



Wilsonville City Hall Development Review Board Panel B

Monday, February 27, 2017 - 6:30 P.M.

I. Call To Order:

II. Chairman's Remarks:

III. Roll Call:

| | |
|---------------|-----------------|
| Aaron Woods | Richard Martens |
| Shaw n O'Neil | Samuel Scull |
| Samy Nada | |

IV. Citizen's Input:

V. Election Of 2017 Chair And Vice-Chair

- Chair
- Vice-Chair

VI. Consent Agenda:

A. Approval of minutes of the August 22, 2016 meeting

Documents:

[Aug 22 2016 Minutes.pdf](#)

B. Approval of minutes of the September 26, 2016 meeting

Documents:

[Sept 26 2016 Minutes.pdf](#)

VII. Public Hearing:

VIII. Board Member Communications:

A. Results of the November 14, 2016 DRB Panel A meeting

Documents:

[DRB-A Nov 14 2016 Results.pdf](#)

IX. Staff Communications:

A. Development Code Update Discussion

X. Adjournment

Assistive Listening Devices (ALD) are available for persons with impaired hearing and can be scheduled for this meeting. The City will also endeavor to provide the following services, without cost, if requested at least 48 hours prior to the meeting.

- Qualified sign language interpreters for persons with speech or hearing impairments.
- Qualified bilingual interpreters.
- To obtain such services, please call the Planning Assistant at 503 682-4960

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2017

6:30 PM

VI. Consent Agenda:

- A. Approval of minutes from the August 22, 2016
DRB Panel B meeting

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

**Development Review Board – Panel B
Minutes–August 22, 2016 6:30 PM**

I. Call to Order

Vice 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, Aaron Woods, Samy Nada, Samuel Scull, and Council Liaison Julie Fitzgerald. Shawn O’Neil was absent.

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. City Council Liaison Report

Councilor Fitzgerald reported on the recent City Council meeting as follows:

- In work session, a presentation was given about a potential ordinance or code for the City to consider regarding the aesthetic requirements for the installation of any new cell phone transmitters in the City’s rights-of-way. The objective was to prevent transmitters from interfering with the functions of the City’s rights-of-way. Further proposals would be forthcoming from staff.
 - The Council reviewed the IT Strategic Plan to assess whether the City was sufficiently staffed to keep up with the City’s and the citizens’ IT needs; Council would be deciding how to proceed with Staff’s recommendations over the coming weeks.
 - Council continued discussion on the Town Center Redevelopment Plan contract.
 - Council also discussed and responded positively to a project to reopen the Willamette Falls Locks. While the project would involve a number of different entities, Wilsonville would be positively impacted if the locks were reopened.
- During its regular session, Council approved Ordinance No. 795, an amendment for about three acres in the Villebois Village Center.
- Council discussed Clackamas County Gas Tax measure for the November 2016 ballot. All of the cities in the County were asked to adopt a resolution regarding the gas tax.

Aaron Woods inquired about the status of an earlier request by the Council for input on the IT Strategic Plan and whether input was still being taken.

Councilor Fitzgerald responded that Council had discussed the final draft of the Plan and she believed there was still opportunity to provide input, particularly with regard to expenditures or important decisions. She encouraged sending input or asking questions via email to the City Manager about the IT Plan. She also suggested that people request a copy of the IT Strategic Plan for review.

Vice Chair Martens asked whether the City Council voted to support the gas tax.

Barbara Jacobson, City Attorney, clarified the County had asked all the various cities for a resolution to adopt an intergovernmental agreement (IGA), but due to disagreement about the wording and other issues, the County decided not to do an IGA. Council discussed passing a resolution in support of the measure at the next meeting, but so far no action had been taken by Council on the matter.

Councilor Fitzgerald added there had been some discussion about whether the cities could issue a joint statement regarding the gas tax, but Council did not have that information at the time of the meeting and the Mayor may still be looking into that. The County was looking for funding to help with a huge shortfall in road repair.

Vice Chair Martens asked if the State or Federal governments imposed any constraints limiting what the City could do regarding the regulation of cell phone towers.

Councilor Fitzgerald recalled such constraints were already in place, but responding to aesthetics was quite complicated.

Ms. Jacobson explained with the new 5G technology was driving a movement to get away from large towers in favor of tall, skinny poles or to attach the cell phone devices to light poles in the right-of-way, which the Council was considering. The City had more ability to control what went on its own property or within its own right-of-way as opposed to private property. The City could not prevent phone companies from attaching the devices to light poles in a right-of-way. Certain constraints under State and Federal Law did limit the City's actions; however, the City could regulate the aesthetics and placement of devices to avoid a blight on the environment.

VI. Consent Agenda:

A. Approval of minutes of July 25, 2016 meeting

Aaron Woods moved to approve the July 25, 2016 DRB Panel B meeting minutes as presented.

Samy Nada seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

VII. Public Hearing:

A. Resolution No. 331.

Black Bear Diner: Michael Rose, Real Income Corp - Owner/Applicant. The applicant is requesting approval of a Site Design Review request and Class 3 Sign Permit for conversion of an existing restaurant to a Black Bear Diner Restaurant. The subject property is located at 30175 SW Parkway Avenue on Tax Lot 102 of Section 23AA, T3S, R1W, Clackamas County, Oregon.
Staff: Daniel Pauly.

Case Files: DB16-0037 Site Design Review
DB16-0038 Class 3 Sign Permit

Vice Chair Martens called the public hearing to order at 6:43 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 reviewing the site's history of restaurant tenants, and noting the project's location and surrounding features, with these key comments:

- Site Design Review. Because the proposed restaurant had a similar style and the same footprint as the existing restaurant, the traffic report and parking requirements were not being used as criteria since the use was essentially staying the same. No changes were being made to the building's footprint or use that would trigger such reviews. The traffic report was prepared for information about the streets and to use in future reports. The scope of what the Board was considering included the changes to the architecture and site design, the landscaping, as well as the sign permit request.
- He reviewed the proposed architectural changes, which included sloped canopies, sloped roofs over the entry area and adding architectural lighting as well as detail along the cornice. The architectural elements adapted to this building were very indicative of the Black Bear brand throughout the region. The western outdoor motif with wood beams and river-rock-type detail fit the site. (Slides 5-7)
 - The proposed colors and materials were appropriate and met the Site Design Standards, including the long-lasting siding and stone veneer elements.
- Class III Sign Permit. As an existing site, the Applicant could either follow the previous sign approvals or use the current Sign Code, which the Applicant decided to do. This allowed for 48 sq ft of signage on the north side facing the parking area, and 60 sq ft facing Parkway Ave, but no building signage was allowed to face I-5 or on the south side of the building.
 - The Applicant already received a permit through Administrative Review to put up a slightly smaller Black Bear sign to replace the old Denny's freeway sign which had already been removed.
 - Although the trademark black bear statutes would have visual interest and a purpose, whether or not they were holding a sign, the bears were not considered a sign. However, the signs the bears were holding were considered directional signs, which have square footage and height limitations, so the bears would need to be carved in a way to meet those Code limitations.
- Landscape Improvements. The Applicant was already working on enhancing the landscaping to mirror the enhancements to the building, including adding landscape areas to replace some pavement.
- He noted that under the current Code, a nonconforming site condition existed in relation to parking. The Applicant was maintaining the pavement area, so there was no trigger to require meeting current parking standards; however, pavement markings and additional changes to the parking were being done due to recent changes to the I-5 Interchange, which took property from the site eliminating 18 parking spots on the west side of the site due to the need to provide vehicle circulation behind the building. (Slides 11 to 13)
 - As currently striped, the parking stalls did not meet the City's required dimensions to be classified as a parking space. Based on recommendations in the Traffic Report, the site would be striped to include 51 parking spaces, reflecting the recommendation to eliminate one parking space to provide greater access for trash collection on the south side of the site. (Slide 14)
 - When reviewing the parking area to ensure it functioned in the best way possible, Staff considered what could be done on the adjacent street, Parkway Ave. Currently, Parkway Ave had a wide area in the middle striped as a turn lane. The city engineer confirmed there was not enough traffic volume to warrant a turn lane. Therefore, Staff suggested closing the south driveway and restriping Parkway Ave to add street parking where none currently existed. This change would also provide a couple more onsite parking spaces, resulting in the site having more legal parking spaces than what existed after the interchange improvements.
- He entered the City Prepared Striping Plan (Slide 15) into the record as Exhibit C3 and explained the technically detailed drawing showed the engineered construction of Exhibit C2, which was included in the Staff report. He explained which striping costs would be the responsibility of the Applicant.
- He clarified that the plans currently showed 51 parking spaces and that eight more would be added with the closure of the driveway along Parkway Ave and at least two more spaces on site for a total of 61 spaces.

Aaron Woods asked why the traffic study was done midweek between 4 pm and 5 pm.

Mr. Pauly replied the standard practice was to perform traffic studies on a Tuesday or Wednesday.

Steve Adams, Development Engineering Manager, explained Mondays and Fridays were not considered typical traffic days, but Tuesday through Thursday reflected a more typical traffic pattern. Traffic studies are done Tuesday through Thursday or over a seven-day period. The time of day for the study was per the City Code, which required that development did not overly impact the streets during the 4:00 to 6:00 PM Peak Hour.

Mr. Woods explained he was concerned about traffic congestion, which was especially bad closer to the weekend. Given there was only one way to enter and exit the site, he asked if the lunch and dinner hours had been considered since there would be more traffic in and out of the site.

Mr. Adams deferred to the Applicant to explain how customer traffic patterns during different times of day were determined. He explained that the traffic study was done more as a reference point since the site predated the City and no traffic studies had been done. The traffic study showed the development would not create any adverse effects on the intersections involved. The Town Center Loop West/Wilsonville Rd intersection would be most the most heavily traversed, however, half of the traffic would go straight through or right and would not impact the interchange area. The City Code did not permit the application to be denied due to differences in traffic impacts between one type of franchise owner and another.

Samuel Scull confirmed one of the site's two driveways would be blocked and asked if that was adequate for 61 parking spaces at peak time.

Mr. Adams replied the change was discussed with DKS Associates before talking about it with the Applicant. DKS had verified that for the amount of traffic on Parkway Ave and Main St, the one existing driveway being shared with the gas station would be sufficient.

Mr. Pauly added that from an engineering and safety standpoint, limiting the number of conflicts and access points to streets was preferred. Many parking lots much larger than the Applicant's only had a single access, so there were no concerns about stacking or blocking people in with the amount of proposed parking limited to one access point.

- He confirmed Staff was comfortable with the amount of space available for garbage or large supply trucks to access the site, adding restaurants generally work to schedule deliveries during off-peak hours.

Mr. Adams added that in his experience, trash collection was also timed during off-peak hours.

Mr. Scull asked if the configuration was also adequate for the fire department and emergency vehicles.

Mr. Pauly answered yes. The fire or emergency access would be through the main access at the north side of the building.

Samy Nada asked if the garbage collection company reviewed the proposed design to ensure enough space was available for their trucks to turn around, especially with one driveway.

Mr. Pauly replied obviously, sites like this were not ideal for garbage service, but DKS had reviewed the site plan, specifically with regard to trash pickup and circulation, and the traffic engineers had no issues.

Mr. Nada noted the City's minimum requirement for parking was 121 spaces and even with the street modification and restriping, there would only be 61 total spaces. He asked how many other restaurants in

town had similar circumstances. With at least 20 or more employees also needing parking, he did not know how this would work.

Mr. Pauly replied the Applicant might be able to discuss their parking management or experience at other similar restaurants and how many spaces are used at peak hours. He noted according to today's parking requirements, a lot more spaces would be required; however, the scope of review was limited to the architectural changes. The Applicant had a similar layout of booths and tables inside. He understood the office space or lounge area upstairs would not be occupied, so less square footage would be used than previously approved. Although the proposal did not meet Code, the Code did allow the use to be continued with the existing legally created conditions.

- He cited Boones Junction Pizza and the Red Robin/Wanker's Corner parking lot as examples of restaurants that did not have the required parking spaces; though he did not do any official counts. Some restaurants in General Commercial, multi-tenant shopping centers would not likely meet the parking requirements for a restaurant either as it was difficult to know when the tenant space would be a restaurant or a dry cleaner.

Vice Chair Martens asked if the Code specifically provided for use as a restaurant, in terms of parking, or was it more of a commercial use based on square footage.

Mr. Pauly responded parking requirements for General Commercial were a lot less than for restaurants. General Commercial or Retail parking was usually spread throughout the day while restaurant traffic was more concentrated during peak hours. Substantially more parking spaces were required for restaurants per 1,000 sq ft than for General Commercial or Retail spaces.

Mr. Scull asked about the reason for closing one driveway.

Mr. Pauly explained the driveway was not needed, though it could remain open and still be approvable. In considering the overall conditions and the pavement available, closing the driveway still allowed for adequate truck circulation while also providing more space for parking and eliminating one potential conflict space for vehicles. Because parking was a major need on the site, the tradeoff was closing one driveway which still provided adequate truck circulation.

Mr. Adams added that closing the driveway added four to six additional parking spaces. ??

Vice Chair Martens called for the Applicant's testimony.

Thomas Bowen, 10601 NE 97th Circle, Vancouver, WA, explained that deliveries from Sysco, which would bring about 90 percent of the restaurant's food and paper products would be between 3:00 am and 4:00 am, and it might be possible to schedule trash pickup early in the morning as well. The restaurant had 34 tables and 11 counter seats. Most of the time, occupants for each table come in one vehicle, so he believed the 51 parking spaces would accommodate the available table seating, noting it was about the same as when the restaurant operated as a Denny's. He noted he was the general manager at the Denny's and would now be the general manager for Black Bear.

Mr. Woods asked what the peak hours were for customers at Black Bear.

Mr. Bowen explained Black Bear restaurants generally see the highest customer traffic occurs during the dinner hours, which were generally 6 pm to 9 pm on weekdays. On weekends, the breakfast flow was heavy from 8 am to 3 pm, as was dinner from 4:30 pm or 5 pm to 9 pm or 10 pm. The hours of operation would be 6 am to 10 pm seven days a week.

Mr. Nada asked how many customers the restaurant could serve overall.

Mr. Bowen replied the restaurant was set up for 168 customers, however, that number would not be served all the time. For example, a four-seat booth would be occupied by two people. The hourly guest counts would usually be about 120 guests per hour. He noted that guest counts were tracked, and he had done so at Denny's.

Vice Chair Martens said he counted roughly 160 seats including the meeting or banquet room, and asked if any industry standards existed for occupancy at peak times, including employees or others waiting to be seated, to estimate how many vehicles would be parking at peak times.

Mr. Bowen replied did not know how many vehicles, only the hourly guest counts. Generally, banquets would not be scheduled during peak hours because so much of the parking would be used. Banquets usually ran two to three hours and were usually scheduled in the mornings or afternoons Monday through Friday; none were booked on Saturdays and Sundays because of the parking issue. Sunday evenings might be a possibility.

Mr. Scull asked what the average staff count was per shift.

Mr. Bowen stated Denny's had about 11 employees per shift, but Black Bear would probably have about 28 employees per shift because many food items at Black Bear were prepared from scratch, which required 2 prep cooks, a baker, and 5 cooks on the line. There would also be 9 to 10 servers and 7 or 8 bus helpers and hostesses.

Mr. Scull noted employees could consume 25 percent of the parking.

Mr. Bowen replied the Applicant hoped to have the staff park in the circle on Parkway Ave.

Mr. Nada stated this was important. He did not know if the Applicant could get approval to park there, but he roughly estimated that with a 120 guest count and assuming the best, at four people per car, there would be 30 cars; adding 24 or 28 staff would exceed the current parking capacity.

Mr. Bowen clarified that half the staff would probably not be driving, but get dropped off. A lot of young people would be washing dishes, bussing tables and hostessing, and most did not drive. At Denny's on the weekends, for example, with 18 people on shift, there would be 8 or 9 staff cars parked out front, where he had the Denny's employees park. In between the restaurant and I-5 to save the other parking for the guests.

Mr. Nada said given a similar 50 percent ratio for Black Bear, 14 or 15 parking spots would be needed for staff. He did not believe the parking in the Parkway Ave circle was not mentioned in the traffic study.

Mr. Pauly explained the circle was far enough way that it would not have been considered in the traffic study. He confirmed Parkway Ave had typical on street public parking.

Mr. Bowen noted he had seen people park there all the time. He guessed about 8 to 10 parking spaces were available.

Mr. Pauly clarified that Main Street had bike lanes, so no parking was allowed there.

Vice Chair Martens called for public testimony in favor of, opposed, and neutral to the application. Seeing none, he confirmed there were no further questions from the Board and closed the public hearing at 7:21 pm.

Samuel Scull moved to adopt Resolution No 331 with the addition of Exhibit C3. Samy Nada seconded the motion.

Vice Chair Martens stated that while the Board had discussed parking, which was a point of interest, it was not a criterion for approval for the subject application.

The motion passed unanimously.

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

VIII. Board Member Communications

There were none.

IX. Staff Communications

Daniel Pauly, Senior Planner, noted the email he sent about his recent promotion, adding he looked forward to working with the Board in his new role, adding he would be introducing new planners soon.

The Board congratulated Mr. Pauly on his promotion.

X. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:26 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2017

6:30 PM

VI. Consent Agenda:

- B. Approval of minutes from the September 26, 2016 DRB Panel B meeting

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

**Development Review Board – Panel B
Minutes–September 26, 2016 6:30 PM**

I. Call to Order

Chair Shawn O’Neil called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm.

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: Shawn O’Neil, Richard Martens, Samy Nada, and City Council Liaison Julie Fitzgerald. Aaron Woods and Samuel Scull were absent.

Staff present: Daniel Pauly, Barbara Jacobson, and Mike Ward

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. City Council Liaison Report

Councilor Fitzgerald reported on the City Council’s recent work session, noting Council spent a good deal of time hearing reports about traffic studies on Wilsonville Rd, an update on the Boones Ferry Road to Brown Road Connector Plan, and upcoming changes to City Code regarding the new forms of wireless communication facilities.

- Council also heard a report on the Company National Citizens Survey conducted the on Wilsonville’s citizens. Of the 127 different standards overall, 26 of Wilsonville’s ratings exceeded benchmarks, 96 were similar, and 5 were lower than other cities that participated in the survey.
 - According to the survey, the top priority for the city’s residents over the next five years was traffic, roads, and transportation, with planning, growth, and expansion being the second priority, and housing and affordability third. She encouraged the Board to read the survey, which was available on the City website, along with further details.

VI. Consent Agenda:

- A. Approval of minutes of August 22, 2016 meeting
Approval of the August 22, 2016 DRB Panel B meeting minutes was postponed due to lack of a quorum.

VII. Public Hearing:

- A. **Resolution No. 333. Villebois Phase 11 Central – Berkshire No. 2: Stacy Connery, AICP, Pacific Community Design, Inc. – Representative for RCS–Villebois Development, LLC – Applicant/Owner.** The applicant is requesting approval of a Zone Map Amendment from Public Facility (PF) Zone to Village (V) Zone, Specific Area Plan – Central Refinements, Preliminary Development Plan, Final Development Plan, Tentative Subdivision Plat and Type ‘C’ Tree Plan for the development of detached row houses and associated improvements in Villebois SAP Central, Phase 11. The subject property is located on Tax Lot 3300 of Section 15AC, Township 3 South, Range 1 West, Willamette Meridian, City Of Wilsonville, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Daniel Pauly.

| | | |
|-------------|-----------|------------------------------|
| Case Files: | DB16-0031 | Zone Map Amendment |
| | DB16-0032 | SAP Central Refinements |
| | DB16-0033 | Preliminary Development Plan |
| | DB16-0034 | Final Development Plan |
| | DB16-0035 | Tentative Subdivision Plat |
| | DB16-0036 | Type C Tree Plan |

Chair O’Neil called the public hearing to order at 6:36 pm. 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, noting the project site’s location and surrounding features and reviewing the Applicant’s requests with these key comments:

- The Zone Map Amendment was similar to other applications the Board had seen previously. The site was proposed to be rezoned to Village from its zoning as the Dammasch State Hospital. This was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.
- SAP-Central Refinements and Preliminary Development Plan (PDP):
 - The Applicant proposed a change in the number of units. Originally, 37 units comprised of condos and urban apartments were planned for Specific Area Plan (SAP) Central, and now 16 detached row houses were proposed. Because all of the land uses in the Village Center were grouped into small-lot single-family and smaller, the land use change was not significant.
 - The Code allowed a change of up to 10 percent in density from the original Specific Area Plan approval. The proposed 21 unit reduction on the subject site combined with another application with a recently approved reduction resulted in a 6.44 percent reduction overall from the original SAP approval, which was within the confines allowed through the refinement process in the Code.
 - Another consideration when changing product types within the same land use category was product or housing diversity as well as urban form. There was a general idea of a transect within Villebois with the densest, highest buildings in the Village Core around the Piazza transitioning to less density moving away from the Core with the largest homes along the edge.
 - The subject site was northeast of the Barber St/Costa Circle West intersection at the edge of the Village Center, so from the transect standpoint, the site made sense as a transition area to transition from the single family into the denser urban Village Center Core, similar to that seen south of Barber St across from the park.
 - He noted that along that particular stretch of Barber St, the Piazza was not right in the middle of the Village Center, but off to the side, so that stretch along Barber St was the shortest transition area from outside of the Village Center to the Core, so regardless, there would be a pretty abrupt density change compared to the north end which had more room for a gradual increase in density. From Staff’s perspective, the density could go either way, similar to the product on the other side of the park or similar to the product around the Piazza.

- The Applicant illustrated in Slide 1 how the proposed two-story homes would appear to be about two-and-a-half stories, with the roof pitch and such, and how those would appear next to a three-story, mixed-use building. There would be some transition, but it would transition fairly well and would mirror what currently existed across the street due to what was already built, as well as a recently-approved project. He indicated the existing Charleston Apartments along Costa Circle, which were a taller, mixed-income apartment complex, as well as the location of the similarly-sized detached row homes proposed across the street. Therefore, the urban form made sense and Staff believed the proposal met all the applicable criteria and could be approved from that perspective.
- Because the current proposal was likely to come in for permitting prior to some of Polygon's earlier phases approved to the north, the Applicant would be required to improve Valencia Ln as outlined in the Engineering conditions of approval. Those improvements would provide access to the back of the homes via an alley, and all of the homes would face Barber St, Costa Circle, or Valencia Ln.
- The parking requirement for 16 single-family units was 16 spaces, a one-per-one requirement. Beyond the garages, driveways would be put in where lot depth allowed and four homes would also have exterior driveways. The parking requirement would be met with the Applicant's proposed parking, assuming residents used their garages for parking; however, on street parking would also be available.
- Traffic. As was previously discussed when reviewing Phase 10 Central, an overarching traffic study was done for SAP Central, which assumed the 37 units proposed on the parcel. The current proposal, as well as another reduction recently approved across the street, actually reduced the number of traffic trips so, the proposed project continued to meet Level of Service.
- The Final Development Plan.
 - Architecture in the Village Center did not follow the Pattern Book, so it was within the Board's purview to review the architecture of each of the homes as part of the review process. Architecture outside the Village Center was required to follow the Pattern Book and reviewed by a consultant architect. The detached row houses in the Village Center, such as the modern homes along Barber St or the bluish "Officer's Row" homes along Villebois Dr, were built to visually create one single unit, even though they were detached. The architecture was made to match each unit so that they appeared as one bulk almost in terms of design.
 - The proposed project followed a different approach like that taken with the row houses across from Piccadilly Park along Costa Circle where the homes featured a variety of architecture similar to what was seen outside the Village Center. As a condition of approval, the Applicant was required to switch out some of the units based on consumer preference and sales, but the same rules of adjacency had to be met in terms of architectural variety and not having the same housing styles or architecture across the street or next to each other as outlined in the various architectural pattern books.
 - He indicated how the two-and-a-half-story homes would transition to the higher, mixed-use building that was still planned, but not yet approved, next to the Piazza. Other components included fencing and front courtyards along with trees. The Applicant would use fencing approved from the Architectural Pattern Book and used elsewhere in Villebois, so it would be consistent with the look of other projects.
 - Landscaping was proposed in the most prominent areas in the Village Center, particularly on the corner of Costa Circle and Barber St. Some of the landscaping was not shown in detail in the yards. Because the Applicant might change some floor plans at the last minute, a condition of approval required final Staff review of a complete Landscape Plan prior to the issuance of any building permits for the project.

- The Tentative Subdivision Plat provided lots that met Code to allow the development of the planned product type. All of the different remnant pieces were appropriately addressed and the needed right-of-way was shown dedicated.
 - He indicated an area where the plan originally showed some retention of birch trees, but birch trees had declined greatly throughout the city because of the bronze birch borer, which was also the case here. Of the eight trees on the site that would be impacted by the proposed development, seven were in Poor condition and would be removed anyway. The remaining tree was a decent, Moderate tree that was in the right-of-way and not significant enough to be retained within a new street as had been done for other more significant trees within Villebois.

Samy Nada asked what the average square footage was of the row houses.

Mr. Pauly deferred to the Applicant, but believed they were around 1,700 to 2,000 sq ft.

Mr. Nada asked what the difference was between single-family homes and row houses because it seemed that either could work for this particular development. The only difference he could find was that single-family homes had more restrictions than row houses.

Mr. Pauly replied that some of it regarded semantics within the Villebois Code. The proposed type of unit was called Small Cottage outside the Village Center, which was the smallest of the single-family homes and would be similar to the product found along Costa Circle across from Piccadilly Park, as well as the similar-sized homes Polygon had built farther up Costa Circle at the corner of Paris and Costa Circle. He confirmed the widths of the lot and home differentiated the two-story homes and row homes. Some of the detached row houses in the Village Center were actually larger than the small homes because they were three-story units, giving them more square footage.

Mr. Nada confirmed the Parking Code for row houses was the same as for single-family homes and that regardless of home size; only one parking space was required.

Mr. Pauly added parking requirements would start to differentiate with multi-family units.

Richard Martens confirmed two-car garages were required in the proposed development. He noted Covenants, Constraints, and Restrictions (CC&Rs) for a recently-approved project were to require that garages be used for parking instead of storage and asked if any thought had been given to adding a similar requirement to the current proposal.

Mr. Pauly clarified that had not been used for single-family homes elsewhere in Villebois. The project Mr. Martens mentioned was essentially a condo project with apartment-style parking that consisted of a parking lot partially covered with garages. Even with on street parking, that project could not meet the parking requirement without counting those garages because of the density of the units in the condo buildings. Even if residents in this project had just one car in their garage, for example, the parking requirement would still be met on the street, which was consistent throughout the history of Villebois. It was within the purview of the Board to put in a similar condition of approval if the Applicant was open to it; however, it had not been done previously where parking would be tight due to the denser development at the Village Core because there was enough parking even if the garages were not used at all.

Mr. Martens clarified he was not proposing that the requirement be imposed, but had brought it up as a potential tool because one complaint from the development from time to time was lack of parking. The requirement would give the HOA the tool to deal with the problem that people would be complaining about.

Mr. Pauly added the threshold regarding when such a condition should be required was not clear. It was clear in the previous development because they did not even come close to meeting minimum parking by using those garages, so there was some discretion there.

Mr. Martens asked if this project was materially different than the project across the street that DRB-Panel A approved a couple of weeks ago for the same Applicant.

Mr. Pauly replied the main difference was the subject project involved a zone change whereas the other one did not because it was a revision of a previous approval that was never built. Typically, both applications would have been grouped together because of the product type and history, but they were assigned to different planners at one point, one of which had subsequently left, so he was now the planner on both and they had already been scheduled separately. In terms of the units, and the projects' design and look, there was no difference except for the subject project needing a zone change because nothing had been approved for the site previously. Both projects would have a similar design and be a cohesive unit across Barber St when developed.

Chair O'Neil asked if Trocadero Park, which included the skateboard park and had been approved last year, was within the neighborhood.

Mr. Pauly indicated the subject site was at the northeast corner of Costa Circle and Barber St, adding that Paris Ave and Trocadero Park were two blocks away.

Chair O'Neil noted he did not see a lot of parking issues when he was at the skate park; however, he had heard in that hearing and from others about the parking concerns. When it came to the Villebois development, there was always someone who said they did not expect the traffic volume and lack of parking they found. He noted that residents in Rivergreen, which was a bit bigger and had bigger lots, also found themselves with lots of cars on the street and limited parking at times, too. He wanted to voice his concern and acknowledge parking was something Wilsonville would be struggling with as a growing community.

Mr. Pauly stated that in terms of parking demand in the area, the parks across the street only had parking on one side of the street, so parking along the frontage of this would be used by park users as well during the day. Plus, projects to the northeast were fairly dense, approved condo buildings and attached row house buildings, and would have parking demand on street. He emphasized that the Village Center would have an urban feel and parking came with that urban feel.

Chair O'Neil called for the Applicant's presentation.

Rudy Kadlub, 11422 SW Barber St, Wilsonville, OR, stated he was the Master Planner and the Master Developer of the Villebois Village Center and that the entire process had begun in 2002. One of his roles was to be the visionary, however, it was pretty good looking out six years, but at 14 years it was a little foggier. The applicants had been into the City a few times to ask for modifications to the original Master Plan in terms of product types and density. Back in 2010 or 2011, the City approved some major apartment projects in the city. Some areas within the Village Center were originally designed to be apartments. This particular site had been designated as multi-family originally, but the developer found over the last three to five years that it was really difficult to attract more multi-family because there was an imbalance of multi-family to single-family currently in the city. As such, they were not able to get the rents that would make a new apartment project viable in Wilsonville. Therefore, the Applicant was trying to stay within the notion of keeping the density, the maximum number of people, within walking distance of the Piazza and the future mixed-use properties. The idea originally, and as it remained today, was to have as many people as possible walking to services as opposed to driving.

- The currently proposed single-family product was a bit different than the cottages across the street because the home sites had a smaller width. The subject lots were 28-ft wide versus 32-ft to 34-ft lots across the street and were denser than single-family products outside of the Village Center, even in some other areas of the Village Center.
- One of the three development tenets subscribed to when doing the planning for Villebois a number of years ago was connectivity, diversity, and sustainability. In this case, the Applicant considered diversity an important part of the planning for this particular site. There were a variety of different products all within eyesight of this location, including apartments, community housing, attached row homes, condominiums, detached row homes in the form of the Officers Row, contemporary-looking detached row homes, and urban lofts.
 - The proposed detached product type was more traditional so the diversity was great. Even though the type of housing was similar to some of the other pieces, the architecture created a bit more variety in the Village Center. Within a block, there were seven or eight different types of houses that he was excited about.
- He was also excited to introduce a new builder to Villebois, Portland, and the State of Oregon. David Weekley Homes was America's largest private homebuilder. He had met David Weekley many years ago and had watched them progress throughout the country. The company had a knack for architecture, design, and good planning, so he was very comfortable having them enter this marketplace and participating in Villebois.

Stacy Connery, AICP, Pacific Community Design, confirmed she had nothing further to add regarding the Board's comments.

Mr. Kadlub noted that with regards to parking, the site across the street was approved a couple of weeks ago for about 34 homes, but was originally approved for a 49-unit apartment project that did not get built due to lack of financing. The proposed number of homes had decreased from 83 to 25 homes in the area, which reduced the density a bit. Even though the density for detached product was high, it was lower than what it had been, so that provided some relief on the parking. The proposed homes would have two-car garages. At some point, the residents of Villebois might figure out that if they used their garages to park, there would be more parking on the street. When no parking was left on the street, the residents would be forced to use their garage. He believed many people take the easiest path, but eventually it would all even out. He introduced Steve Puls from David Weekley Homes, noting Mr. Puls had lived in the area for a couple decades.

Steve Puls, David Weekley Homes, 19968 NW Cornwall Lane, Hillsboro, OR, 97124 stated the proposed project was the first David Weekley Homes had in Oregon, and they were very excited about that. David Weekley was a private company, and proud of it. The owner was still involved day to day, reviewing plans, and had looked at the proposed location as well as the plans associated with the project. David Weekley Homes was in 23 markets, but operated locally. He has lived and worked in Portland for 24 years. He was proud to say that Portland was his home. The company was known around the country for many things. They were well acquainted and very experienced with master plans, which was one thing that had drawn the company to Wilsonville, and Villebois, in particular. They had won more than 655 awards for new home designs and were very focused on customer service and buyer satisfaction. More than 93 percent of David Weekley's homeowners would definitely recommend the company at the time they received their home. David Weekley Homes has been ranked as one of *Fortune 100's* Best Place to Work for ten years straight, and prided itself on its community involvement with the Weekley Foundation, having given over \$100 million to a variety of local organizations in the US and abroad. For this project, they were proud to be working with Mr. Kadlub and looked forward to being a part of the Villebois community. He concluded that brochures about David Weekley Homes were available for those interested in learning more.

Chair O'Neil called for public testimony in favor of, opposed, and neutral to the application. Seeing none, he noted there would be no rebuttal from the Applicant and closed the public hearing at 7:14 pm.

Chair O'Neil stated that he responds based on the citizens' concerns, and no citizens had come and voiced any concerns. He understood the comment "People should learn to park in their garages", but many of these homeowners were told by realtors that the garages were for storage, so he could understand why some people may have concerns in that community about the parking and the fact that there was no parking with that particular park. However, since no citizens had come to testify about that he had no other option than to support it. And while he agreed the Board should take into consideration DRB Panel A's approval of a similar site, he believed DRB Panel B still had to maintain independence in its decision-making. He was going to assess the subject application independently, but would likely support the application because no concerns had been expressed by any citizens.

Mr. Martens reiterated he had offered that as a suggestion, but was not proposing that it be a requirement of approval. He would still encourage the Applicant to give some thought to that when drafting the CC&Rs to give the eventual HOA Board a tool to address parking issues. When citizens come to the City and complain about the lack of parking, one response could be to ask if they were managing parking within their own HOA. Once added, it would simply be tool that was available. He advocated the condition because he lived in an HOA that had it and it worked.

Mr. Nada stated that the minimum requirement of one parking space per 1,700 to 2,000 sq ft unit would lead to more parking issues and was too low for that size of home.

Mr. Martens responded it was designed for high density and would still be better than NW 23rd in Portland.

Mr. Nada countered that was why people moved from Portland to Wilsonville.

Chair O'Neil moved to approve Resolution No. 333 as presented. Samy Nada seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Chair O'Neil read the rules of appeal into the record.

VIII. Board Member Communications None

A. Results of the September 12, 2016 DRB Panel A meeting

IX. Staff Communications

Daniel Pauly, Senior Planner, updated the Board on some of the projects they had reviewed and addressed questions from the Board with these comments:

- The storage place was coming along. The architects had changed from the DRB approval to the construction drawings, and some of the renderings were not coming up correctly along the top edges, so that some of the gap between the roofs and some parapet edges were not what was shown in the drawings, so some small adjustments needed to be made. Staff and the Applicant were working through it, trying to remain as close as possible to the DRB approval.
- He met the contractor and completed an inspection of the tree fencing last week on the 14-lot subdivision, which should be going full speed ahead with the houses being removed very shortly.
- Black Bear Diner should be picking up their construction permits this week, so that project would be moving forward full swing.
- Subaru was about a month or so from occupancy. He would have a meeting with them this week to review the final details and ensure everything was on track to get the landscaping and everything installed prior to occupancy.

- He confirmed he had not heard about any issues from the Catholic Church.
- The bids for the middle school had come in a lot better than expected. He noted that after the Board's review, the school district had come back administratively to reduce the scope of the school, removing some of tech rooms, for example, as they were not certain it could all be built within the current bidding atmosphere. However, the project came in well below expected, enabling the school to build all of their alternates and even some extra amenities.
- The skate park at Trocadero Park was complete and would be fenced until the remainder of the park was finished. He had reviewed the permits for the restroom building late last week, so that building permit would be issued shortly so the rest of the park would be moving forward.
 - He confirmed the Applicant had followed Board's recommendation so there would be street parking on the side adjacent to the skate park. Parking was also planned in the nearby subdivision, adding the subdivision plat was currently on his desk. He noted there had been a lot of interest when the skate park was first finished, but that had quieted down recently.
- He explained that the lots had been cleared where the two houses were proposed in Old Town down from the Mayor's business that used to have an old single-wide mobile home, but no construction had ever taken place. For some reason, the original builder had sold the property as he had seen a Sale Pending sign. Staff had received a couple of inquiries from different builders asking if they had to build the exact same thing, so it was possible that a new builder would return with new plans for the two lots.

Chair O'Neil asked if there was any further update about the City's relationship with the Old Town Neighborhood Association.

Mr. Pauly replied Staff continued to have conversations because an application had been submitted for Fir Ave and 4th St, which was the 9-lot subdivision that was a part of the controversy that initiated the Old Town Neighborhood Plan. The project had been on hold from the applicant's standpoint for some unknown reason as Staff could not get a hold of the applicant. The proposal did bring a lot of folks out, however, prompting conversations including about what the appropriate scope was for the Neighborhood Plan going forward. While the density was going to happen, there had been concern that all of the architecture would be American Modern Craftsman style on two-story houses, which often seen in new subdivisions in Portland. The neighborhood had talked with the applicant about bringing in some authentic diversity, such as including some farmhouse styles, to provide some architectural diversity. Those conversations were still occurring, especially as these new projects were coming up. He believed the City and the Old Town Neighborhood were developing good relationships.

Chair O'Neil noted everybody attended the big hearing on that development and he had anticipated that the dealership would have had the same crowd; although they were present, they had remained silent. It would be great to have it consistent throughout; that the Plan was worked out before it comes.

Mr. Pauly responded that although Code did not require it, neighborhood meetings were encouraged. Many issues had been worked out in the neighborhood meetings for the Charbonneau driving range application, which would probably not have proceeded very far without them. One developer had actually walked away, and now another developer was having meetings, and the neighborhood seemed pretty supportive of the application thus far.

- He clarified the buffer defined by Code for public hearing notices was 250 ft and those notices went to the property owner on the tax rolls. Every single house with a different property owner on the tax rolls would receive the notice.

Chair O'Neil apologized for his absence at the last two Board meetings.

X. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:28 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

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

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2017

6:30 PM

VIII. Board Member Communications:

A. Results of the November 14, 2016 DRB Panel A meeting

City of Wilsonville

Development Review Board Panel A Meeting Meeting Results

| | | |
|--------------------|---|----------------------------|
| DATE: | NOVEMBER 14, 2016 | |
| LOCATION: | 29799 SW TOWN CENTER LOOP EAST, WILSONVILLE, OR | |
| TIME START: | 6:31 P.M. | TIME END: 8:08 P.M. |

ATTENDANCE LOG

| BOARD MEMBERS | STAFF |
|---------------------------|------------------|
| Mary Fierros Bower, Chair | Daniel Pauly |
| Kristin Akervall | Barbara Jacobson |
| Ronald Heberlein | Steve Adams |
| Fred Ruby | Jennifer Scola |
| James Frinell | Kim Rybold |

AGENDA RESULTS

| AGENDA | ACTIONS |
|---|--|
| CITIZENS' INPUT | None. |
| CONSENT AGENDA | |
| A. Approval of minutes of September 12, 2016 DRB Panel A meeting | A. Approved as presented with Fred Ruby abstaining. |
| PUBLIC HEARING | |
| A. Resolution No. 334. Charbonneau Range Subdivision: Pahlisch Homes Inc. – Applicant: Charbonneau Golf Club – Owner. The applicant is requesting approval of Stage I Master Plan Revisions, Stage II Final Plan, Site Design Review and Tentative Subdivision Plat for a 40-lot single family subdivision on the property historically used as the Charbonneau driving range. The subject property is located on Tax Lot 325 of Section 25, T3S, R1W, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Daniel Pauly <div style="margin-left: 40px;"> Case Files: DB16-0039 Stage I Master Plan Revisions DB16-0040 Stage II Final Plan DB16-0041 Site Design Review DB16-0042 Tentative Subdivision Plat </div> | A. Unanimously approved with the addition of Exhibit A3. |
| BOARD MEMBER COMUNICATIONS | None. |
| A. Results of the September 26,2016 DRB Panel B meeting | |
| STAFF COMMUNICATIONS | None. |