office, studio, or small retail.

**Mr. Nada** understood it would be more of a judgment call.

**Mr. Pauly** replied anything that was not food or beverage would likely be fine.

**Mr. Nada** asked if flex spaces were common in the city.

**Mr. Pauly** responded that in most small shopping centers, such as the Wilsonville Road Business Park, developers wanted to keep their options open, so Staff often advised them to plan for food and beverage and provide enough parking for it or decide there would be no food and beverage at all. Beyond that, there was a wide array of what the individual uses could be.

**Mr. O'Neil** asked Staff to remind him where the crosswalks were located.

**Mr. Adams** replied that all four corners of Barber St and Villebois Dr had marked crosswalks.

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

**Steve Hansen, 11398 SW Barber St, Wilsonville, OR** stated he lived in the Seville Row Homes in Villebois. He and his neighbor, Mr. Dreisse, shared several concerns, some of which had been addressed, but he wanted additional clarification.

- The solid brick north wall of Building 3 that faced Barber St needed some aesthetic enhancement. The Seville Row Homes were very ornate, very nice townhomes and a solid brick wall adjacent to them would diminish the value of the homes. He believed a closer look needed to be taken at the architectural design of Building 3.
- Although Mr. Pauly had addressed the issue, he was still unclear as to who would pay for the alleyway and the additional parking behind the Seville Row Homes, whether it would be the Villebois Master Association or the builder, David Weekley Homes.

**Mr. Pauly** replied that the Applicant would have a chance to offer a rebuttal and answer further questions after public testimony but to his knowledge, if the HOA controlled it, they would have to pay. It came down to negotiation, and that would occur when the final plat was recorded and the legal documents were filled out. He left further comments beyond what he said to the Applicant as his comments were more of a general overview based on a variety of past projects.

**Mr. Hansen** stated that he had spoken with Mr. Pauly earlier in the day and had received some answers, but he had real concerns about traffic and congestion at the corner as there was no stop sign there and vehicles drove too fast up and down Barber St. He understood traffic

studies were supposedly done to gauge cross traffic and that perhaps there was not a lot at the present time, but with Villebois Dr set to be punched through as a cross street that would increase. There were activities in the Piazza area, such as mailboxes, a tap room, convenience store, coffee trailer, and various activities, all of which demanded a lot of pedestrian traffic and he questioned if that had been addressed.

- He was concerned by the lack of a stop sign and wanted to draw the Board's attention to the need for one. He believed that the City Engineer made that decision, but he knew it was a serious concern of everyone who lived in the Seville Row Homes and the general neighborhood.

**Mr. Pauly** added that as relayed to Mr. Hanson earlier in the day, ~~that~~ the City Engineer and engineering staff was fully aware of those concerns and were continuing to monitor the intersection for a warrant to see if it needed to be converted to a four-way stop.

**Ms. Meyer** noted Mr. Hansen's concern about the plain, brick wall of Building 3 on Lot 3 that would face Barber St.

**Chair Martens** suggested waiting for the Applicant's rebuttal to address her concern.

Villebois Lot 12 – Plan 1 showing the building elevation along Barber St **was** displayed.

**Mr. Hansen** commented that the elevation would not be very aesthetically pleasing to someone driving up and down Barber St, adding it certainly did not give the appearance of a residence, but more of a—

**Ms. Meyer** asked if there would be any trees lining that street.

**Mr. Pauly** responded there was a large existing tree along Barber St that would be preserved. The tree was aligned with the main entrance to Building 3, right in the middle of the façade.

**Brian Dreisse, 8192 SW Edgewater, Wilsonville, OR** stated he was an investor in the Seville Row Homes and was also concerned about the plain brick wall of Building 3 that would face Barber St. He had some experience developing commercial property as he had developed 13 individual commercial properties along Mississippi Ave in North Portland. He believed the building itself to be quite aesthetically pleasing and well done. He liked the different elevations, the façade and the front, and believed an attempt had been made to make it look quite attractive given the kind of materials and colors that were used in the finished product. However, he was concerned that a 10-ft high plain brick wall facing Barber St right at the square would not give people walking by a reason to enter the building. In his experience, that wall should instead look open and inviting to passersby. Given the 10-ft height, the brick wall would look unattractive, act as a barrier, and put a stop to people wanting to enter the building. He implored the developer to soften the façade, which would be easy to do. He firmly believed potential commercial tenants would find the building much attractive to rent, buy, or lease if the developer changed the plain brick wall.

**Chair Martens** asked how Building 3 might look compared to other adjoining residential units.

**Mr. Dreisse** responded it would be out of scale. In comparison, the commercial space across the street had almost floor-to-ceiling glass windows, whereas Building 3 had a plain brick wall. As an investor, he would want something that would invite people into the space, not a brick wall. He believed the building just needed to be more neighborhood-friendly, which could be easily done without a large monetary increase. A 10-ft high, 60-ft long brick wall right on the main plaza corner of Villebois did not make sense.

**Chair Martens** called for the Applicant's rebuttal.

**Rudy Kadlub, Costa Pacific Communities, 14350 SE Industrial Way, Clackamas, OR**, stated he was the master planner of Villebois, dating back to its origin in 2002. He provided some historical background regarding the site, which had been one of 23 sites originally designated for mental health housing in conjunction with the sale of the property from the State of Oregon when it was the state hospital. In 2013, the State abandoned their claim to the balance of approximately 18 sites, and Costa Pacific acquired the sites back from the State so mental health housing could be diversified throughout the rest of Clackamas County rather than concentrate any more in Villebois. For a number of years, the site sat vacant because the State had neither the desire nor the money to build a mixed use building on it. It made little economic sense to fit the building that was originally designed, three stories of apartments, 12 units, over a ground floor retail space there. Costa Pacific never could make the parking work nor could the State figure out how to develop the property to its original intention. As Mr. Pauly explained, they had tried a number of different scenarios on the site, none of which had been able to work from a financial standpoint.

- David Weekley Homes had worked diligently with Costa Pacific for about 18 months trying to come up with a plan that was suitable and to fit the guidelines. The Villebois Village Center Architectural Standard (VCAS) required 30 percent of hard surface on the ground floor, so that was part of the reason for the amount of brick on the building, which barely met that minimum. To clarify, it was a wainscot or siding on the building, not a wall out in front of the building.
- The Landscape Plan featured extensive landscaping at the property line back of the sidewalk, so there was a heavy landscape in front of the brick area in question, as well as an inviting open space and walkway that led to the 8-ft entry door.
  - He was confident that Mr. Coyle, an architect on the site enforcing the guidelines of the Village Center Architectural Standards (VCAS) since 2005, had worked closely with the developer to come up with this alternative. There were a lot of guidelines that they had laid out for themselves and Building 3 was the result. The brick wall would be softened with an 8-ft deep planting bed that ran the entire length of the building.
- He appreciated the comments regarding the architecture, noting that architecture was like art in that whether or not people liked it was subjective. However, it fit with the development tenet of diversity. The developer liked the diversity of the architecture, not only on the site, but as it related to the architecture around the rest of the intersection.

- Alley maintenance responsibility would fall upon the three properties that butted onto the alley. Similar to every other alley in the Villebois Village Center, its maintenance was maintained by the dwelling units that fronted onto or used the alley. The additional alley would be paid for, specifically, by an assessment on the three new lots.
- He supported a stop sign on Barber St. Any time there was an event, and even as the Village Center mixed-use became more intense, there was quite a bit of pedestrian traffic. There were thousands of people during the Beer Fest a few weeks ago. A stop sign made sense, but he understood it was up to Mr. Adams and his team to determine when that should happen.

**Chair Martens** asked about the makeup of the landscaping plan for the area.

**Ms. Connery** stated that the beds would contain a range of ornamental grass, shrubs, and trees. The trees would be Japanese maple and Incense Cedar. The shrubs consisted of Emerald arborvitae, Kelsey Red-Osier Dogwood, Thunberg Spiraea, Doublefile Viburnum, Dwarf Burning Bush, and Carol Mackie Daphne, all of which would provide a nice color scheme.

**Chair Martens** believed the dogwoods and maples should exceed the 8-ft brick height to provide some vertical breaks.

**Ms Connery** confirmed the cedars ranged in height from 8 ft to 10 ft.

**Mr. Pauly** confirmed the Incense Cedars were along the garage face that fronted Barber St.

**Mr. Kadlub** noted that the parking exceeded what was required by three times. The Applicant believed that even a more intense use, such as food and beverage, there would be plenty of parking. He believed the requirement was six spaces per 1,000 sq ft.

**Mr. Pauly** clarified it was different for Villebois, but he did not have the numbers memorized.

**Mr. Kadlub** stated it was lower. He noted if the requirement was five and the Applicant was providing 18, that was 22 parking spaces per 1,000 ft, which was pretty generous.

**Mr. Nada** asked if there was any brick wall or wainscot in the Villebois area that was similar in height.

**Mr. Kadlub** stated most of the other commercial buildings had other types of hard surface. The building directly across the way was stucco board. There were brick planters on several of the buildings along Villebois Dr, but that was a different address. The subject address was specific to the Piazza, so Building 3 was the first building to be built in the Piazza address since the stucco building across the street was constructed in 2007.

**Chair Martens** asked for clarification about the reference made to the 30 percent hardscape requirement.

**Mr. Pauly** responded that it only applied to non-window space. If the space included windows and doors, those were removed from the façade before running the calculations. Seventy-five percent of the façade of Building 3 that faced both Villebois Dr and Barber St needed to be covered by one of the listed materials, which included brick and stucco, which were in the same category and windows were excluded. At this point, 100 percent of both façades were covered by brick or stucco.

**Mr. Martens** confirmed that did not relate to the square footage contained in a window or limit the size a window could be.

**Mr. Pauly** added that the base, middle, and top of the building had to be balanced, and if there was landscaping, it should not cover the entire base.

**Chair Marten** confirmed there were no further questions from the Board and closed the public hearing at 7:44 pm.

**Aaron Woods moved to approve Resolution No. 357 with the addition of Exhibits A3, B5, B6, and D1 including the corrections noted in Exhibit A3. Samy Nada seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.**

**Mr. O'Neil** commented that he was less concerned about parking than he was about putting up a stop sign at Villebois Dr and Barber St. He had almost gotten hit earlier in the day, and even though it did not impact the proposed project, he believed the City should take a careful look at the raceway that was being developed along that stretch.

- He confirmed that Exhibit D1 would incorporate Staff's response.

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Chair Martens** read the rules of appeal into the record.

## **VII. Board Member Communications:**

A. Results of the August 13, 2018 DRB Panel A meeting

**Daniel Pauly, Senior Planner**, noted the additional bowling alley approved in Town Center by Panel A.

B. Recent City Council Action Minutes

**Barbara Jacobson, City Attorney**, stated City Council had approved the Basalt Creek Concept Plan at the last City Council meeting, a major project that had been three years in the making, with battles back and forth between Tualatin and Wilsonville. One battle was still ongoing, a Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) appeal. Tualatin and Wilsonville had agreed to allow Metro to arbitrate their dispute. Metro did, but it was appealed by two of the landowners in the central sub area, which was the area of controversy between the two cities. Although Tualatin had willingly agreed to have Metro arbitrate the decision, she was not sure they were still happy with

that agreement, but they did and now there was a contract between Metro, Washington County, Wilsonville and Tualatin with respect to that. Tualatin also approved the same Concept Plan that Wilsonville did. The project appeared to be on its way, even though they were waiting to hear on the LUBA appeal, although they had not gotten past the first part of the appeal, which was an argument over what should and should not be in the record. Once LUBA made a determination and it was in the record, the cities and Metro would brief a response to the appeal.

**Chair Martens** asked if the core of the appeal was that the landowners believed they could do better financially with residential.

**Ms. Jacobson** confirmed that was the bottom line. The landowners believed their land was worth more and would develop more quickly as residential, because it would take longer to find an industry that would fit that location, whereas houses could easily go there. They argued that there was still a need for more housing in that particular area. In the long run, it might be better to go with industrial, but in the short term, residential was easier to market quickly.

**Chair Martens** asked if Staff was hearing much from the public about Frog Pond since dirt was now being moved.

**Mr. Pauly** replied he was not aware of what was on social media, but he had only received one call from a lady who was surprised by the amount of trees being removed. He encouraged Board members to drive by the site.

**Mr. Woods** stated that he and the members of his homeowners' association drove by there every day. They were not terribly concerned yet, as they had not seen any issues with the dirt turning.

**Mr. Pauly** added that he had spoken with Ms. Wehler, who lived on the property, and she had assured him they were doing a good job of keeping the dust down.

**Mr. Nada** commented that people were beginning to discuss Frog Pond on social media now that it was happening and would become a reality fairly soon. He was sure the City would be receiving a lot more calls.

**Mr. O'Neil** added people did not usually worry about something until it was happening, which was too late to voice concern.

**Ms. Jacobson** stated that Panel B would likely start getting some of those projects soon.

### **VIII. Staff Communications**

**Dan Pauly, Senior Planner**, advised the Board that the property owned by Mr. Elligsen had sold to Sysco last spring. They had purchased the entire property, and although there was no development planned at this time, they had a demolition permit to tear down the house and barn, which would begin next week. As was protocol, it was being photographed and catalogued

by the library prior to demolition. He confirmed that he had heard rumors of squatters on the property, which was why Sysco wanted to tear down the buildings quickly.

**IX. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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