

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

Approved
July 10, 2017

**Development Review Board – Panel A
Minutes–March 13, 2017 6:30 PM**

I. Call to Order

Acting Chair Ronald Heberlein called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm.

II. Chair’s Remarks

III. Roll Call

Present for roll call were: Ronald Heberlein, Fred Ruby, Joann Linville and Jennifer Willard. James Frinell was absent.

Staff present: Daniel Pauly and Barbara Jacobson

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

V. Election of 2017 Chair and Vice-Chair

A. Chair

Ronald Heberlein was nominated for 2017 Chair.

There were no further nominations.

Ronald Heberlien was elected as the 2017 DRB Panel A Chair by a 3 to 0 to 1 vote with Ronald Heberlien abstaining.

B. Vice-Chair

Fred Ruby was nominated for 2017 DRB Panel A Vice-Chair.

There were no further nominations.

Fred Ruby was elected as the 2017 DRB Panel A Vice-Chair by a 3 to 0 to 1 vote with Fred Ruby abstaining.

VI. Consent Agenda:

A. Approval of minutes of the November 14, 2016 meeting

Approval of the November 14, 2016 DRB Panel A meeting minutes was postponed due to lack of a quorum.

VII. Public Hearing: There were no public hearing items.

VIII. Board Member Communications:

A. Results of the February 27, 2017 DRB Panel B meeting

B. Action Minutes from the February 23, 2017 City Council Meeting

Daniel Pauly, Senior Planner, explained to the Board a change recently made by the City Council concerning the Council Liaison position. Council had discussed at length and had decided not to have a liaison attend board meetings, in part because of the time involved and partly due to a concern about Councilors having access to quasi-judicial hearings prior to an appeal to Council and having to declare such at a Council meeting. In lieu, each meeting packet would include action items from the previous council meetings since the last board meeting. Councilors were open to attend meetings upon DRB request. In addition, the Council planned to have a once-yearly summit with boards and commissions to discuss different issues.

Barbara Jacobson, City Attorney, gave a brief description of what a summit meeting had been like in the past and said it had been very successful. Councilors thought that it had been a more effective way to communicate board and commission activity and recommended it.

Mr. Pauly discussed a few of the items covered by Council at the February 23 City Council meeting. One of the items was a work session discussion of implementation of a Red Light Camera at the intersections of Wilsonville Road and Boones Ferry Road and Wilsonville Road and Town Center Loop West.

Ms. Jacobson said that the Red Light Camera was still being discussed by City Council and that citizen input, including input from DRB members, would be welcomed.

Joann Linville asked if data concerning accidents that had occurred had been presented during the discussion of the Red Light Camera.

Ms. Jacobson answered that there had been data showing the number of tickets that had been issued at the affected intersections. The issue appeared to be people pulling out into the intersections during a yellow light and getting stuck in the intersection, blocking the right of way. A Red Light Camera in the intersections might deter people from turning when the light was about to turn red.

IX. Staff Communications

A. Development Code Update Discussion

Mr. Pauly congratulated Ronald Heberlein and James Frinell on their reappointments to the Board and welcomed new board members Joann Linville and Jennifer Willard. He asked board members to introduce themselves and share a bit about their background.

There was a brief round of introductions.

Mr. Pauly shared that at the March 8, 2017 Planning Commission meeting, the Planning Commission had adopted and recommended approval to the City Council the standards for the Frog Pond Master Plan.

He shared a bit of background regarding the two current approaches to development. Development in Villebois was prescriptive and consisted of many details, many of which were specific to Villebois development. In the remaining residential areas, in the Planned Development Residential (PDR) zones, the formula was less specific, which occasionally led to some controversy.

Consultants and staff had determined that their approach to the Frog Pond area would consist of a combination of the approach in Villebois and in the PDR zones. Frog Pond was divided into numbered subdistricts, with the minimum and maximum dwelling units allowed in each specified. It should be fairly straightforward for the developer. It could be difficult when defining a subdivision to determine how many lots to put in, but this approach provided more certainty up front for all parties involved.

The pattern was deliberate and was driven partly by property owner request and partly by location. For example property located in the southwest corner, closer to Town Center, was planned to be to be composed of smaller units whereas the property located to the northwest was composed of larger lots. There was an area set aside for a future school as well as for a church. Small lot sizes were a minimum of 4,000 square feet, medium lots were minimum 6,000 square feet and large lots were minimum 8,000 square feet.

He asked if there were any questions so far.

Ms. Linville noted that it appeared there were several R-5's with a minimum lot size of 4,000 square feet. Why were there multiple R-5's with different densities, in Subdistrict 10 and Subdistrict 6, for example?

Mr. Pauly answered that it varied due to the size of the subdistrict area.

Ms. Linville was concerned that there were duplicates of R-5 but the lot sizes would be the same even though the density would be different?

Mr. Pauly answered that the density would be the same. For example, Subdistrict 1 was quite a bit larger than Subdistrict 10, which was about one half the size of Subdistrict 1. The gross acreage was the driver in determining the minimum and maximum number of dwelling units allowed.

Ms. Linville asked if one could make the assumption that Subdistrict 6 and Subdistrict 1 were roughly proportionate in size.

Mr. Pauly confirmed that they were roughly the same size.

Chair Heberlein asked how much of the SROZ was included in the calculation for Subdistrict 1.

Mr. Pauly said that it was assumed in Subdistrict 1 that the area was not buildable. Calculations for transferring density out of the SROZ and trying to meet the minimum lot size were convoluted. This method provided clarity and certainty.

Chair Heberlein asked when Subdistrict 13 changed to a school site. It was not listed as a school site during the Frog Pond planning process.

Mr. Pauly answered that it recently changed when the school district notified staff that they would build a school site there.

Ms. Linville inquired about the notation for Civic and asked why the maximum number of dwelling units was listed at 7?

Mr. Pauly explained that there was an area that was roughly the size that a central park would be. The school had land-banked that area, but could potentially offer first dibs to the City to buy for a park.

Ms. Jacobson said that with the school and associated recreational facilities, there may not be a need for a park so it was possible that the land could be developed into housing.

Mr. Pauly continued that, similar to Villebois, the purpose was to move from a legislative master plan to using a code that implements [the master plan].

There were a few differences from the Planned Development Residential zones, such as allowed uses. For instance, the PDR zone was a mixed-residential zone, so it did not specify multi-family vs. single family. It simply relied on a density calculation, and any mix of single family vs. multi-family was allowed. In the Frog Pond area, multi-family was allowed but the specifics of where it was and was not allowed was spelled out. Other possible uses were single-family housing, duplexes, accessory dwelling units, co-housing and cluster housing, parks and manufactured homes.

Another difference was evident in regards to the open space requirement. Current Planned Development Residential code standards required 25% open space. That requirement had changed in the Frog Pond planning process. Small lot areas would require 10% open space. Medium and large lot areas now had no requirement for open space. The Development Review Board would have the ability to require open space for parks if they determined that there was not enough or that access was limited.

There was a significant amount of discussion in developing the code as to how detailed it should be. In reviewing Villebois Village Center projects, there was a lot of detail. Every aspect of the design and architecture was paid attention to. In contrast, the Frog Pond code was pulled back a bit in the level of detail that would be required. There were some general standards for lot development and architecture, but it was more of a menu approach. The concept of adjacency was kept, meaning that the same model of house could not be built side-by-side or across the street, but there were no requirements for a specific type or style of architecture.

There were specific standards for many different things, but the menu approach allowed developers to choose five design elements from a list that ranged from A through P. Decorative base materials, porches, dormers, bay windows, decorative chimneys, and decorative molding all made the list.

Applications could possibly be in for review by the Development Review Board sometime later in the year.

Mr. Heberlein asked about the possibility of the City building a wall or sound barrier by the houses adjacent to Boeckman Road.

Mr. Pauly said the best precedence for that would be similar to how Villebois interacted with Grahams Ferry Road – a partially transparent brick base with wrought iron.

Ms. Jacobson said she did not believe that the City would build a wall. That would be the developer's responsibility.

Fred Ruby said that it looked as if an important defining characteristic of Frog Pond was that it was limited to single-family homes. Villebois had all different types of homes. What was the background for deciding that Frog Pond would be limited in that way? Was it general give and take with the community or was it intended to contrast with Villebois?

Mr. Pauly answered that it was a combination of all of those things. There was some concern about neighboring communities and some backlash from those who did or did not love Villebois. Overall, there was a balance of multi-family and single-family and a variety of housing.

Chair Heberlein mentioned that Frog Pond East was planned for multi-family housing, including apartments.

Mr. Pauly said that were strong opinions both ways. The Planning Commission well represented the divergent opinions within the community and yet were able to come to an agreement through healthy discussions.

Mr. Ruby asked if the allowance of small lots was designed to promote the possible construction of town houses?

Mr. Pauly said that 4,000 square feet was a good size lot and would be comparable to a medium to large size lot in Villebois.

Mr. Ruby asked if Frog Pond West was designed to promote more traditional single-family homes, with the exception of some duplexes.

Mr. Pauly answered that there were some allowances for cluster housing or co-housing where units had shared kitchen facilities.

Board members were encouraged to share comments and concerns, if any, before City Council.

Mr. Ruby asked about Frog Pond East and where it lay in terms of the Urban Growth Boundary.

Mr. Pauly answered that it lay within the Urban Reserves. Frog Pond East and Frog Pond South around the school were within Urban Reserves and were not yet within the Urban Growth Boundary.

Mr. Ruby asked for clarification of the difference between the Urban Growth Boundary and Urban Reserves.

Mr. Pauly explained that the Urban Growth Boundary had been adopted by the regional government as areas to be urbanized immediately. The Urban Reserve and Rural Reserve areas were identified through a process implemented by METRO for designating areas to be urbanized or rural in the next 50 years.

Chair Heberlein, returning to the discussion about the residential design menu, asked what drove the minimum of 5 items out of 15 or 16 on the list?

Mr. Pauly explained that the consultants chose that model from their review of model and example ordinances. He didn't recall the exact reasoning, but said that there was precedence for the decision.

Ms. Jacobson said that the provision was still being discussed by City Council. She said that there was a feeling that some of the things on the list of options should be required, such as the percentage of the front of the home that was comprised of windows.

Mr. Pauly reiterated that though the process had been recommended by the Planning Commission to the City Council, it was not done yet. Comments and concerns were still welcome.

Ms. Linville referred to the drawings and the list of A through P menu items and noted that it appeared that there was an assumption that the garage would always face the street, without the option for the front elevation of the home to show the side of the garage instead of the garage door.

Mr. Pauly said it had been discussed and that side-loaded and alley-loaded garages were allowed.

He encouraged board members to review the documents and ask questions.

Chair Heberlein asked about the Open Space requirement.

Mr. Pauly answered that it was in the Master Plan document, which described potential locations for amenities and parks.

Chair Heberlein asked what drove the exemption of R10 and R7 from the Open Space requirement.

Mr. Pauly answered that it was because, with the larger lots, there were private yards and access to a central park. There also was the BPA Power Line park and the Boeckman Creek Corridor park. Language had been added to enable the DRB to make findings that there wasn't sufficient access to a park and therefore require a park. A specific definition that of what was usable land that could be programmed with a purpose rather than just leftover land had been added as well.

Ms. Linville asked if there would be no three car garages?

Mr. Pauly answered that there was potential for three car garages. They could either be alley-loaded or on a really wide house on a bit lot. A smaller lot would not allow for the larger garages.

He concluded with an update to other upcoming projects:

- There was a request for proposal to update the Old Town Standards specifically for single-family homes. The residents of Old Town had worked on a pattern book, so reviews going forward should be clear and objective. The goal was to be able to review the single-family homes administratively. Other minor fixes to the standards were also being considered as they pertained to single-family homes.
- Another project that had been discussed for some time was fixing inconsistencies with density and lot areas in the PDR zone. The goal was to get that accomplished within the year.

X. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:33 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Shelley White, Planning Administrative Assistant