



WILSONVILLE
OREGON

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD PANEL B
MEETING MINUTES

July 24, 2023 at 6:30 PM

Approved

September 25, 2023

City Hall Council Chambers & Remote Video Conferencing

CALL TO ORDER

A regular meeting of the Development Review Board Panel B was held at City Hall beginning at 6:30 p.m. on Monday, July 24, 2023. Chair Rachelle Barrett called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m., followed by roll call.

CHAIR'S REMARKS

ROLL CALL

Present for roll call were: Rachelle Barrett, John Andrews, Justin Brown, Megan Chuinard and Alice Galloway.

Staff present: Daniel Pauly, Amanda Guile-Hinman, Stephanie Davidson, Miranda Bateschell, Amy Pepper, Kimberly Rybold, Zach Weigel, Georgia McAlister, and Shelley White

CITIZEN INPUT

This is an opportunity for visitors to address the Development Review Board (DRB) on items not on the agenda. There were no comments.

CONSENT AGENDA

1. Approval of minutes of April 24, 2023 DRB Panel B meeting

John Andrews made a motion to approve the April 24, 2023 DRB Panel B meeting minutes as presented. Megan Chuinard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **Resolution No. 418. Wilsonville Town Center Mixed-Use Multifamily Development.** The applicant is requesting approval of a Stage 1 Preliminary Plan, Stage 2 Final Plan, Site Design Review, Type C Tree Removal Plan, Master Sign Plan and Waivers for redevelopment of an existing restaurant with a five-story, 114-unit mixed-use apartment building with 3,707 SF ground floor commercial space, parking and associated improvements located at 29690 SW Town Center Loop W.

Case Files:

DB23-0003 Wilsonville Town Center Mixed-Use Multifamily Development

- STG123-0001 Stage 1 Preliminary Plan
- STG223-0002 Stage 2 Final Plan
- SDR23-0002 Site Design Review
- TPLN23-0001 Type C Tree Removal Plan
- SIGN23-0003 Master Sign Plan
- WAIV23-0001 Waivers

Chair Barrett called the public hearing to order at 6:36 p.m. and read the conduct of hearing format into the record. Chair Barrett, John Andrews, Justin Brown, and Alice Galloway 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.

Georgia McAlister, 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. McAlister entered into the record Exhibits A3, B4, B5, and B6, updated exhibits and associated Staff report modifications, which were distributed to DRB-Panel B on July 20, 2023, as well as Exhibits D8 and D9, additional public comments received on July 21, and July 24, 2023, respectively.

Ms. McAlister presented the Staff report via PowerPoint, briefly noting the site's location and reviewing the requested applications with these key comments:

- The subject site, currently occupied by Shari's Restaurant, would be redeveloped into a residential and mixed use building with ground floor commercial retail. The site was designated as Town Center within the Comprehensive Plan and as mixed-use in the Town Center Zone. The site was surrounded by commercial land use developments on all sides. (Slide 2)
- Town Center Plan. This proposed development for DRB review was the first new development under the 2019 Town Center Plan (TCP) and new Town Center Zone (TCZ). The TCP was a long-term, community-driven vision for transforming the Wilsonville Town Center into a vibrant, walkable destination that inspires residents to socialize, shop, live, and work. The vision was centered on the creation of a new main street that would run north-south through the middle of Town Center along with a chain of open green spaces that connected existing and planned parks throughout the Town Center and beyond.
 - The TCZ development standards supported the creation of a vibrant mixed-use Town Center with activated pedestrian places and retail opportunities. Town Center and the subdistricts within the zone were represented on the TCP map, and the red star indicated the location of the proposed development within the mixed-use subdistrict and adjacent to the future Park Place Promenade. (Slide 3)
 - The subject Town Center approach was different than other zones within the city. The proposed project would be the first step in fulfilling the community vision for the future of Town Center.
 - The proposed project had been reviewed using all applicable standards in the TCZ, TCP, Town Center Streetscape Plan, and the Wilsonville Comprehensive Plan. The project complied with regulations within the zone.
- Proper noticing was followed for the application with notice mailed to all property owners within 250 ft of the subject property and notice published in the newspaper. Additional postings were placed onsite and on the City's website. All public notices were mailed, posted, or published on July 3, 2023. Nine public comments for the project were received during the comment period and were included within the materials. (Slide 4)
- Of the eight requests before the DRB for the Wilsonville Town Center Mixed-Use Development application, five were objective in nature as they required verifying compliance with Development Code standards, and three were waivers that required discretionary review.
- The Stage I Preliminary Plan was for the development of the former Shari's site into a five-story mixed-use residential building with ground floor retail. The development would include 114 multi-family residential units and the ground floor would include approximately 4,200 sq ft of retail space.
 - The image on the left was included in the TCP to demonstrate a streetscape with active ground floor uses while the images on the right showed the Applicant's proposal. The Applicant aimed to achieve the community's goal of an active ground floor and surrounding area as demonstrated in the photos. The overall layout and design of the development was consistent with the TCP. (Slide 6)

- Stage 2 Final Plan. The proposed building was surrounded by new local roads and pedestrian connections on all sides consistent with the Town Center's Street Network Plan. The building's façade would be at zero setback from the new local road to the northeast and future Park Place Promenade to the southeast.
 - As required by Town Center Code, parking would be located behind the building with 52 proposed spaces that would feature direct access to the residential and commercial areas. Some parking was tucked under the upper floors of the building to facilitate the most efficient use of the site. (Slide 7)
- The Town Center Plan was a comprehensive approach to area planning that included a street and pedestrian plan unique to the area. The Plan included a multimodal network of local roads, main streets, and pedestrian connections.
 - The proposed project would feature local roads on the southwestern and northeastern frontages with a proposed pedestrian and bicycle path along the northwest frontage. The southeast frontage would abut the future Promenade, a linear park that would provide pedestrian connections and landscaping for the use and enjoyment of the public.
 - The proposed development was oriented to the interior of Town Center in anticipation of future redevelopment in and around the planned main street and Town Center park located to the northeast of the property. The building would be centered on the corner of Park Place and the new local street with the commercial façade opening onto Park Place and connecting directly to the commercial space with pedestrians. The residential façade would abut the new local street to the northeast. (Slide 8)
- The Traffic Study evaluated five intersections with all remaining at Level of Service (LOS) D or better, which exceeded the City's minimum standard of LOS D. (Slide 9)
- Site Design Review. The Applicant used appropriate professional services to design structures and landscaped areas onsite using quality materials.
 - The proposed building was consistent with the Design Standards in the Town Center Plan and was designed to reflect the vision of the TCP with natural materials and neutral tones by utilizing a mix of proposed materials that included brick veneer, fiber cement, composite wood, and accents of black metal.
 - Landscaping was provided throughout the site, including a rain garden and buffering landscaping located adjacent to the parking area and around mechanical equipment.
 - Multimodal connectivity and the site's relationship to the surrounding Town Center had been addressed in the Site Layout.
 - The General Landscape Standard had been used for the majority of the site. Buffering landscaping was provided adjacent to the parking areas and along the transformer to screen both from the public. Street trees were proposed for installation along all frontages and a rain garden that would aid with the filtration of stormwater was provided along the southeast frontage adjacent to the parking area. (Slides 10 & 11)
- Class 3 Sign Permit. No signs were currently proposed, but the Applicant had submitted a proposal for a Master Sign Plan for the future building's commercial tenants. The proposed plan was typical of, proportional to, and compatible with development in the Town Center Zone.
 - Conditions of approval would ensure that the proposed signs did not exceed the maximum allowed size, and the details of design, color, texture, lighting, and materials were provided at the time of application for a Class 1 Sign Permit. (Slide 13)
- Type C Tree Removal Plan. A total of 24 trees were inventoried, including 20 onsite and 4 offsite. Trees proposed for removal were shown with Xs on the Plan. The 4 offsite trees would be retained during construction and the 20 onsite landscape trees would be removed to allow for development of the site. Tree removal was limited to where necessary for construction.
 - The Applicant proposed to mitigate the tree removal with 26 trees planted throughout the site as street and landscape trees, which exceeded the one-for-one mitigation requirement. (Slide 14)

- Discretionary Review - Waivers. As mentioned, the application included a request for three waivers that involved discretionary review by the DRB. Per the Development Code, a waiver must implement or better implement the purpose and objectives of the Planned Development Regulations.
 - Waiver 1 was explicitly allowed in the Town Center Zone when the proposal included at least one item from each of the two menus in Subsection 4.132 (.06)D. The DRB could approve or deny the requested waivers based on review of evidence submitted by the Applicant. The Applicant would address the waiver criteria during their presentation and explain how the requested waivers met the purpose of those standards.
 - The Applicant requested to waive the allowed number of stories for a building in the mixed-use subdistrict to be greater than four stories with five stories proposed and had included one item from each of the two menus to exceed typical building and site design requirements and mitigate the impacts of the waiver.
 - The Applicant had used Menu 1, Item 3, "Provision of ground floor facades that include additional supporting store fronts, the primary entrance of all businesses shall be located on the primary street frontage," and Menu 2, Item 4, "The achievement of LEED certification, Earth Advantage, or another recognized environmental certification." The Applicant had chosen Green Globes certification.
 - The waiver to allow a fifth floor would permit the development to provide the envisioned density and variety of housing types while also providing an active commercial use along Park Place that would make the future promenade successful. The design provided commercial space for the entire frontage along Park Place Ave. and would increase the street-level activity there.
 - Thus, the proposal met the Comprehensive Plan goal of providing a variety of much-needed urban housing, employment, and shopping and set a development pattern for the promenade and new local street that would encourage visitors to make the area the heart of Wilsonville. (Slide 16)
 - Waiver 2. The Applicant requested a change to the Architectural Standards in Subsection 4.132 (.06) M2.b.ii requiring buildings over three stories high to have a 6-ft step back beginning on the fourth story to instead allow the step back to begin on the second story.
 - The intent of the standard was to ensure that as buildings increased in height, adequate light was provided at ground level of the development and the perception of the building mass was minimized. The proposed waiver would introduce the step back at a lower height, which would still achieve the intent of the standard while allowing flexibility in design.
 - The building design prioritized retail and pedestrian frontage on Park Place and the future promenade, differentiated from the residential portion of the building along the new local street. (Slide 17)
- Waiver 3. The Applicant requested to waive the Town Center Parking standard related to the sharing of parking spaces. Subsection 4.132 (.06) I.2. required that all parking spaces be shared and not designated for individual uses.
 - The Applicant had proposed unbundling parking spaces from dwelling units and renting them to individual residents, rendering them unshareable for other uses. This was an implementation strategy in the Town Center Plan to meet the goal of reducing overall parking as there was already an abundance of surface parking throughout Town Center.
 - The goal was to have occupied and active parking throughout Town Center as opposed to underutilized parking areas, a strategy that would further the goal that would be realized as development continued. (Slide 18)
- Nine public comments had been received for the project. Some focused on concerns regarding the 52 proposed parking spaces and whether that would be sufficient for development.
 - The subject application was for the first project with parking submitted after January 1, 2023, which meant it was the first project in Wilsonville subject to the new climate friendly and equitable community (CFEC) policies from the State. CFEC did not allow minimum parking standards to be applied to projects

within .5 miles of a city's most frequent transit routes, and the subject project was proposed within .5 miles of both of Wilsonville's most frequent transit lines, the 4 and 2X.

- With no minimum vehicle parking requirements, the number of spaces was wholly at the discretion of the Applicant. Therefore, the number of parking spaces provided was not under the purview of the DRB. Additionally, it was the goal of the Town Center Plan to more efficiently utilize parking within Town Center and reduce the overall area of surface parking. The subject proposal met the goals of both CFEC and the Town Center Plan in regard to parking.
- At least three additional comments were in support of the project. There was a level of excitement that this was the first project to begin in Town Center that would meet the community's goals and start to realize a project that was thought out back in 2018. Folks were excited for the catalyst and the addition of more shops and active pedestrian spaces within the City.

John Andrews noted there were 114 units, only 50 parking spaces, and a fair walk to any additional parking spaces. He asked where the remaining 64 residents would park their cars, as they certainly would have them.

Ms. McAlister reminded Mr. Andrews that the number of parking spaces included in the project was not part of the review due to the State statute, so the DRB could not require more parking from the Applicant. However, there was a fair amount of street parking available along Park Place as well as in adjacent commercial areas. There was a lot of low-occupancy surface parking within Town Center. As development occurred, that parking would fill up, which was the goal as it was currently underutilized. (Slide 18)

Chair Barrett asked where the new street would be located because she had trouble envisioning it.

Ms. McAlister indicated where the new street, the Park Place Promenade, would be located as well as an additional local street and pedestrian connection, noting Town Center Lp would be improved with further development. She also indicated where the low-occupancy parking was located in the middle of the yellow. (Slide 18)

Megan Chuinard asked if there was parking available for retail use or if it was all residential.

Ms. McAlister confirmed there was no parking for retail, as the Applicant would be renting those spaces to individual residents, but she deferred to the Applicant for further information.

Chair Barrett confirmed there were no further questions from the Board and called for the Applicant's presentation.

Seth Henderson, Partner, Level Development NW, 7327 SW Barnes Rd, Portland, OR, 97225 stated his family lived locally in southwest Portland and thanked the DRB members for their time and commitment to their community.

- The subject project had started in April 2022 with him and his team at the corner coffeeshop. They had read through every word in the Town Center Plan, the 2019 ordinance and its 2021 addendum, and sought to understand the community's involvement in the Plan, what other changes were coming, how the community envisioned the project's execution, and had a general dialogue around how the project would start and move along within the entire area as they did not have \$20 million to address the Fry's property and Kaiser was pretty embedded on the east side of the park.
- The Applicant was passionate about mixed-use, multi-family, urban infill, sustainable design. They had done 18 developments in the last ten years within the Portland metro area and wanted to build within cities that had a clear vision.

- Currently, Town Center was retail and office space, but an energetic, vibrant town center required residents that would bring activity 24/7. Additionally, along the Park Place Promenade, it made sense to have retail all along that elevation, so that was what the Applicant had proposed.
 - The challenge was how to design something that worked with Town Center today but would also work with the ultimate vision, and the Applicant had worked with Staff to accomplish that.
- The Applicant understood the significance and magnitude of the first project as it would set a precedent in terms of quality, materials, and process. The Applicant had worked with City Staff for a year, had enjoyed the collaborative effort, hoped they felt the same, and noted the project represented that collaboration.
 - The quality of a development was mirrored by the quality of the team, and not just firms but individuals.
- The Applicant had done four projects with Chris Hodney of Hacker Architects with the current project being the fifth. Level Development always looked to get community input on their team, and Chris was a resident of Wilsonville.
 - Chris had to drive by the site, justify the building to his neighbors, and he would address the DRB directly as to how the process went and the progress thus far.

Chris Hodney, Hacker Architects, 555 SE Martin Luther King Jr., Blvd, Suite 501, Portland, OR, 97214 stated he was a resident of Wilsonville. When the Applicant started projects, they always looked for the real character of a place and what the residents of the community envisioned. With Town Center, the Applicant had the benefit of a public vision that was well-documented.

- As a resident, he was very excited. He loved the outdoor spaces in the residential neighborhoods, the parks, and the community in Wilsonville, but was also excited to see the level of walkability, density, and employment opportunities that could come to Town Center as well.
- The architecture in Town Center would be something new for Wilsonville, a next step and a new level of density and pedestrian-oriented space that would become the heart of Wilsonville in the future.
- The project was very important to the Applicant, and they recognized how visible it was given the proximity to Town Center, the future promenade along Park Place, and its distinction as the first building in the district.
 - The Applicant viewed the project as a great opportunity and responsibility to set an exceptional example of what mixed-use development could be in order to uphold the goals of the Town Center and truly shape public space.
- The proposed building was modern and urban while utilizing timeless architectural strategies to give prominence to the ground floor and to further activate the sidewalks. He believed they had created a building that would feel as if it had always been there once the promenade and surrounding development followed suit.
- They had looked closely at the Town Center Plan documents, specifically the future-scenario documents, when they considered the site layout and shaping to envision what the community saw for the area in the coming decades.
 - The Applicant had specifically looked at clues to determine what the community thought the most active spaces should be, and it was clear from the documents that Town Center Lp was seen as a secondary, traffic-focused road while the active frontages and pedestrian-oriented spaces were internal to the Loop.
 - The Applicant strived to use the building design and site layout to activate every bit of the frontages of those two primary streets, Park Place and the proposed future local street, to meet the vision of the area.
- The ground floor started with the activation of Park Place, and the entire Park Place frontage would be lined with approximately 4,200 sq ft of retail. Additionally, the tenant entries would directly face Park Place, anchoring the street even more.

- The design of the ground floor retail would be carried around the corner onto Town Center Lp as well as wrapped along the north into the primary apartment lobby. The remainder of the frontage along the new local street on the north was urban ground floor residential.
- Along the northwest property line, a pedestrian accessway with landscaping and lighting would be provided utilizing the right-of-way dedication. Right-of-way improvements would also be done along Town Center Lp in the form of landscaping and a new sidewalk. Between the sidewalk and parking was a fairly deep wedge-shaped buffer area of landscape that would provide screening and stormwater treatment.
- Parking access would be via a two-way drive off Town Center Lp
- The upper building floor plates were all residential and resident-amenity. He indicated the footprint of the upper floor plates and noted they were pulled back 6 ft from the ground floor at all frontages, although it was particularly visible along Park Place. The ground floor residences were pulled back even further along that frontage. (Slide 4)
- The massing of the building was designed to reinforce the prominence of the ground floor and mark a hierarchy from the more active commercial frontage along Park Place before transitioning to an urban residential frontage along the new local street on the north.
 - The massing along Park Place was more simple and urban. The upper floor was set back from the ground floor 6 ft with two recessed balcony stacks that added some articulation. The corner was cut back at the primary intersection, which allowed for an interior amenity space and roof deck that directly looked over the street, allowing residents to activate and engage with any festivals or events on the promenade.
 - The massing to the right on the new local street would be broken up even further with recessed balcony cuts at every unit which broke the roofline and massing into unit-width facades and reinforced the local street as an urban residential street versus the Park Place commercial street.
- The proposed material palette was fairly neutral and warm with touches of texture and warmth at areas pedestrians interacted with most. Materials were natural, or natural-inspired, in an attempt to invoke a look of color variation, texture, shadow, and weathering similar to older buildings throughout Wilsonville.
 - The ground floor would feature primarily glazing and black metal with walls of linear brick, a unique and modern architectural brick of a warm concrete color with imperfections in the corners and surfaces that provided visual interest and weathered texture but with a very modern proportion and application.
 - The upper floors were meant to recede a bit to allow the ground floor to stand out as primary so a midtone warm gray was chosen for them to contrast with the lighter brick of the ground floor.
 - Touches of warmth would be integrated into the bronze-colored accent panels and composite wood siding of the balconies in an effort to balance the composition of the overall building and bring warmth to the moments the residents directly interacted with.
 - He indicated the brick material at the ground floor and noted the scale of the ground floor. The Applicant had utilized a 16-ft-tall civic-scale ground floor to really activate Park Place and the new local street.
 - Large storefront openings were punctuated by fairly large entry openings for the retailers which would provide shadow and relief in the façade as well as good flexibility along the entire Park Place frontage.
- Landscaping was a major piece of the project, along with the signage and furnishings that the retailers would bring to the building as well. It added a layer of richness to the pedestrian experience that could not be curated, but was unscripted, and the Applicant was trying to show a little of that.
- Permanent weather protection would be provided along the entire frontage in the form of really deep steel canopies that would be approximately 11.5 ft off the street and protect pedestrians and outdoor seating year-round.
- Residential frontage along the northeast local street would utilize a similar material palette and differentiate between ground and upper levels as well. This portion of the building featured more of a residential

treatment. The units were raised 2-ft off and set 9-ft back from the adjacent sidewalk, which allowed for the provision of usable patios, porches, and entry stairs.

- Front doors faced the street, and there were two layers of planting in between the porches and the sidewalk which provided a good buffer to vary the scale and density of the planting and break down the scale at the pedestrian level. Upper floors were slightly projected from the ground floor units on the residential frontage, which gave a bit of weather protection and a little more depth to play with.
- He noted Ms. McAlister had done a great job explaining the justification for the waiver and how they met the purpose. The Applicant believed all the waivers equally or better met the purpose and intent of Town Center that they were a waiver to.
- Waiver 1, Building Height Within the TCMU Subdistrict. He noted there would be 5-story buildings within the TCMU Zone, and the CMU Zone to the northwest, as it was explicitly allowed by Code depending upon use.
 - The waiver would allow the Applicant to achieve incredibly high density and bring a variety of housing, retail, and employment to the site. He noted that height was limited by stories, not feet, and that a 4-story office building with active ground floor would be similar in height to a 5-story housing building, bringing the proposed building within the anticipated scale of development.
- Waiver 2, 4th floor Building Façade Step-Back. The Applicant proposed to instead step back at the second floor above the retail and keep the setback all the way to the ground at the residential frontage.
 - The intent of the step back standard was to manage the scale of buildings, allow light to filter down to the street and sidewalk, and mitigate the additional height of buildings in the district. Given the 16-ft height at the retail, a second-floor step back would reinforce and accentuate the prominence of the ground floor, provide the same access to light, and provide the same roof line as Code standard but result in less bulk and more openness from the pedestrian experience.
 - Above the residences on the north side, a 6-ft step back would benefit ground floor residences by bringing light and air down to them as well as pedestrians. The roof line would still be comparable to that allowed by Code and would give pedestrians the same access to light. Additionally, a ground level step back allowed for the porches and layers of landscaping that would benefit both the residents and pedestrians.
- Waiver 3, Shared Parking. The Applicant had proposed that all onsite parking be for residents with retail utilizing shared parking.
 - Residential onsite parking needed to be designated if it was to be unbundled from the cost of the apartment unit, and that was a measure identified by the State as a way to reduce parking demand and carbon emissions.
 - The Applicant believed this approach to parking was directly aligned with the intent of the limitation in the Town Center Plan and with State legislation.
- Waiver 1, Building Height Within the TCMU Subdistrict. Additionally, Waiver 1 required that one item from each of two design menus must be met, and the Applicant envisioned Waiver 1 and Waiver 2 working hand-in-hand.
 - He believed the Applicant more than provided the intent of additional ground floor facades that included additional supporting store fronts and noted they had exceeded the 50% building frontage standard by providing 100% building frontage and wrapping the corner at Town Center Lp with a truly active space that also met all ground floor window requirements.
 - The 16-ft scale was very supportive of even more active use as the highest intensity retailers and restaurants wanted taller ceilings, and he believed they had exceeded a standard design here with that feature.
 - All tenant entries faced Park Place, which he believed was a requirement of this item.
 - He believed the variety provided in the ground floor use and the different landscaping and architectural treatment of the two frontages helped with that item also.

- Green Globe certification. At present, the Applicant was targeting two Green Globes, with four being the maximum.
 - Some of the highlights the Applicant had focused on included improved ventilation and indoor air quality, higher-efficiency water heating systems, one of the biggest energy uses in a housing building, efficient fixtures and occupancy centers for lighting and plumbing fixtures, and drought-tolerant landscaping and renewable resources.

Alice Galloway asked where public restrooms would be located.

Mr. Hodney indicated two gender neutral public restrooms would be located right in the middle of the retail tenants. Given the covenants they had on the site and the amount of retail, he expected that was in line with Code requirements.

Ms. Galloway asked how many of the 114 units were affordable and what the Applicant's definition of affordable was.

Mr. Henderson stated that it came down to the definition affordable, which had many elements such as percentage of median family income, whether it was on the covenant, or whether or not subsidies were taken from the State or another organization to support the development itself. There would likely be 20% of units that fell within the 80% median family income, which was for Clackamas County; however, the Applicant was not taking any funds in terms of subsidies to create the development.

Ms. Galloway replied her concern was the need for more affordable housing and understood 20 units would be designated for affordable housing.

Mr. Henderson confirmed it would be a little more than 20 units. Each year, Clackamas County stated what the median family income was, what 80% of that was, and what percent of a salary went to housing, which enabled anyone to do the calculations and determine which units would fall within that amount of rent on a monthly basis.

Ms. Galloway asked if Green Globes was a national or international program.

Mr. Henderson stated he had been a LEED AP since 2008. The U.S. Green Building Council, LEED, had gone from putting as much money as possible into sustainable building to creating a business plan that instead gave money to consultants, certification, and registration as opposed to actually making sustainable buildings. Green Globes was an international program that had originally been set up for hospitality. Much less funds went towards the management of the program, and more funds went towards making a development sustainable.

Mr. Hodney confirmed that all the units would have washers and dryers.

Mr. Brown asked for clarification on parking space unbundling.

Mr. Hodney explained that parking stalls were not included in the rent of the units. Tenants who wanted a parking space had to pay extra to have one. This was to incentivize residents to use shared parking and/or be efficient about the parking they were paying for.

Chair Barrett asked what the result of not approving Waiver 3, but still approving the rest of the plan, would be.

Mr. Hodney replied that as he understood it, Code Standard would require all the onsite parking to be shared parking for both public and resident use.

Kimberly Rybold, Senior Planner, explained the intent of that Code standard stemmed from existing commercial development. Oftentimes, a business would have X number of spaces signed only for use of this tenant, and that was replicated throughout many parts of Town Center. The Code standard was meant to prevent that kind of designation of individual spaces for specific users, particularly in commercial uses since in the suburban context those had historically been more protective over individual parking spaces for tenant spaces. The City hoped to get away from that as a means of de-emphasizing over-construction of parking. As it applied here, the proposed waiver had the same purpose and intent, to be more efficient about parking, but the Applicant simply proposed to do it in a way that was different than the standard dictated.

Chair Barrett stated she wanted to clarify if not approving the waiver would result in the construction of more parking spaces.

Ms. Rybold deferred to the Applicant to clarify how they would approach parking if it could not be unbundled.

Mr. Henderson responded that they had not thought about that. If a stall was designated for a unit, they would be determining which units had parking. The challenge would be potential renters who wanted a parking space not renting due to all units with assigned parking already being rented.

- At present, approximately only 20% to 30% of stalls were occupied. The whole intent behind mixed-use was shared parking between different uses, so instead of building giant parking lots everywhere, the focus was on the quality of the uses of the buildings they were constructing.
- Once they were through entitlements and resolved the next stage of their design process, they would reach out to all the adjacent business owners and propose shared parking which would generate additional revenue for the business owners.
- The Applicant intended to look at other ways to use all the empty stalls already there to house potential cars, whatever that amount was. CFEC and the State dictated that if parking was designed for, people would always be focused and reliant on automobiles. If parking was made difficult for people via either having to walk a few blocks or pay a few extra dollars, they could be pushed towards alternative transportation. Although this would not be accomplished in the near-term, the Applicant had to strike a balance between what was provided today and the ultimate Town Center vision.

Ms. Chuinard noted the Staff report stated that priority would be given to residents that needed accessible stalls; however, there were only two ADA stalls. She asked if there was access for retail shoppers if those two spaces went to residents. Additionally, she wanted to know how the Applicant would navigate who needed access to stalls if residents came in who wanted to purchase a space but only 51 were available.

Mr. Henderson stated the ADA stalls would remain regardless of whether any residents required them. They would be for residents or retail and any disabled person could use them. He had developed approximately 3,000 units over his career and could count on two hands the number of disabled individuals who had leased a unit, so quite frequently those stalls remained open all the time. He confirmed that within the Staff report, accessible stalls meant ADA stalls.

Ms. Chuinard stated she needed clarification on the prioritization process for those two ADA stalls as residents would come in and out of the housing and theoretically re-prioritization could not take place as spaces will already have been offered to residents.

Mr. Henderson asked if the Staff report addressed prioritization in regard to the ADA stalls in particular or just stalls in general.

Ms. Chuinard read from Page 69 of the Staff report, the paragraph that addressed the 51 stalls and 2 ADA stalls, "Priority will be given to residents needing the accessible stalls." She understood that to mean the two ADA spots were allocated to residential parking only.

Mr. Henderson stated it would be a challenge if two disabled individuals renting units had those spots assigned to them and a retail customer needed a spot, as there would be no place to park. The Applicant was providing the number of ADA stalls required by Code and law. If there were no disabled renters, those spots would likely sit open.

Ms. Rybold added that Staff reviewed the ADA requirements within the Building Code requirements and they were generally consistent with the Development Code. This issue could possibly be refined at that stage of review. Staff was still trying to figure out all of the minimum CFEC regulations as well; however, the requirements of the Building Code and ADA parking had not changed in light of CFEC, so as part of that mixed-use, they would review and ensure that adequate ADA parking was provided for all uses onsite.

Ms. Galloway confirmed the rooftop garden was only for residents and asked if the rain garden was pedestrian-level.

Mr. Hodney replied the rain garden was really a bioswale for stormwater treatment but confirmed it was pedestrian-level along Town Center Lp.

Mr. Andrews stated there was a lot of traffic on Town Center Lp and he was concerned it would get worse, especially with the addition of 114 residential units. He asked how that would be addressed.

Ms. Rybold replied that intersection access was reviewed as part of the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) and deferred to Amy Pepper for additional clarification.

Amy Pepper, Development Engineering Manager, stated DKS had conducted an evaluation of the traffic and the access point and found that it met all current safety standards at the time of Building Permit review. After construction, the Engineer would provide a sight-distance analysis to confirm that it met the safety standards. All intersections met the Level of Service (LOS) D or greater standard. While traffic would increase, it was still above the City's adopted LOS.

Chair Barrett confirmed with Ms. Pepper there was only one entrance/exit for parking.

Chair Barrett noted the building was tall for Wilsonville and asked if earthquake preparedness was a part of the evaluation.

Mr. Hodney replied that it was built and engineered to Oregon Seismic Code, which was pretty robust. The building featured a concrete ground floor that supported the four floors of wood above it and a lot of sheer walls throughout the building.

Chair Barrett asked why retail was not all around the building.

Mr. Hodney replied they had wanted to bring the greatest variety of density and active uses to the site but also had to consider what was already there. Presently it was a Frye's parking lot, and would be for a few more years, so they needed a design that was successful now and met the goals of the District without a 100-ft-long empty frontage. As such, they chose to focus on the retail they believed the site could support along Park Place and front the northeast side with residential units.

Chair Barrett noted the Applicant had emphasized that the materials chosen were natural and asked how good they were at withstanding local weather such as rain and ice.

Mr. Hodney responded that the brick and composite wood siding had some natural elements to them and were natural inspired, but they were all very durable material. Fiber cement panels were used in the area climate ubiquitously. There were measures that needed to be taken with the detailing and refinishing to ensure it held up as well as possible. The brick, metal, and glass at the ground floor were incredibly durable. The composite wood siding held up very well. He and his office had designed a building for PCC in Portland over ten years ago using that same material and believed they had not needed to refinish it yet. Additionally, the darker, richer color of the wood siding helped with the weathering on a stained product, as it would help with the painted panels on the upper floors of the proposed building.

Mr. Andrew asked if other buildings in the Portland area used similar materials and would have a similar look to the subject project.

Mr. Hodney replied that the brick was the hero in the subject project and the most unique material. That was purposeful. Examples of the subject materials could be seen in use in Portland as well as other cities that had more dense housing. The material palette chosen, particularly for the ground floor, was selected for and aligned with what the Applicant envisioned as the real character of Wilsonville, what it meant to live there, and overlaid with the vision of the Town Center character.

Mr. Henderson added that there were developers who came in, bid, built, stabilized, and sold, so were looking at an approximate 3-year timeline. The Town Center was within an Opportunity Zone, which meant there was a 10-year commitment from receipt of funds to maximizing capital gains deferral, and as such, the Applicant was holding the building a minimum of seven years from completion. They wanted materials that would last and for the quality of what they built to represent them for that entire period. They were not building something to be sold immediately, and he hoped the design and the materials represented that.

Chair Barrett called for public testimony regarding the application and confirmed with Staff that no one was present at City Hall to testify and no one on Zoom indicated they wanted to testify; therefore, there was no rebuttal. She called for any additional discussion or questions of Staff.

Mr. Andrew stated he was still concerned with parking because approximately half of the residents' parking would be a long way off.

Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager, responded that the DRB could not regulate the quantity of parking either directly or indirectly under State rules. Staff understood that Board members and community members might have opinions and feelings about it, and Staff recognized that, but the rules were what they were on that point.

Ms. Rybold replied that the non-CFEC context to that question was that over time as the Town Center built out and more local roads were added, there would be additional opportunities for on-street parking to be developed.

- Within the TCP itself, there was a step-by-step approach for the City to evaluate parking as development occurred in Town Center. The current baseline was shown on the map during the Staff presentation and detailed the parking assessment done as part of the planning process that recognized an abundance of surface parking. (Slide 18)

- One recommendation was to undergo monitoring as development occurred and conduct another study. Staff and City Council had discussed what might be needed long-term, and the TCP acknowledged that possibility and recognized that the Plan would evolve over time.
- As the TCP was implemented in nondevelopment-related ways, parking would be looked at and addressed through the various strategies laid out in the Plan to ensure that it was being managed appropriately as development occurred.

Chair Barrett asked what, if anything, was in the Code to prevent the overcharging of tenants for parking spaces.

Ms. Rybold stated the Development Code did not regulate cost; however, some of the strategies in the TCP addressed potential pricing for both unbundled spaces and the management of future on-street supply.

Mr. Pauly added that although the unbundling concept seemed cutting edge now, it would become more common as time went by, especially as policymakers at higher levels were also discussing the concept and recommending it as cities redid their parking standards.

Chair Barrett asked for clarification on the voting process and if Board members needed to vote on the waivers separately from the overall proposed development.

Mr. Pauly replied that to deny a waiver, they would have to work through the Staff report as the Staff report essentially approved the waiver. He confirmed that if the Staff report were voted into the record, all of the necessary information would be voted in as it was contained within the report.

Chair Barrett confirmed there were no additional questions or discussion and closed the public hearing at 7:49 pm.

Amanda Guile-Hinman, City Attorney, confirmed added Exhibits D8 and D9 were to be included in the motion.

Ms. Rybold clarified the exhibits that were entered into the record were:

- Exhibit A3: Staff memorandum sent to the DRB-Panel B on July 20, 2023.
- Exhibit B4: Updated narrative from the Applicant, replacing Exhibit B1.
- Exhibit B5: Updated plan set from the Applicant, replacing Exhibit B2.
- Exhibit B6: The materials board received from the Applicant.
- Exhibit D8: Additional public comments received on July 21, 2023.
- Exhibit D9: Additional public comments received on July 24, 2023.

Alice Galloway moved to adopt the amended Staff report with the additional exhibits as read into the record by Staff. Justin Brown seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

John Andrews moved to adopt Resolution No. 418 with the amended Staff report. The motion was seconded by Megan Chuinard and passed unanimously.

Chair Barrett read the rules of appeal into the record.

BOARD MEMBER COMMUNICATIONS

1. Results of the May 8, 2023 DRB Panel A meeting
2. Results of the June 12, 2023 DRB Panel A meeting
3. Results of the July 10, 2023 DRB Panel A meeting
4. Recent City Council Action Minutes

There were no comments.

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager, introduced new Assistant City Attorney Stephanie Davidson.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:54 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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