

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

**Approved**  
Sept. 8, 2014

**Development Review Board – Panel A  
Minutes–August 11, 2014 6:30 PM**

**I. Call to Order**

Chair Mary Fierros Bower 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: Mary Fierros Bower, Lenka Keith, Simon Springall, Kristin Akervall, and Councilor Liaison Julie Fitzgerald. Ken Ruud was absent.

Staff present: Blaise Edmonds and Barbara Jacobson

**VI. 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 August 4<sup>th</sup>, 2014 City Council meeting as follows:

- Another lengthy discussion was held during work session with some collaborators of the Willamette Water Supply Group. While the City of Wilsonville, Willamette Water Supply Council, and all the other communities involved were committed to a thorough community communications plan, it never hurt to draw more attention to the project, which would have huge long-term visual and physical effects on the community.
  - Council received an update about the project’s timeline. Between now and the fall of 2014, pipeline routes and reservoir sites for taking water from Wilsonville to Hillsboro were being evaluated with preliminary water plant, intake master planning and governance negotiations taking place in the fall of 2014. With respect to the City of Wilsonville, the negotiations referred to how the City would chose to continue participating in the planning. A few different methods were being considered in addition to ongoing community engagement.
  - The Group briefly overviewed the method for finding the best pipeline routes, which included Geographic Information Systems (GIS) mapping, environmental studies and considering a number of factors, such as whether the route was acceptable or constructible, the communities located along the various routes being evaluated, regulations that would come into play on the different routes and the existing conditions. The Group would also consider whether the route was resilient, any natural hazards that might affect the route over time, other utilities, and the best method for managing costs for ratepayers.
  - The project was very involved and she encouraged people to look at the website and contact Council with any questions.
- Council also reviewed the City’s stormwater utility rates and evaluated them against other comparable cities. This analysis had been planned and would be helpful when evaluating whether the rates being charged were sufficient to maintain the City’s existing infrastructure.
- Council voted to acknowledge and accept the Charbonneau infrastructure assessment and would not be moving forward to determine how to stage and pay for about \$45 million worth of stormwater, sewer and other infrastructure improvements needed in the next 20 to 30 years.

## VI. Consent Agenda:

A. Approval of minutes of May 12, 2014 DRB Panel A meeting

**Lenka Keith moved to approve the May 12, 2014 DRB Panel A meeting minutes. Kristin Akervall seconded the motion, which passed 3 to 0 to 1 with Simon Springall abstaining.**

B. Approval of minutes of June 9, 2014 DRB Panel A meeting

**Simon Springall moved to approve the June 9, 2014 DRB Panel A meeting minutes. Kristin Akervall seconded the motion, which passed 3 to 0 to 1 with Lenka Keith abstaining.**

## VII. Public Hearing:

A. **Resolution No. 287. Carriage Homes: Sage Group LLC – owner.** The applicant is requesting Final Development Plan (FDP) approval for six (6) Carriage Homes in Villebois Village Center No. 2. The subject .14 acre property is located on Tax Lot 200 of Section 15AC, T3S, R1W, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Blaise Edmonds.

**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.

**Blaise Edmonds, Manager of Current Planning**, 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. Edmonds** presented the Staff report via PowerPoint, briefly reviewing the site's history and noting the project's location and surrounding features, with these key comments:

- He entered the following exhibits into the record:
  - Exhibit E1 Five-page letter submitted by Ron and Donna Larson via email dated August 10, 2014 recommending additional conditions of approval.
  - Exhibit A3: Memorandum dated August 11, 2014 from Blaise Edmonds providing responses to some of the issues raised in Exhibit E1. He noted this exhibit was different than the response emailed earlier to the Board because a street name was corrected from Barber St to Toulouse St. The exhibit was labeled A3, not A4, as another exhibit expected from the applicant was not submitted.
- A Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) was approved for Phase 2 of the Villebois Village Center and this particular FDP, originally approved in 2008 under DB-08-0063, had expired, so the Applicant had to resubmit the application, which was almost identical to that submitted in 2008.
- The project site was a very narrow piece of property where the Applicant proposed six, small apartment-type dwellings with garages and carports located underneath. A condominium project called the Carvalho was to be located adjacent SE, but plans had changed and detached row houses were now being proposed for that project site.
  - Originally, the Carvalho was going to lease out or rent garages from the Carriage Homes and, although the Carriage Homes might not have the use of a garage or carport, one parking space per unit was still required. He understood that it was no longer the case, and the Carriage Homes would have their own garages and carports, so additional parking would be available for these units.
  - The parking lot to the northwest and immediately adjacent to the Carriage Homes site is for the Charleston Apartments.
- The request included an updated Phasing Plan which resulted from a change in plans for the Trafalger Apartments, located at the northwest corner of PDP Phase 2. Phase 3 now only included the Carriage Homes. He noted part of the DRB's review was adopting the Updated Phasing Plan.

- Site Plan. The units were very tight and alley-loaded with the idea that open space and recreation was available at the nearby Piazza Park and the linear green.
- Tree Preservation & Removal Plan. As mentioned in the letter from the Larsons, a tree that was originally approved for removal as part of the PDP in 2008-2009 was now also slated for removal. The tree mitigation would occur in terms of street tree planting and the Applicant would be required to plant at least one, 2-inch caliper tree.
  - The Larsons did not believe any street trees were being planted on either side on the Landscape Plan. However, the Community Elements Book for Villebois for PDP-2 Central required two Autumn Blaze trees off Toulouse St, but did not identify any street trees on the frontage along Zurich St.
  - Following discussion, the Applicant was willing to plant one Autumn Blaze street tree off Toulouse St, as they believed the space was too crowded for two trees, and plant another off Zurich St, which the Larsons hoped the DRB would approve. He encouraged rewriting Finding 23 to state that the planting of at least one tree off of Toulouse St and one tree off Zurich St would be appropriate and would help break up the end elevations of those units.
- Planting Plan. The plant legend and number of plants proposed was identical to the one from the 2008 FDP with most plants proposed along the northwest side of the property. As mentioned in their letter, the Larson's believed more plantings were needed between the garage units, potentially 16 small planting areas, which was very typical of what was seen in alley conditions in Villebois where landscaping was often introduced to attempt to break up the monotony of the alley and garage doors.
  - With regard to discussions about applying the Low Screen Standard along lot lines or areas separating parking lots, he had clarified that the Larsons were more concerned about the view of the carports at either end facing the street and that additional screening was needed to help screen the sides of the cars and the carports from the adjacent streets. He agreed additional screening should be provided there, noting that the addition of street trees would also help break up the view of the side of the carports.
- The Larsons also talked about installing a vine or wire mesh fence that would go on the southwest, northeast and backside of the property along the adjacent parking lot. The Larsons objected to a square wire fence and he had envisioned a false wrought iron fence similar to that used near Villebois' swimming facility, which would be more aesthetic and in keeping with the Villebois character.
  - Vision clearance needed to be preserved at the intersections of the alley with Toulouse St and Zurich St, so a transparent fence was needed. He did not believe the wire fence was appropriate for the application, nor did it need to be 6 ft high, but could be 4 ft high instead. Most fences along property lines in Villebois were transparent fences. If solid fencing was used, a solid hedge more than 30 inches high could not be planted because it would obstruct vision clearance at the intersections of the alley.
  - He was seeking a compromise from the Applicant and Staff sought a condition of approval that would require a higher quality, transparent fence at least on the ends where the fence was visible, and possibly a low shrub together with a single street tree at each end to help screen the sides of the cars.
- Prior to tonight's meeting, the Larsons mentioned the Applicant's civil plans showed bio detention cells, but the Applicant emailed that no bio detention cells existed. Clarification was needed from the Applicant about whether bio detention cells really existed, as numerous conditions of approval regarding stormwater design existed from the City's Natural Resources Program Manager, Kerry Rappold.
- Some confusion existed about the elevations originally shown in 2008-2009 and what was presented in the application. Little planting areas between the garages for shrubs were shown on the elevations, but the Landscape Plan presented by the Applicant did not show them. The elevations also showed street trees potentially on each end of the units along the streets, but again the Landscape Plan did not show them. The Larson's very thorough and well thought out letter pointed out the discrepancies

about what was proposed and what was shown in some of the drawings.

- He believed the discrepancies could be the result of over embellishments of the architectural rendering to make the buildings look nicer. But this was a good example that one should not be fooled by what the architectural graphics and the plan drawings indicated.
- No change was made to the architecture from what was approved in 2008. The plans were very interesting with small units of approximately 600 sq ft.
- Going into the hearing, he did not realize so many little issues would need to be hammered out tonight for a DRB decision. He directed the DRB to listen to the Applicant and what they were willing to do, in addition to the testimony being received. From this collaborative effort, he believed the project would turn out to be better than what was originally approved in 2008. He recommended approval of the project.

**Chair Fierros Bower** asked where the lighting poles would be located.

**Mr. Edmonds** believed the lighting poles were indicated by Xs on the Street Tree/Lighting Plan. Alleys typically had very low-level lighting with wall pack lighting that would shine back into the alley and porch lighting up above to light the stairs up to the living units. The lighting would be very low-key.

**Mr. Springall** asked if the streetlights were part of the current application, as the displayed plan was part of the 2008 application.

**Mr. Edmonds** replied it was replicated for the current application. He confirmed the 2008 FDP included three applications that were being split up amongst different buyers and potentially different builders. The Carriage Homes were being broken out for the Sage Group and the project owner, Patrick Lucas, might buy and build something else in the Village Center. This was his first taste of building in Villebois.

**Ms. Akervall** confirmed the buildings in the development would be rental properties and immediately after completion would become rent-for-lease properties. She asked if specific requirements existed within Villebois about how that worked or what proportion of the neighborhood was rental versus not.

**Mr. Edmonds** replied the units were considered similar to the multiple family housing category in Villebois, like condominiums. Village Center had the highest proportion of rentals, because it also would have the highest density. Detached row houses that would be fee simple ownership was being built adjacent to the SW, but the buildings around the Piazza would most likely be rent-to-lease with some possibly converted to condominiums over time. Condominiums involved some legal technical problems in terms of liability issues and obtaining construction financing. Rental and lease units would be located in the Village Center, following the concept of having single-family detached housing at outer edges of Villebois. He confirmed the proposed development complied with the SAP Central density levels for the neighborhood.

**Lenka Keith** asked if the carports were only on the end units.

**Mr. Edmonds** clarified there were no carports, only parking spaces, and indicated a total of 6 parking spaces and 12 garage spaces on the Planting Plan (Sheet L1).

**Ms. Keith** noted Sheet A.11 of the FDP showed the front elevation with a vehicle parked next to the front door.

**Mr. Springall** understood each unit had a two-car garage and a parking space, so essentially three parking spaces were provided for each one-bedroom apartment.

**Mr. Edmonds** confirmed there were 18 parking spaces total.

**Chair Fierros Bower** believed the application stated 12 parking spaces.

**Ms. Akervall** replied it was confusing because the drawings showed a two-car garage plus a parking space.

**Mr. Springall** stated the application was confusing because at one point, it stated 12 parking spaces were being provided and, in fact, according to plans, 18 parking spaces total existed.

**Mr. Edmonds** noted that Finding 2 stated there were six dwelling units, 12 parking spaces and six garages were proposed.

**Mr. Springall** responded that was incorrect.

**Mr. Edmonds** deferred to the Applicant to clarify that for the record. He believed he had pulled that information from the application, but it might be wrong.

**Mr. Springall** asked why so many spaces were being provided.

**Mr. Edmonds** explained that originally, the garage spaces of the Carriage Homes were going to be leased out to the adjacent Carvalho Condominiums and not to have so many parking spaces for the Carriage Homes. The apartments and the garages underneath were to be leased separately, so one would be living above someone else's garage, but that was no longer proposed. This development would stand alone, so now they would be reaping all the rewards of additional parking.

**Mr. Springall** did not believe a plan with three parking spaces for each single-family apartment did not seem very congruent with a highly walkable neighborhood.

**Mr. Edmonds** suspected the garage would be used for storage because the units were very small. He noted the minimum parking Code requirement for Villebois was one parking space per unit, not three.

**Mr. Springall** said the whole premise of three parking spaces per unit seemed peculiar and did not fit with what Villebois was supposed to be about. He said he would ask the Applicant to talk about that.

**Mr. Edmonds** agreed the Applicant could address it. He noted that throughout the city, one could drive through any residential, single-family neighborhood on a spring day and find a full garage with cars parked in the driveway. There always seemed to be a lack of storage, especially in apartments, so it might seem excessive, but in this particular case, he believed the tenants might use the garage as extra space for something other than parking.

**Chair Fierros Bower** noted rental units typically had visitor parking adjacent to the property. In this case, she did not believe any visitor parking existed, so the extra parking spot could be used for visitors.

**Mr. Edmonds** agreed, noting the angled parking at Villebois Drive South next to the linear green (Slide 4) served as parking for residents and visitors. Most residents, even in a one-bedroom apartment, would have at least two cars per unit, especially if they work. Parallel parking also existed along Zurich St and Toulouse St. It would be interesting to see if the Carvalho had adequate parking without the garage spaces of the Carriage Homes. He believed the Carvalho would have fewer units than originally planned.

**Chair Fierros Bower** called for the Applicant's presentation.

**Stacey Connery, Pacific Community Design, 12564 SW Main St, Tigard, OR, 97223**, clarified that no bio retention cells were proposed for the project. She noted a hatching was shown on the civil drawings that looked similar to bio retention cells on other sites, but it was intended to demonstrate the sidewalk construction that would occur along the street frontages on both sides; it was not intended to be a bio retention cell.

- With regard to Mr. Edmonds' memorandum, the Applicant was perfectly happy to add the shrubs in the spaces between the parking spaces and the garages as suggested, and to plant a street tree on each street frontage as shown in the architectural renderings.
- Regarding the fence along the parking space, she noted Page E19 of the Villebois Master Fencing Plan for Specific Area Plan (SAP) Central showed a transparent fence type labeled as the American Modern fence, which the Applicant proposed using instead of the vine or wire mesh fencing. She believed that was the fencing described and that it would match the architecture of the units. The Applicant was also happy to add shrubbery along the fence to help with screening.
- As identified by Mr. Edmonds, she noted each rental unit would have two garage spaces underneath and the adjacent parking space, which repeated on down the length of the alley. As noted, visitor parking space parking was located directly adjacent to each unit, which was a nice feature. She confirmed a total of 18 parking spaces existed when counting the garages and the parking spaces.

**Mr. Springall** confirmed there was no requirement that the open space adjacent to the units be used for visitor parking, adding it would more than likely be used by the resident.

**Ms. Akervall** said she was also surprised to see all of the parking. In one sense, she realized one could have a boat, motorcycle or many other things there, but she also wondered if it was a bit excessive. She asked if the Applicant had considered using some of those parking spaces to make ground floor units to service those with mobility issues or older people.

**Patrick Lucas, 8215 SW Tualatin Sherwood Rd, Tualatin, OR, 97062**, said there was never enough parking. One of his pet peeves in his neighborhood was everyone parked in the street even though they had a three car garage because it was full of junk. The proposed units would probably have at least one garage side full of things. He agreed there were many parking spaces for what they were trying to do, and stated that if it would help in the DRB's decision, he would turn the two end parking spaces into landscaped areas, so that 16 total parking spaces would exist and then the ends might not have to be screened. He confirmed additional landscaping would be done in those areas, such as more trees and shrubs, instead of doing the fence.

**Chair Fierros Bower** asked if certain Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC&Rs) or something would prevent a tenant from storing items in the open parking space.

**Mr. Lucas** replied he did not see anything in the CC&Rs, but was not sure how that would be enforced.

**Ms. Connery** suggested it could be a condition in the tenant's paperwork.

**Chair Fierros Bower** clarified she meant the open parking space, not necessarily a private garage, but it was just a visual thing.

**Mr. Lucas** stated he would not want that either, so it would definitely be part of the lease.

**Ms. Keith** asked if the Code had any provisions that would prevent future tenants from storing things in the open parking space.

**Mr. Edmonds** replied the usual things, like bicycles or scooters, would probably be stored in garages. No Code existed for that, but Code provisions does require screening and buffering outdoor storage areas such as in industrial and commercial zones. He believed property management would control outdoor storage.

**Mr. Springall** said he heard the Applicant state that storage in the open parking space could be managed by a condition of the lease, so it did not seem that any issue existed there.

**Ms. Akervall** agreed, adding she liked the idea of additional green space on either end.

**Mr. Springall** confirmed the result of converting the outside parking spaces would mean two units would have slightly less parking than the central four units, so the central visitor parking spaces would still exist. He asked if the idea was to have low screen landscaping and no fence on the exterior units.

**Mr. Lucas** replied that was correct.

**Ms. Akervall** confirmed street trees would be located on either side.

**Mr. Springall** asked if adequate space existed to plant two street trees on each side.

**Ms. Connery** replied the street trees that were planned for Toulouse St and Zurich St had a 25-ft spacing between them and the length of the lots was just slightly less than 30 ft long, so not quite enough length existed to do two trees on the lots. She confirmed an actual proposal was being made to replace the end unit parking spaces with landscaping.

**Ms. Akervall** believed that was a good idea, as less asphalt would be used.

**Barbara Jacobson, Assistant City Attorney**, confirmed that Page E19 of the Villebois Master Fencing Plan, which was entered into the record as Exhibit A14, was still relevant as an option for screening the site.

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

**Ron Larson, 29101 SW Villebois Dr S, Wilsonville, OR, 97070**, stated that he and his wife lived across the street and down just a bit from the south end of the Carriage Homes. He thanked the Applicant and DRB for working through a number of issues in the letter they had submitted with the five points. He believed the street trees had been addressed and he appreciated the Landscape Plan with the shrubs along the alleyway, as he believed that would add value to the entire development. He believed the parking screening had been worked through very well. He originally believed a conflict existed between the need to screen and requiring a transparent screen, as that did not seem to fit this particular application. He believed having a parking space directly adjacent to the right-of-way line was unique in Villebois, so eliminating that parking space was a good move, for which he thanked the Applicant, noting that eliminated the fencing.

- In terms of stormwater drainage, it was clarified that the bio cells were not being done which had been shown on Plan Sheets C2 and C5.
- One new thing they learned at the meeting tonight was that the units would be rentals. He noted when he and his wife moved to Villebois in 2009, they had looked at the townhomes which they bought, in addition to the Carvalho Condominiums at the corner of Villebois and Toulouse St. They had also talked with a realtor about the Carriage Homes and in 2009, the Carriage Homes were described as being single-family dwellings for sale at approximately \$150,000, so it was a bit of a shock to learn that they would instead be rental units.

- He noted also in the applications that the Carvalho would now be row homes and believed it would be very important to understand the ownership there from what the realtor told he and his wife in 2009.
- He and his wife wanted to see a good quality development, as could be seen throughout Villebois. He agreed there was never enough parking, noting the apartments located further to the east basically filled the diagonal parking on Villebois Dr every night. He believed the proposed parking was a good amount, as the units did not have the on street frontage that provided visitor parking.
- He noted he and his wife would definitely be interested in whether single-family homes were being proposed for the Carvalho Row Homes. He was not sure much could be done about the Carriage Homes being rentals now, but he hoped they would be more upscale than the three-story apartments where one unit was on top of another, as that was not always pleasant.

**Donna Larson** stated she was dismayed that the information provided online by the City did not clearly state that there was a change from homes to apartments. When purchasing their home in 2009, they tried to do due diligence before purchasing to see what would be built around them, so their home could maintain its value. They had one apartment across the street from their frontage, Renaissance Court, and they did not want apartments surrounding their property because they did not feel that would retain their home's value.

- She reiterated her dismay about this not being made clear, noting they were still called Carriage Homes so they had not prepared anything. They did want the project to go forward and she and her husband understood it needed to be developed. It was obvious that Costa Pacific would no longer be developing the way they had planned, but they understood that these things happened.
- She and her husband definitely wanted to know what would be going on with the Carvalho Row Homes because it would affect their property values. They understood the economics of the area, which was one reason they moved to Wilsonville. She reiterated their dismay about the information from the City not being clear about these now being apartments and not homes. She added that she and her husband did want to see the project move forward.

**Mr. Springall** recommended that Staff ensure that the Larsons were on the list of people to keep informed of future applications.

**Mr. Edmonds** noted the application for Carvalho had been submitted. He explained that the information seen online was general information and Staff encouraged the public to actually come in and look at the application materials. He noted the Carvalho would basically be detached row houses for sale, adding that before they were larger, boxier, French-style structures proposed as condominiums.

- The owners of the subject property simply stated they were not finding it in the marketplace to build condominiums and larger, type units, so they returned with tall, three-story detached row houses with a different design. The Seville Apartments, proposed on the NE side on Barber St near the Piazza, had French style, but the proposed row houses are modern style and would be detached, three-story row houses. All of that information was available in the packet for the public to see. Both developments are homes for sale and not for rent.

**Ms. Akervall** confirmed it was possible for people to buy the homes and then immediately rent them out.

**Mr. Edmonds** responded that happened in every neighborhood in Wilsonville and was nothing the City could control. He noted some homeowners' associations (HOAs) would like to regulate that, but it was very difficult, as it was pretty commonplace.

**Chair Fierros Bower** confirmed that the Applicant had no rebuttal.

**Ms. Akervall** appreciated the detail and visual references in the Larson's letter. She added this was an example of multiple people coming together to make the whole plan better, which was excellent.

**Mr. Springall** said in this case it was very effective because it had clearly moved the plan along and made the whole development better.

**Chair Fierros Bower** closed the public hearing at 7:37 pm.

**Mr. Edmonds** noted that Finding 2 should be corrected to reflect the original number of garage versus parking spaces which was 12 garage spaces and 6 parking spaces.

- He suggesting amending Condition PD5 in Exhibit A3 to state, “The applicant/owner shall plant approximately sixteen (16) shrubs, at minimum 2 gallon size, one in each of the planter areas in between ~~and~~ at each garage within a concrete curbed planting area with automatic irrigation”.
- He explained he wanted to create some kind of a curbed area to protect the shrub and the minimum Code was a 2-gallon shrub with some kind of irrigation. He was not sure how that would be done, as it was hard to string irrigation line under asphalt.

**Mr. Springall** believed the landowner would be responsible for irrigating the shrubs.

**Mr. Edmonds** discussed how irrigation the shrubs might be irrigated, noting that irrigating between the asphalt driveways would be challenging. The landowner would have to figure out how to maintain the shrubs so they would not die, which was why he raised the irrigation issue. The shrubs could be hand watered or a landscape maintenance service could irrigate them.

- He was not sure how the gutter systems and downspouts would work for irrigation. Typically the Building Code required them to be tied into the stormwater system and not one shrub area. He confirmed his proposed condition addressed irrigation, but suggested deleting “automatic” from the condition.
- He proposed new Condition PD6 as follows, “The applicant/owner shall replace the parking spaces, one at each end of the project, with landscaping and plant street trees, one at each end at a minimum 2 -inch caliper size.”

**Mr. Springall** noted originally Mr. Edmonds mentioned Autumn Blaze street trees and asked if he wanted to specify the kind of tree.

**Mr. Edmonds** believed the Applicant could deviate from that type of tree at the ends of the project because they might find a better shade tree for the park like settings at each end. The trees needed to be deciduous, but he wanted to give the Applicant the liberty to choose what tree they wanted to plant.

**Mr. Springall** noted this was a new idea just produced tonight and the Applicant might need to go back to their landscape architect to determine how to landscape it.

**Mr. Edmonds** agreed they might want a different tree than an Autumn Blaze. He noted nothing was specified under the current Community Elements Book on Zurich St, so the Applicant had liberty on that side as well. He wanted to give them a chance to figure out the landscape treatment.

**Ms. Keith** confirmed the three conditions that were discussed were condensed into Conditions PD5 and PD6.

**Ms. Jacobson** clarified that Condition PD6 was a landscaping condition that discussed what would be done with the two extra parking spaces, and suggested separating the language about the street trees. She also suggested stating that the landscaping be suitable for screening.

**Chair Fierros Bower** suggested requiring irrigation for the landscaped end spaces.

**Mr. Edmonds** amended Condition PD6 to state, “The applicant/owner shall replace the parking spaces, one at each end of the project, with suitable Low Screen Landscaping Standard along the public streets and automatic irrigation, including planting street trees, one at each end at a minimum 2-inch caliper size.” He clarified the fence was never required in the conditions, so there was no need to remove it.

- He clarified that the landscape architect would ensure the irrigation system did not overwater the street trees.

**Chair Fierros Bower** noted the plans identified a metal fence that was not being required so she wondered how that should be addressed.

**Mr. Edmonds** believed enough testimony existed on the record that clarified the fence was not required.

**Ms. Jacobson** read the proposed additional conditions into the record based on the discussion as follows:

- Amend new Condition PD5 proposed in Exhibit A3 to state, “The applicant/owner shall plant approximately sixteen (16) shrubs, at minimum 2-gallon size, one in each of the planter areas in between ~~and~~ at each garage within a concrete curbed planting area with ~~automatic~~ irrigation.”
- New Condition PD6 “Outside parking will be reduced from six (6) spaces to four (4) with the two end spaces instead being dedicated to additional irrigated landscape screening material.”
- New Condition PD7 “Two street trees of minimum 2” caliper will be planted, one on Zurich Street and one on Toulouse Street.”

**Ms. Jacobson** confirmed Mr. Edmonds stated for the record that Finding 2 should have originally stated 12 garage spaces and six parking spaces and that Condition PD6 modified it to 12 garage spaces and four (4) parking spaces.

#### **Simon Springall move to approve the Staff report as amended.**

The following correction and additions were made to the Staff report:

*(Note: additional language in bold, italic text; deleted language struck through)*

- **Correct the fourth line of Finding 2 on Page 9 of 18 of the Staff report to state, “...12 parking garage spaces and 6 ~~garages~~ parking spaces.”**
- **Add Exhibits A3, A14 and E1.**
- **Add the following Conditions of Approval:**
  - **Amend new Condition PD5 proposed in Exhibit A3 to state, “The applicant/owner shall plant approximately sixteen (16) shrubs, at minimum 2 gallon size, one in each of the planter areas in between ~~and~~ at each garage within a concrete curbed planting area with ~~automatic~~ irrigation.”**
  - **New Condition PD6 “Outside parking will be reduced from six (6) spaces to four (4) with the two end spaces instead being dedicated to additional irrigated landscape screening material.”**
  - **New Condition PD7 “Two street trees of minimum 2” caliper will be planted, one on Zurich Street and one on Toulouse Street.”**

**Lenka Keith** seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**Simon Springall** moved to approve Resolution No. 287. The motion was seconded by **Lenka Keith** and passed unanimously.

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

#### **VIII. Board Member Communications**

There were none.

**IX. Staff Communications**

There were none.

**X. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 7:57 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

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