

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

**Development Review Board – Panel A
Minutes–March 10, 2014 6:30 PM**

**Approved
April 14, 2014**

I. Call to Order

Chair Mary Fierros Bower called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

III. Chair’s Remarks

The Conduct of Hearing and Statement of Public Notice were read into the record.

IV. 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: Chris Neamtzu, Blaise Edmonds, Barbara Jacobson, Steve Adams, Kerry Rappold, and Michael Wheeler

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

City Councilor Julie Fitzgerald reported that City Council:

- Recently heard the Planning Commission present the draft of the Housing Needs Analysis, which looked at Wilsonville’s housing inventory and available lands to ensure compliance with Goal 10. A public session had been held for the public to provide input while the draft was being developed.
- Recently passed an ordinance for no smoking within 20 ft of a bus stop.
- Discussed at work session developing a new wayfinding process which would provide new and better signage in Wilsonville so tourists and residents could better find their way around town. The entire Council agreed this improvement was needed and welcomed input on ideas or examples of signage used in other cities as this project was in the early stages.
- Noted the joint training that would be held on May 17th for all boards, commissions and City Council, which would provide the opportunity to discuss any possible additions, training or general improvements to the communication process between the commissions and boards.

VI. Consent Agenda:

A. Approval of minutes of February 10, 2014 DRB Panel A meeting

Simon Springall moved to approve the February 10, 2014 DRB Panel A meeting minutes as presented. Lenka Keith seconded the motion, which passed 3 to 0 to 1 with Kristin Akervall abstaining.

Blaise Edmonds, Manager, Current Planning welcomed new DRB A Board Member Kristin Akervall, noting her professional background in sales and operational analysis and that she has lived in Wilsonville for four years.

VII. Public Hearing:

A. Resolution No. 271. Renaissance at Canyon Creek II: SFA Design Group – Representative for Renaissance Development – Applicant. The applicant is requesting

approval of a Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment, Zone Map Amendment, Stage I Preliminary Plan, Stage II Final Plan, Waiver, Tentative Subdivision Plat, Site Design Review and Type 'C' Tree Plan for Development of eight (8) residential lots. The subject 1.79 acre property is located on Tax Lot 5000 of Section 13BA, T3S R1W, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Michael Wheeler

Case Files: DB13-0050 – Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment
DB13-0051 – Zone Map Amendment
DB13-0052 – Stage I Preliminary Plan
DB13-0053 – Stage II Final Plan
DB13-0054 – Waiver
DB13-0055 – Tentative Subdivision Plat
DB13-0056 – Site Design Review
DB13-0057 – Type 'C' Tree Plan

The DRB action on the Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment and Zone Map Amendment is a recommendation to the City Council.

Chair Fierros Bower called the public hearing to order at 6:38 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.

Michael Wheeler, Associate Planner, announced that the criteria applicable to the application were stated on page 3 of the Staff report, which was entered into the record. Copies of the report were made available to the side of the room.

Mr. Wheeler presented the Staff report via PowerPoint, reviewing the site's details, surrounding features and items related to the proposed case files with the following key comments:

- The site was located west of Old Canyon Creek Rd which runs north and south from Boeckman Rd, but no longer **connected** physically to Boeckman Rd. A new section of Canyon Creek Rd that was dedicated as part of the previous development surrounded the proposed site.
- The proposal for the 1.79-acre site would also complete the circulation system for the neighborhood by connecting Morningside Ave on the west and provide the east-west linkage to Summerton St. Improvements would also be made along a portion of Canyon Creek Rd South on the eastside.
- Two additional exhibits received from the Applicant and distributed to the Board separated the information displayed on Slide 8 into two individual graphics. Slide 8 showed the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment changing the site's designation from Residential zero to one unit per acre (RES 0-1) to Residential four to five units per acre (RES 4-5). The proposed zone amendment would change the current RA-H Zone to a PDR-3 Residential Zone bringing the site into conformance with the zone north and south of the site. He entered the two additional drawings into the record as follows:
 - Exhibit B2.7: Comprehensive Plan Map
 - Exhibit B2.8: Zone Map
- He noted the number of drawings in Item 9 of Section B1 on Page 19 of the Staff report should be changed to nine (9) to correspond to the number of total drawings.
- The Applicant provided a drawing of the current conditions of the site, showing the dwelling, fencing, and some outbuildings at the east end. The property was the lone remnant from the surrounding Renaissance at Canyon Creek Development proposed in 2003.
- He reviewed the two issues outlined on Page 6 of the Staff report regarding the Lighting Plan and requested side yard setback waiver.

- The Lighting Plan was not clear. The Applicant's Utility Plan showed street light locations but provided no detail about their composition or whether the lights were existing or being proposed. These specifications would typically be found on a cut sheet.
- Applicant was requesting one waiver from the side yard requirement for all zones and proposed 5 -ft rather than 7 ft side yard setbacks for each lot for two or more story homes, which was the same waiver proposed and approved for Renaissance at Canyon Creek located north and south of the proposed development.
- The recommended conditions of approval were found on Pages 7 through 18 of the Staff report, most of which came from the Engineering Division regarding the required public improvements to widen streets and connect to existing pipelines.
- The Landscape Plan (Slide 13) showed a nice pedestrian path to the west from Morningside Ave to a private drive adjacent to the north. A fencing treatment would be installed on the west end as well as many trees and shrubs to beautify the area.
- The Applicant adequately addressed the applicable criteria and no real issues existed, other than what could be addressed through the proposed conditions of approval. Staff recommended approval of all applications.

Blaise Edmonds, Manager, Current Planner noted the Zone Map and Comprehensive Plan amendments would be a recommendation to the City Council and the companion applications were contingent upon Council's approval of those amendments. The Board was approving all of the companion applications, but the City Council had the final say on the Zone change and Comprehensive Plan amendments.

Simon Springall confirmed that the conditions of approval resolved the lighting issues.

Mr. Wheeler added the City Engineer supplied the condition. Public lighting must comply with the City Engineer's standards, whereas private property illumination, such as in a commercial parking lot or park, utilizes the City's outdoor lighting program. Public illumination was exempt from the section of the Development Code dealing with outdoor lighting. The City Engineer would ensure the lighting was compliant and consistent throughout the neighborhood, rather than relying on a lighting expert to provide that documentation.

- He confirmed that the same side yard setback waiver was approved the adjoining developments in 2004.

Chair Fierros Bower called for the Applicant's presentation.

Ben Altman, SFA Design Group, 9020 SW Washington Square Dr, Portland, OR 97223, representing Renaissance Development, introduced Amy Snell from Renaissance and stated the development was fairly simple and straight forward. The eight lot plat was really an infill of a lot that was left out because of the owner's choice at the time the original Canyon Creek Development was reviewed and approved. Subsequently, that owner has passed away and the heirs decided to sell it, so the Applicant was back before the Board to plat this very similar to the pattern that would have been approved or laid out had it been part of the original. However, there were a couple of minor changes in this plat, primarily because the City changed the Development Code after the Canyon Creek Project was approved relative to open space requirements and limiting the number of lots that could access from a private street. He described how the original plat was reconfigured to accommodate the change in the Code regarding access so the lots would front on the public street.

- Due to the change regarding open space requirements, more open space was provided within the eight lot development than the ratio applicable at the time the original development was approved. With this plat, the total open space within the two developments, both the existing and the subject eight lot project, would be slightly higher than it would have been had it all been plated at the same time.

- As mentioned, the Applicant was basically requesting the same Comprehensive Plan designation, zoning, and 5-ft foot setback waiver for the side yards as existed in the Canyon Creek Development, so that everything remained the same in the neighborhood. The open space would be part of the existing homeowners association (HOA) that was established for Renaissance. Provisions were made to have the right to add this property to it, assuming it would become available someday, so this development would be incorporated into that process. Staff already addressed the lighting question. The Applicant did not address it because it was a public street and assumed the lighting would match the existing. He noted Staff had already provided a good summary of the proposal and offered to answer any questions.

Lenka Keith asked about the rationale for the 5-ft side yard setback, noting it would make yard maintenance a bit more challenging. She also asked what the average setbacks were for the existing developments with the approved 5-ft setback.

Mr. Altman replied the existing development was all at 5 ft; he did not believe any side yards were more than that. The basic rationale was that in order to get a building envelope that made sense on these narrow lots with the type of homes Renaissance develops, a wider lot width was needed. Taking another 4-ft for a 7-ft setback on the side yards would result in a very narrow building that was hard to work with. The Applicant was matching what was already approved for the area, so the proposed development would remain consistent and be platted as if it was part of the original plat.

Mr. Springall inquired if the Applicant considered taking the trail clear to Canyon Creek Rd and asked what the issue was with the trail on Tract B?

Mr. Altman replied it involved two things, noting the issue was discussed with Staff. First, he noted the existing wall along Canyon Creek Rd, and the Applicant was continuing that same street frontage configuration with the sidewalk, a small retaining wall and trees. Second, because Tract B was private open space and maintained by the homeowners, Staff recommended not connecting to the public street.

Mr. Springall understood there was a low wall there now, and the surrounding area had a 6-ft fence, but no wall.

Mr. Altman believed there was a wall there, but assured the Applicant was matching whatever was currently there, so that the street frontage along Canyon Creek Rd would all be the same.

Mr. Springall noted that matching what was there would result in the loss of trees. On the displayed Landscape Plan, he noted the eight trees being preserved that line the edge of the new Canyon Creek Rd were in line with the 6-ft fence of the properties to the north and south.

Mr. Altman replied the idea was to continue the fence, bringing it in a bit from the sidewalk, with landscaping between the sidewalk and fence. The fence would have brick pilasters with fencing in between the pilasters as reflected in the Landscaping Plan.

Mr. Springall asked if the fence would be between the trees and sidewalk.

Mr. Altman indicated where the fence would run on the displayed Landscape Plan, and clarified the Applicant was not changing what was there, but adding to it. He recalled there being a small brick wall in place presently.

Mr. Springall confirmed there was a small brick wall and that the trees were in the raised area behind the small brick wall. They appeared to be in line with the location of the fence to the north and south.

Mr. Altman stated the Applicant had originally discussed keeping the trees and directed the Board to the Preliminary Grading and Demolition Plan which showed the removal of four trees and retaining the remaining trees, as well as the retention of the block wall at the street. He did not have a cross-section to show that.

Mr. Springall recalled from the arborist's report that eight trees were to be retained and they were all along the western edge of the property, but that did not seem to be the same as the displayed drawing.

Mr. Altman replied that Exhibit 4 showed the retention of five trees.

Mr. Edmonds noted Finding H2 on Page 49 of the Staff report stated, "The 20 trees currently proposed for removal are subject to mitigation requirements. The 17 proposed street and 6 trees proposed in the open space (west)...". The Applicant was proposing six trees to be planted in the west as shown on the Landscape Plan. It looked like they were going to replace trees with six new trees. It was not clear from the finding why the Applicant was removing trees; perhaps better specimen trees were being planted.

Mr. Altman clarified the trees being removed were of poor quality.

Mr. Wheeler noted a colored graphic at the end of the arborist's report in the notebook. The number of trees being removed from that west edge corresponded to the four illustrated on the Demolition and Grading Plan. Three trees were suitable for preservation, four to be removed and a cluster at the south end suitable for preservation as a group only. All of the remaining trees were in the areas where the grading would actually occur for the bulk of the lots in the center.

Mr. Springall thanked Mr. Wheeler, adding that he saw it was consistent now.

Kristin Akervall requested further clarification, adding she recalled that eight trees were to remain, rather than the six shown as being preserved along Canyon Creek Rd.

Mr. Wheeler indicated the trees that were to be removed or remain on the arborist graphic, noting those shown in red were proposed for removal and the three that would remain as well as the cluster of trees. The number would depend on whether the cluster was reflected as separate trees or a cluster in the table by the arborist.

Mr. Springall noted the drawing had two more trees on the right hand side marked as suitable for preservation, but the trees were marked for removal because there would be houses there.

Ms. Akervall agreed, confirming that was on Lots 1 and 2.

Chair Fierros Bower asked if the private open space was reserved for a park or lawn area.

Mr. Altman replied that basically, it was passive open space with an open grassy area, trees and some picnic tables at the north end.

Chair Fierros Bower called for public testimony in favor of, neutral and opposed to the application. There being none, the Applicant had no rebuttal.

Chair Fierros Bower closed the public hearing at 7:12 pm.

Lenka Keith moved to approve **Resolution No. 271 with the addition of Exhibits B2.7 and B2.8, and modifying Item 9 under Section B1 on page 19 of the Staff report to state, “(7 9 drawings)”**. **Kristin Akervall** seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

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

VIII. Board Member Communications Welcome new Board member Kristin Akervall.

Chair Fierros Bower invited Ms. Akervall to speak about her background.

Ms. Akervall stated she has lived in Wilsonville for four years previously working in financial and data analysis for colleges and universities. She had worked in a virtual office from home for several years, and after selling her business, wanted to become more involved in the community. She looked forward to being involved and appreciated the opportunity.

IX. Staff Communications

Blaise Edmonds, Manager, Current Planning, noted the SROZ training session on the agenda that would be presented by Kerry Rappold and explained that some upcoming applications would involve the City’s Goal 5 and the SROZ.

Barbara Jacobson, Assistant City Attorney stated there would be an appeal of the Board’s last decision before the City Council’s next meeting on March 17, 2014 if the Board wanted to attend or watch on television.

Mr. Edmonds advised Board members not to discuss the application with each other as resolution could potentially be remanded back to the Board.

This agenda item was addressed as part of the regular DRB Panel A meeting.

- **Development Review Board Training Session – SROZ training by Kerry Rappold**

Kerry Rappold, Natural Resources Program Manager, conducted training on the Significant Resource Overlay Zone (SROZ) via PowerPoint in preparation for an upcoming application involving the SROZ. He addressed clarifying and circumstantial questions from the Board. He agreed to create a pdf file of the presentation to distribute to the Board members.

Staff confirmed that individual Board members could contact Mr. Rappold with questions as well.

X. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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