

<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Approved</u> November 14, 2016</p>

**Development Review Board – Panel A
Minutes–September 12, 2016 6:30 PM**

I. Call to Order

Chair Mary Fierros Bower 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: Mary Fierros Bower, James Frinell, Ronald Heberlein, Kristin Akervall, and City Council Liaison Julie Fitzgerald. Fred Ruby was absent.

Staff present: Barbara Jacobson, Daniel Pauly, and Shelley White.

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

V. City Council Liaison Report

Councilor Fitzgerald reported on the September 8, 2016 City Council meeting, noting Council:

- Reviewed an in-depth study that evaluated different approaches to managing the budget and cash flow related to Community Development fees and other items to ensure the City was doing the best job possible of capturing the Staff time required for different development activities in the city. It was a complex issue and Staff had reviewed many different options and cities’ practices. The issue would continue to be considered for some time to ensure there was enough in reserve and so the City could get as close as possible to predicting it.
- One big variable was the changes in the economy that created up and down activity levels regarding building projects, so what exactly the City would face from year to year was uncertain, making it hard to budget; however, the process would provide good guidance moving forward.
- Discussed an in-depth Staff report about the potential results of the ballot measure regarding the sale of marijuana within the City of Wilsonville, which was driven in by State legislation. No creativity was involved; the City would just follow the State’s instructions. If the measure passed, the City Council wanted to be able to have plans in place as to where and when marijuana could and could not be sold. Work continued on that issue.
- Was presented an extensive report considering the options for managing traffic, truck traffic, speeding, and other issues of concern on Wilsonville Rd. The City had received a lot of feedback from the County, State, ODOT, and different elements that drove what could and could not be done on Wilsonville Rd. It was a complex issue, and Council would spend more time discussing it at the next meeting.
- She noted that the *Boones Ferry Messenger* had some important items to read about, and she encouraged the Board members to look at the descriptions regarding the ballot measures concerning the community recreation center and the marijuana initiative. She also encouraged the Board to take, and encourage others to take, the survey related to the Transit Master Plan (TMP) Update. The survey

was intended to provide feedback about any changes that should be made to the planning of SMART routes, frequency, etc.

VI. Consent Agenda:

A. Approval of minutes of July 11, 2016 DRB Panel A meeting.

James Frinell moved to approve the July 11, 2016 DRB Panel A meeting minutes as presented.

Kristin Akervall seconded the motion, which passed 3-0-1 with Ron Heberlein abstaining.

VII. Public Hearing:

A. **Resolution No. 332. Villebois Phase 2 Central Modifications - Berkshire: Stacy Connery, AICP, Pacific Community Design, Inc. – Representative for RCS–Villebois Development, LLC – Applicant/Owner.** The applicant is requesting approval of a SAP Central Refinement, Preliminary Development Plan modification, Final Development Plan modification and Tentative Subdivision Plat for development of ten detached row houses and associated improvements at the southeast corner of Costa Circle West and Barber Street. The subject property is located on Tax Lots 1900 and 2500 of Section 15AC, T3S, R1W, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Daniel Pauly

Case Files:	DB16-0027	SAP Central Refinement
	DB16-0028	Preliminary Development Plan modification
	DB16-0029	Final Development Plan modification
	DB16-0030	Tentative Subdivision Plat

Chair Fierros Bower called the public hearing to order at 6:40 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, briefly noting the project’s location and surrounding features, and reviewing the Applicant’s requests with these key comments:

- A couple of projects had been approved for the subject site, but none had been built, so those previous approvals would need to be modified to enable construction of the proposed 10 detached row houses in the Village Center. The row houses would be similar to the cottage homes, the smallest of the detached unit types, elsewhere in the Villebois development.
 - He reminded that Villebois had aggregate land use categories: medium-sized, single-family homes and larger and small single-family and smaller, including all attached units. In Specific Area Plan (SAP) Center, including the Village Center, all of the land uses were within the smaller category of small single-family and attached units.
- Specific Area Plan and Preliminary Development Plan Modification
 - The prior approval for a majority of the site was for a 49-unit, three- and four-story, apartment complex with tuck-under parking and a pocket park in the southeast corner to preserve three trees. Those trees were actually permitted for removal based on an arborist’s recommendation, and due to the number and the trees’ poor health, Staff approved a Type A permit. With the removal of the trees, there was no purpose for the park, which was not in any of the master plans. The park did not have good visibility from the street, so it was not a good location for a park outside of preserving the trees, which were now being removed.

- The Applicant now proposed 10 row houses, which was quite a change from the 49-unit apartment. To approve a refinement, Staff reviewed both quantitative and qualitative criteria.
 - Regarding the quantitative criteria, the overall density of the Village Center was allowed to change up to 10 percent. With the current proposed reduction, the cumulative change in density would only be down to 4.36 percent fewer units than the original approval, resulting in 966 units versus the original SAP Central approval for 1010 units, which easily met the test. The new unit count would also still be well above the minimum unit count for Villebois required in the Master Plan and by the State statute that allowed the Villebois project to go forward.
 - The qualitative component was more about urban design and feel and housing diversity. In Villebois, the densest development was in the Village Center, particularly at the core, with less density, the larger lots and single-family homes, along the edges of the development.
 - The subject site was in the transect, an interesting location at the edge of the Village Center where the smaller lot, single-family homes transition into the denser, multi-story, multi-family product. Looking at the Piazza as the core of the Village Center, the Barber St frontage was the shortest transition period, as there were only a couple of lots from Piccadilly Park and Edelweiss Park to the Piazza. South, north, or east of the Piazza, there was much more room to make that transition.
 - The current proposal sought to change the previously approved height and density to essentially, a two-story, single-family product. Looking at what had been done elsewhere and the overall concept in terms of urban design, both worked, because they were both adjacent to and made sense in a transect. Somewhere along Barber St, there would be an abrupt change, and the current proposal would push that change a little farther east.
 - A similar product was also proposed on the north side of Barber St. That application was scheduled for Panel B later this month. The projects had been split because the current proposal did not require approval of a zone change, so the developer could move forward quite a bit sooner than the 16 lots to the north that required the zone change.
 - In terms of housing diversity, there was limited guidance in the Code regarding flexibility to change product type within a single aggregate land use category. However, it was clear that the intent of grouping the land uses was to not allow single-family homes throughout the Village Center. Historically, it always came back to the idea of the transect, where at the edge of the Village Center, it was more open to having detached units; whereas in the core, especially along Barber St, Villebois Dr, and other areas with addresses for urban design to create specific urban rooms, Staff had been a lot more particular about making sure those urban forms were met. At the edge, no criteria stated the Applicant could not go to the lower height as they were still able to meet all of the architectural standards and fell within the established criteria. In Staff's view, this was the type of flexibility that was intended, so the project was approvable and made sense in terms of the transect, which was an important consideration.
 - With regard to circulation, the proposed alley was typical and not too long, and neither the fire district nor Republic Services had any concerns about access issues. The area was serviceable as proposed.
 - Parking. For row houses, the requirement was one space per unit and the proposed garages met that requirement. In addition, there would be onstreet parking; however, no offstreet parking proposed outside of the garages, which did meet Code.
 - Traffic. With the reduction from 49 to 10 units, there would be fewer trips generated than originally proposed, so creating less congestion easily passed the traffic criteria.
- The Final Development Plan Modification included addressing architecture, and looking at the Village Center Architectural Standards (VCAS). Key items to note were that all of the windows were appropriately shaped, long-lasting materials were proposed, and the architectural styles were

consistent with the VCAS. All the proposed plans had been reviewed by the City's contractor architect, who had reviewed all of the homes in Villebois, and were found to be satisfactory. Efforts were made to ensure the enhanced elevations, where sides were exposed to the public view shed, were addressed.

- Courtyard fencing was proposed, which was consistent with other courtyard fencing as described in various pattern books throughout the Villebois development.
- Landscaping. The street trees and onsite landscaping all fell within the material recommendations and requirements established in the Villebois documents.
- The Tentative Subdivision Plat established the lot sizes allowed in the Village Center and created the easements and tracts, including the revision of the tract to allow the midblock pedestrian crossing to the east.
- He noted that this evening, he had received updated renderings of what the streetscape would look like with the trees, fencing, and how the different homes would go together.

Chair Fierros Bower confirmed two parking spaces were proposed per unit and asked if street parking would be available for visitors, since no additional parking was being provided; only those provided in the units.

Mr. Pauly clarified that street parking was not differentiated between visitors, residents. Being a public street, it would be treated as any other street in Villebois. Staff hoped, and a lot of HOAs encouraged, residents parking in the garage to keep street spaces free for aesthetic reasons, as well as visitors.

James Frinell asked if Staff would approve the same kind of idea for vacant areas closer to Villebois Dr that transition from the central, commercial area.

Mr. Pauly responded the area immediately east the subject site was planned to be mixed-use condos and at this point, Staff would not support having this sort of product in that area.

Kristin Akervall asked how tall the mixed-use condo building was expected to be.

Mr. Pauly replied the VCAS stated up to 60 ft, with an average of 45 ft, adding the Applicant had been encouraged to maximize the height to create that urban feel. Typically, that would be ground level parking and/or commercial with three to four stories of residential above. He confirmed three-to-four-story condos would transition to two-story, single-family homes on the same block.

- He displayed a map (Slide 8) and indicated the subject property and the size of the projects approved for the surrounding areas. Along Costa Circle facing Piccadilly Park were similar two-story, cottage-type units that transitioned down to some of the older, two-story Arbor attached row houses. The area directly south on Barber St, north of Villebois Dr, was planned for a mixed-use condo type product, but no land use approvals had been received yet. It was expected to be one of the taller type buildings.

Ron Heberlein asked if there was any conversation about the subject property transitioning from three stories on the first couple of lots down to two to provide more of a transition, because it did seem abrupt to go from four down to two stories.

Mr. Pauly replied no, that had not been discussed, but it was a thought the architect could entertain.

Ms. Akervall asked if he Mr. Pauly had any images of other buildings completed on Barber St leading up to the block to show as an example.

Mr. Pauly explained that Polygon had built a number of duplexes and some three-story single-family homes east of Villebois Dr. Higher building had been encouraged, particularly in the address overlay on

Barber St that ended at Villebois Dr and there was a lot of concern that the Polygon product match the existing homes built by a previous developer. There was also the more urban form of the three-story front façades that blended more with the mixed-use buildings that had a more modern look. Although detached, the buildings along Barber St east of Villebois Drive were designed to look like a single unit, whereas the ten new proposed homes were meant to reflect more of the diversity currently seen among the existing cottages outside the Village Center, such as along Costa Circle or across the park.

Chair Fierros Bower noted the 6:12 roof pitch of the proposed buildings and asked what the overall height was of the proposed units.

Mr. Pauly responded the Compliance Report noted they were less than 35 ft high. (Section IV of the Notebook)

Chair Fierros Bower asked what the height difference was between the 45 ft or so height of the mixed-use building and the ten proposed homes.

Mr. Pauly stated, as an example, the apartment building previously approved on the subject site was 3½ stories on the western portion, but four stories elsewhere. He displayed a photo showing a visual example of how the proposed ten units might look alongside the existing homes, which would be a similar transition. A lot of consideration would be needed for the design of the western façade of the next building. He cited a similar transition between the four-story Charleston Apartments and the existing homes built by Polygon along Costa Circle that were a similar height. He confirmed the Charleston Apartments were directly behind and across the alleyway from the proposed project.

Chair Fierros Bower invited the Applicant to present testimony to the Board.

Rudy Kadlub, Villebois Master Planner, Costa Pacific Communities, 11422 SW Barber St, Wilsonville, noted 15 years ago no one knew what transect meant, and he was proud that Staff now used the word so well and understood it. He reminded the three development tenets used for planning Villebois included diversity, in the broadest sense of the term, diverse product types, diverse land uses, diversity in home style and architecture, and diversity in price points. He believed the proposed project helped meet the diversity tenet. The homebuilder was new to Villebois and Oregon, and he was excited to have more choices available.

- He was pleased with the Staff report and the Applicant had no issues in terms of the recommendations.
- He noted Costa Pacific had studied and continued to work on the mixed-use portion of the community. They had gone through a number of design studies, and it was unlikely that a four-over-one, four stories of residential over one story of retail, would be done as all the studies had indicated there would not be enough room for the parking required for that kind of density without building subterranean parking. After all these years, they still had not figured out a way to do structured parking in the suburbs and make pricing or rents work to support structured parking.
 - When developing the Master Plan in 2002-2004, the vision was to have a parking structure, parking garage, or mixed-use buildings with tuck-under or structured parking. Even though the pricing had come up, the relative costs had also continued to rise, and it did not seem that the two would ever mix in the suburbs.
- He also had concerns about the adjacency and height, adding it would be wrong to have anything shorter than what existed. He noted that the pitch of the roof and gables of the proposed ten units were 12:12, and the rest were 6:12, so fairly steep roofs. The plate height on the ground floor was 10 ft on the ground floor, 9 ft on the second floor, for a height of 19 ft at the eaves on the second floor, and then the roof went up another 8 ft to 9 ft for a total height of 28 ft or so. The three-over-one, which was more likely than the four-over-one, would be closer to 45 ft with a commercial look, so the

roof would be flat. The two-story unit roofs would scale up to approach more of a three-story massing, whereas the adjacent buildings would be four-stories and have a flat roof, so the height difference was not that significant.

- In addition, there was a bit of a buffer there due to the wide pedestrian path that extended between this particular application and the future building to the east, called the Campanile Building.
 - He introduced Steve Puls, local representative from David Weekley Homes, the largest private home builder in the country. The company had been on Costa Pacific's radar for a number of years. He admired their attention to detail and design. He had looked at many of David Weekley's other communities and home designs and was convinced they could meet the architectural standards.

Steve Puls, Division President, David Weekley Homes, 19968 NW Cornwall Lane, Hillsboro, Oregon, 97124, stated that although new to the area, David Weekley Homes had been building homes for 40 years across the nation. They were the largest privately-held builders, still with the original owner, David Weekley, who showed up for work every day and was very involved in design. He had spoken that morning with the owner about the proposed project.

- David Weekley Homes operated in 23 markets with Oregon being the 23rd and farthest west; previously Salt Lake and Denver were the farthest west. Although a national company, they operated locally. He noted he had been a Portland resident and in the local home-building industry for 24 years; however, he represented David Weekley Homes and he was proud to say this would be their first project in Oregon.
- As a private builder, David Weekley was focused around design, customer service, and satisfaction. The company had won more than 655 awards for new home design and 93 percent of its customers were definitely likely to recommend the company to a friend or family member when their home was completed. David Weekley Homes had been ranked on *Fortune 100's* Best Place to Work for ten years in a row and did a lot of charitable giving. The David Weekley Foundation had given over \$100 million to a variety of foundations across the US and abroad.
- He had known Mr. Kadlub for a long time and respected him very much. They were both excited about the community and David Weekley looked forward to being a part of it.
- He noted some brochures were available to the Board that briefly described David Weekley Homes and he thanked the Board for the opportunity.

Mr. Frinell noted that in the packet, the facades looked variable and eclectic, but in the latest view, they looked very homogenous in style. He asked why there had been a change.

Mr. Puls explained although there would be some repeat floor plans due to the limited number of lots, they understood the adjacency rules and had not completed the designs, so the Applicant was open to considering more variety among the streetscape and elevations if needed.

Mr. Frinell responded that new one seemed more consistent with other projects that had been approved throughout Villebois and looked quite different and exciting.

Stacey Connery, Costa Pacific, believed the difference might be due to the difference in vibrancy of color between hand-coloring and computer-coloring.

Mr. Kadlub stated three different elevations were shown, whereas the other one only showed two that were repeated, so it was probably not the best choice. He believed it was important to have at least three elevations to avoid feeling that the elevation was repeated every other house. He believed the colors also looked a bit mousey and wanted to see more variation and vibrancy in both the body and trim colors.

Mr. Puls agreed, adding David Weekley worked with a professional design color consultant and there were a variety of professionally selected palettes that would provide a lot more diversity than was currently displayed.

Mr. Heberlein asked if there would be any hesitation to looking into a more gradual transition from the larger adjacent elevations, such as a third level.

Mr. Puls responded the Applicant had looked at an optional third level, but was concerned about the square footages getting too large for such a small house, putting them in the 2,400 to 2,500 sq ft range which would result in a higher price point. The Applicant wanted to stay at a more affordable price point; however, if there was demand, they would consider it as an option on that portion, but that would not guarantee a staggered progression.

Ms. Akervall asked how wide the walkway would be between the mixed-use building and the subject property.

Ms. Connery believed the tract was 15 ft with a 10-ft wide pathway.

Mr. Pauly clarified it would be 15-ft from the corner of the side yard of the first two-story lot.

Mr. Heberlein understood it would be approximately 21 ft to 22 ft.

Ms. Connery noted that was just the pedestrian pathway, adding there was a setback on the west side to the house and then there was the mixed-use lot on the east side.

Ms. Akervall confirmed the setback for the mixed-use portion would be at least 5 ft.

Mr. Kadlub added there was about 30 ft to 35 ft between buildings.

Mr. Heberlein stated almost the width of the current lot sizes for this development.

Mr. Pauly added that as the trees matured, it would also similar in height to the mixed use building adding the existing trees that would be retained offer height.

Mr. Heberlein asked where trash and recycling bins would be located.

Ms. Connery replied they would be stored in the garages and placed behind the garages on pickup day.

Mr. Heberlein confirmed there would be enough space in the garage to store trash bins and parked cars simultaneously. He asked if the line on the floor plans of the garage layout helped indicate where the trash bins would be located.

Mr. Pauly replied if the board is concerned about garage parking we had a template for a Condition of Approval to require garages be kept available for parking. On this project, garage spaces had to meet a standard parking spot dimensional requirements.

Mr. Heberlein understood the proposal exceeded the parking space calculations, but he was leery of that because in a garage this size, it was rare for two people to actually park their cars inside, which meant they actually used street parking, and waste bins in the garage would further reduce available space. He noted standard garages were 19-ft, 10-in wide by 24-in deep.

Ms. Connery clarified there was a 16-ft garage door.

Mr. Kadlub added that the buildings were 20-ft, 10-in, –21 ft wide.

Mr. Pauly confirmed 9 ft by 18 ft was a standard parking spot.

Ms. Connery noted the parking requirement for the proposed homes was one per unit, and the Applicant was providing two garage spaces.

Mr. Pauly replied that even if you only had one car in each garage they would still meet the minimum parking requirements.

Mr. Heberlein responded the calculations would need to be updated to specify there was only one parking space in the garage, and the rest was extra space, if everything could not actually be fit inside.

Ms. Connery reiterated only one parking space was required.

Mr. Heberlein understood, but added it was misleading to say there were two spaces in the garage if six other items were also required to go in the garage that would effectively eliminate one of the parking spaces.

Ms. Connery stated the only required items were trash bins and vehicles. There was space for the bins either on the side or towards the back of the garage.

Mr. Heberlein asked if air conditioning would be an option and if so, where they would be located.

Mr. Puls replied he had not thought about the air conditioning, adding sometimes there were restrictions on the side yard, and he was unsure of the Code regarding that.

Mr. Heberlein noted previously, the Board had sometimes seen them depicted in the landscape plans to see where everything would be located. One thing he noticed on the current planting plan was it did not have any definition between the homes as to what was going to be installed as part of the build-out, which followed all the same kinds of questions related to what would be going on between the two houses.

Ms. Connery stated in other homes similar in size and with similar setbacks, the air conditioning units tended to be in the active side yard. The homes were usually staggered a bit to provide a wider active side yard, which the homeowner could access.

Ms. Akervall confirmed that was how other Polygon homes of a similar size were designed.

Mr. Pauly stated having active versus passive side yards was common throughout Villebois homes to.

Ms. Akervall confirmed the existing homes had air conditioning units and there had been no noise complaints.

Mr. Pauly noted the newer units were pretty quiet, as well as being highly efficient.

Chair Fierros Bower asked if the trash bins could be stored in the active side yard or did they have to be stored in the garage.

Mr. Pauly responded that would be up to the homeowners association (HOA).

Mr. Heberlein understood that screening of trash receptacles was required, but he did not know if that applied to single-family homes.

Mr. Pauly said that's more for multi-family

Ms. Akervall understood it would depend on how the fences were. Many homes in Villebois had side yards where it was difficult to get the trash bins through the side yards and out to the street. She believed people were more likely store the trash bins in the garage.

Mr. Heberlein asked if the Landscape Plan was part of the subject approval or would a separate Landscape Plan approval occur later.

Mr. Pauly responded the Applicant provided the typical internal landscaping between houses that had been done in the Village Center. Staff had pushed them to provide the details for the front landscaping. The Board could condition the Applicant to provide a Master Landscaping Plan for the entire project prior to granting permits; however, at this time, the exact placement of some of the buildings was still being determined. At this point, two approaches could be taken with the transect: either the buildings could all be the same height to work together as unit, or an 'outside-the-Village-Center style' could be applied that addressed the rules of adjacency and diversity of product, which was where the Applicant was leaning. Therefore, it was not as important to make sure a particular unit was at a specific location at this stage of the process. He recommended the Applicant have an overall Landscape Plan that met Code standards in place after they finalized where the units would be and before they pulled permits. He confirmed that such a condition of approval could be added.

Mr. Heberlein noted one issue he saw was that Detail 1 of the Master Fencing Plan showed a 6 ft by 12-ft patio at the front of some of the home plans, but the Landscape Plan did not show what the landscaping would like for those homes with that patio. It showed the area entirely planted and no path was shown from the door to the street.

Mr. Pauly agreed there needed to be more landscape detail once the final site plan for the homes was established. Oftentimes, if there was a front gate on the small lots, no path would be provided to access the actual side yard.

Mr. Heberlein clarified there was no path shown to the front door.

Mr. Pauly agreed a path to the front door was a reasonable condition for all 10 lots at once.

Chair Fierros Bower called for public testimony in favor of, opposed and neutral to the application. Seeing none, she asked if there was any further discussion.

Mr. Heberlein asked how tall the trees were in front of the first three lots. If the trees were taller than the homes, it would provide some natural transition from the adjacent four-story development.

Mr. Pauly displayed a Google street view along Barber St to show the street trees' heights in relation to taller buildings, showing the view across and down the street. He confirmed where the subject site and Piazza were located, and that similar units were proposed directly across the street, so caution would be needed with regard to the rules of adjacency. Referencing the aerial photograph in his presentation (Slide 8), he indicated the locations of the projects proposed along Barber St near the subject site, including a taller mixed-use building, the similar units across the street, and a potential parking area.

Mr. Heberlein asked about the wording for the new condition.

Mr. Pauly read the proposed language for new Condition PDC-6 as follows, “Prior to issuing building permits, the Applicant shall submit and get approval through the Class I administrative process a Landscaping Plan for all ten lots.” He confirmed the Applicant had no comments regarding the proposed language.

Chair Fierros Bower closed the public hearing at 7:40 pm.

Ron Heberlein moved to approve Resolution No. 332 with the addition of new Condition PDC-6 as read into the record by Daniel Pauly. The motion was seconded by James Frinell.

Ms. Akervall believed the homes looked nice and the proposal had its benefits compared to the previously approved larger multi-unit building, especially given the traffic study. However, she had concerns about how the transition would work with the Charleston Apartments located right behind the site. It felt a bit odd. Having the strip of park as the division line between the smaller single-family homes and buildings with a larger presence made sense and felt more natural than extending around the corner and suddenly going into something else. While the proposal appeared to meet all of the requirements, she was still a bit apprehensive about how the transition would feel walking down Barber St, which was a main street in the community and should showcase the thoughtful collection of places that make up the community. However, she could not suggest a solution at this time.

Mr. Heberlein said he agreed with the concern, especially with the large multi-family development proposed right across Barber St from the first four homes. Although it met all of the requirements, it could be a situation where, after it was built, it did not feel right going down the street.

Mr. Frinell stated the proposal met all the criteria and would be consistent with what would be across the street. He believed it would be a fine transition.

Chair Fierros Bower stated she was leaning towards that thought as well. The proposal met the requirements and standards and the trees would provide somewhat of a buffer. The designers were sensitive and would be thoughtful in how to make it all come together.

Ms. Akervall understood the homeowners could elect to have a three-story option if they wanted, which could be worse from an aesthetic standpoint depending upon how many homeowners chose that option. The heights of the homes should be intentional all the way through, so she did not believe that was a solution.

Mr. Heberlein agreed, adding if only the first lot was a three-story home and the remaining were two-stories, he did not believe it would not work to have one of that style, then go to nothing.

Ms. Akervall agreed consistency would be good in that sense. She reiterated that the proposal met all of the requirements, but she did not feel good about it at a gut level. She was just not sure how it would read going down the street.

Mr. Heberlein stated he was not inclined to vote against it necessarily, but he did have concerns.

The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Fierros Bower read the rules of appeal into the record.

VIII. Board Member Communications

- A. Results of the July 25, 2016 DRB Panel B.
- B. Meeting and results of the August 22, 2016 DRB Panel B Meeting.

There were no comments.

IX. Staff Communications

Dan Pauly, Senior Planner, provided an update on the status of several projects recently approved by the Board and projects anticipated to come before the Board for review with these key comments:

- Construction for the Ash Park Subdivision would begin soon. Both grading and tree removal permits had been received, so he anticipated that construction permits would be issued shortly.
- Republic Services was still working through Metro's permitting, which was expected to take some time.
- Wilsonville Greens was done and he had toured the facility.
- Montague Park turned out really nice, and no noise complaints had been received yet about the pickle ball court.
- Grading was being done for Brookeside Terrace. The plat had been submitted last week, so the building permits would follow shortly and construction should begin soon. He did not know when the pool across the street would be completed.
- He expected the next biggest project likely to come before this Board in November was the 40-lot subdivision on the driving range in Charbonneau.

Ron Heberlein asked why DRB Panel A would not review the development proposed on the other side of Barber St. From a continuity standpoint, he believed Panel A should review it because the Board now knew what was being done on the other side, having reviewed this development, and could ensure the two sides meshed together.

Mr. Pauly responded Staff had gone back and forth on that because it was a unique situation. The project just approved by Panel A had a quicker process because it was previously approved and zoned, which put it on a different track; otherwise the applications would have been reviewed at the same time. The application was also assigned to Panel B to even the workload. Generally, he agreed the same Board should review similar or adjacent projects. He assured that adjacency and the relationship with the development just approved by Panel A would be discussed in the Staff report. He noted Panel B had worked on a number of projects in this section of Villebois and was up to speed.

Chair Fierros Bower believed that since Mr. Pauly was the planner on the project, he had heard the comments and concerns of DRB Panel A and could pass those along to Panel B.

The Board congratulated Mr. Pauly on his promotion to Senior Planner.

X. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:53 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

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