

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

**Approved  
Sept. 9, 2013**

**Development Review Board – Panel A  
Minutes–June 10, 2013 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, Lenka Keith, Ken Ruud, Jerry Greenfield, Simon Springall, and Councilor Liaison Susie Stevens.

Staff present: Chris Neamtzu, Blaise Edmonds, Kerry Rappold, Steve Adams, Barbara Jacobson, Nancy Kraushaar, Mike Ward, Daniel Pauly, and Amanda Hoffman

**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.

**IV. City Council Liaison Report** Councilor Stevens reported on the following City Council actions with these comments:

- Council reviewed and was comfortable with the basic design of the Memorial Park parking lot project before the Board tonight. She was glad to see the project moving through quickly as the parking lot redesign was sorely needed.
- A work session was held on June 3<sup>rd</sup> where the City of Hillsboro and Tualatin Valley Water District presented a project to build a new water plant on the Willamette River. She was impressed that a lot of public outreach would be done to educate the citizens of cities from Tualatin to Hillsboro. It would be about 10+ years before the huge project was operational.
- Council would hold a special joint meeting on July 15th with the Planning Commission, Metro Councilor Craig Dirksen and possibly other Metro staff to discuss Climate Smart Communities, a state mandated plan to reduce car and light truck emissions throughout the Portland metro region by 2035, with benchmark goals within that time frame. Cities in the Metro area are being engaged early on given the program’s relationship to transportation.
- Council held First Reading of the Transportation Systems Plan (TSP) on June 3<sup>rd</sup>. The last update was in 2003, so some significant changes had been made. The Planning Commission did a superior job, working in great detail on developing a great plan. Council only recommended a few small changes.
- Council was excited about new ideas and new leadership now that new Parks and Recreation Director Stan Sherer has joined City Staff.
- She announced that Lieutenant Nick Watt would be retiring as Wilsonville’s Chief of Police who emphasized community outreach, engaging citizens in law enforcement, and policing to have a relationship.

## VI. Consent Agenda

- A. Approval of minutes of May 13, 2013 DRB Panel A meeting

**Jerry Greenfield moved to approve the May 13, 2013 DRB Panel A meeting minutes. Ken Ruud seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.**

- B. **Resolution No. 255. Terrene Apartments Monument Sign: CRP & Holland Brenchley Estates II LP - applicant.** The applicant is requesting approval of a monument sign and waiver for the Terrene apartments. The subject site is located on Tax Lot 200 of Section 14A, T3S, R1W, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Blaise Edmonds

Case Files: DB13-0028 – Monument Sign and Waiver

**Ken Ruud moved to approve Resolution No. 255. The motion was seconded by Lenka Keith and passed unanimously.**

- C. **Resolution No. 256. Carl's Jr. Restaurant Accent Lighting: Ben Altman, SFA Design Group and Craig Anderson, CB Anderson Architects – representatives for Josh Veentjer, Wilsonville Devco LLC – owner.** The applicant is requesting approval of architectural accent lighting on a previously approved drive-thru fast food restaurant. The site is located on Tax Lot 302, Section 02DB; T3S-R1W; Washington County; Wilsonville, Oregon. Staff: Daniel Pauly

Case Files: DB13-0027 – Site Design Review

**Simon Springall moved to approve Resolution No. 256. Jerry Greenfield seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.**

## VII. Public Hearing:

- A. **Resolution No. 257. Memorial Park Parking Lot: City of Wilsonville - applicant.** The applicant is requesting approval of a Site Design Review for expansion and modification to the Memorial Park parking lot and a Type C Tree Removal Plan to remove 26 trees. The site is located at 8200 SW Wilsonville Road on Tax Lot 00691, Section 24, T3S-R1W, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Amanda Hoffman

Case Files: DB13-0030 – Site Design Review  
DB13-0031 – Type C Tree Plan

**Chair Fierros Bower** called the public hearing to order at 6:41 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.

**Amanda Hoffman, Assistant 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.

**Ms. Hoffman** presented the Staff report via PowerPoint with these key comments:

- An aerial photo indicated the existing parking lot area proposed for redesign in blue and the area proposed for parking expansion in green. Redesign of the existing parking area was proposed for better circulation and pedestrian safety. The expansion to the south would provide additional parking.

- The Site Plan showed how the parking lot would shift to an east/west circulation rather than the existing north/south configuration.
  - Twenty-six trees were proposed for removal. The arborist's report was included in the meeting packet. The more significant trees being preserved were shown in brown and the new trees were indicated in green. The Applicant proposed many shade trees in addition to the existing trees to provide for and meet the parking lot shade tree requirement.
  - The sewer pump station that was originally part of the proposal had been removed from the application.
- The Landscape Plan proposed a number of shade trees, accent trees, shrubs ornamentals and ground cover.
  - An evergreen screen, about five feet wide and six feet tall, was proposed on the western portion of the site to provide some additional privacy along the residential area, especially with the area being expanded to the south.
- Staff recommended approval of the project for the site design review and the Type C Tree Plan. See above

**Lenka Keith** asked if any rules exist for parking spaces per acre of open space.

**Ms. Hoffman** replied the City did not have parking requirements for parks in the Zoning Code.

**Simon Springall** inquired about the intended pedestrian route through the parking lot.

**Ms. Hoffman** deferred to the Applicant for a detailed description.

**Ken Ruud** confirmed the arrows on the site plan indicated traffic flow. He voiced concern about the inability to immediately access the first row of parking unless one drove around the next one-way aisle.

**Ms. Hoffman** explained the parking was changing to a completely different direction, adding they were all one-way aisles. She deferred to the Applicant regarding whether directional signage was proposed.

**Mr. Ruud** was concerned about the construction timeframe due to so many sports events held in the park.

**Ms. Hoffman** again deferred to the Applicant to explain the reasoning for the building timeframe.

**Mr. Ruud** asked about liability to the City since the expansion was going to be on the first base side of the ball field.

**Barbara Jacobson, Assistant City Attorney**, responded the City always has potential liability for the activities in its parks and must manage the parks in a reasonable fashion and take reasonable precautions. There was some immunity from liability for entities that offer recreational facilities free of charge and parks generally fall into that category, except if someone was paying to use a portion of the park, then that would change.

**Chair Fierros Bower** asked if bicycle pathways were allocated.

**Ms. Hoffman** responded the pedestrian pathways were also allowable for bikes, which the Applicant could clarify. The Applicant was proposing additional bike parking near the restrooms.

**Ms. Keith** asked what the width was of the drive aisles.

**Ms. Hoffman** replied the width could be found on the Site Plan under Typical Standard Size Angle Parking Dimensions, the Aisle Width stated 18 ft.

**Mr. Greenfield** inquired how that fit within the standard.

**Blaise Edmonds, Manger of Current Planning**, replied the Development Code had dimensions for parking spaces, but not for drive lanes, so architectural standards are used which are typically 11ft to 12 ft with one-way aisles. The Applicant could verify the width.

**Mr. Greenfield** stated the recognized standard was between 17 ft to 19 ft depending on the angle of the parking.

**Ms. Hoffman** added that City Council discussed aisle widths and parking size dimensions at length. This was the final production after those discussions.

**Mr. Greenfield** stated he stepped off the distance in a parking lot and determined it was a pretty fair allowance.

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

**Kerry Rappold, Program Manager, Natural Resources**, presented the proposal, reviewing the project's background and process and addressing questions raised by the Board with these comments:

- The City has had an internal team working on the project's design for some time. There were several issues the Applicant had worked to address with the proposal.
  - There have been a lot of problems with the parking lot over the last 20 to 30 years. One significant issue was the ponding of water on the site, which is a result of a higher ground water table in that area, as well as there being no method to manage the storm water in the parking lot. Addressing this issue was a very important objective in terms of the design and features within the proposed parking lot.
  - The curbing and connections coming into the parking lot were deteriorating. Traversing the parking lot at this point in time was not a safe situation. Pedestrian safety and improving the movement of traffic within the parking lot were big factors in deciding to shift the parking lot's orientation. This enabled the Applicant to provide a number of things, including a perimeter driveway, which improves circulation as people come in, and turning the aisles would help eliminate the cutoffs that were occurring as people just drove right through the parking lot not knowing which direction they should travel.
- The new configuration also allowed them to preserve as many trees as possible. The expansion to the south was to accommodate the tree preservation they had and maintain as many parking spaces.
- The parking lot currently had 131 spaces, but the parking spaces were very small. Typically, only about 115 to 120 cars parked at any time, so 121 standard sized parking spaces were proposed with 18-ft drive aisles.
- The process started in early March and the City's website was used to get information out to the community about the project. An online open house was conducted March 25th through April 4th that had a number of stations with information about the project. At this time, the pump station was still included as part of the project. Many of the comments received regarded the pump station and that people did not want it there.
  - On April 11th, he presented the design to the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board along with the feedback received from the online open house. The Board's only recommendation was to switch the sidewalk and landscape strip along the properties so the sidewalk was not adjacent to the street.

- Two subsequent meetings were held with City Council where two alternatives to the original site design were presented. The proposal now before the Board was the end result of Council's discussion, which reduced the total number of parking spaces in order to provide standard-sized spaces, and expanded the drive aisles from 16 ft to 18 ft wide.
- He noted as much tree preservation was done as possible as the trees were probably the nicest feature of the parking lot. Many of the existing trees were in poor to moderate condition. A number of trees being removed were Norway Maples, which technically are an invasive species. The Applicant wanted to improve the trees on the site and provide safe trees for those using the parking lot.
- He explained that ideally, they would prefer to do such construct in winter, but paving limitations existed as far as temperature. The Applicant tried to do the construction that would have the least disturbance to park uses and intended to start construction after Labor Day with hopes of finishing by October 15<sup>th</sup>, which was when the City wanted other paving projects completed. Spring was unpredictable due to the rain. They had reached out to active park users about the construction schedule who seemed to be supportive of the time of year.

**Dave Brokaw, Project Engineer, Wallis Engineering**, reviewed key elements of the site design with these comments:

- The Applicant wanted to remove the vehicular traffic confusion associated with the current parking lot layout. The two-way drive aisle along the outside of the parking lot enabled vehicles to access the river shelter without having to pass through the active pedestrian zones of the parking lot.
  - Interior to the parking lot, along areas with the most pedestrians, the one-way drive aisle would limit the number of vehicles, slow speeds, and make the pedestrian crossings safer.
  - All the aisles were one-way aisles, the parking stalls' widths were per the City standard at 9 ft x 18 ft, and the parking aisles were 18 feet. City Council was happy with the subject design.
- A pedestrian pathway connected to the bridge trail that crosses the small Boeckman Creek tributary. Per the Trails Master Plan, a 10-ft trail along the east side of the parking lot would connect to the Day Dream Ranch access. A couple pedestrian paths would run east/west across the parking lot to get pedestrians safely to the main portion of the park.
- Trees saved two middle islands oddly shaped, specifically to save as many trees as possible in that area.
- Another advantage of the east/west layout of the parking stalls was the way storm water was captured. Water could be treated for water quality in the swales as the parking lot drains from south to north prior to discharging into the creek.
- There would be a number of signs, but not for every one-way stall so as to avoid sign confusion. Signs at the main entrance would direct people which way to go and some signage would direct people to the accessible stalls. Pavement markings with arrows would also direct the flow of traffic.
- Lighting in the parking lot would be updated by PGE to replace insufficient lighting and minimize light spill into the neighborhood. The lighting would comply with the City's Dark Sky requirements.
- On the Landscape Plan, the colored areas were new landscaping; he noted a grassy area that would be replaced. The blue areas indicated the water quality features, which was still in a state of flux as the design is completed. The tree replacement exceeded Planning Department requirements.
- Regarding the issue of baseballs and liability, he indicated that conifer trees would be planted near the baseball field to help screen the parking lot from errant foul balls.

**Mr. Rappold** noted a Trails Plan was developed for Memorial Park in 2004. Some of the project's pathways correspond with that Trails Plan. Also, the 2012 Stormwater Master Plan had identified the parking lot as a retrofit opportunity, including water quality treatment. Both plans influenced the project's design.

**Mr. Brokaw** stated the only trail intentionally designed for bikes was the 10-foot wide path as part of the Trails Master Plan. The rest of the sidewalks are 5-ft wide, which was more inclined to pedestrians, not bicycles.

**Mr. Rappold** explained the dotted areas indicated typical landscaping in terms of shrubs and ornamentals.

**Ms. Hoffman** noted the dotted areas were defined in more detail on Sheets L2 and L3 in the packet.

**Mr. Ruud** noted concern about traffic flow when cars are backing out of parking spots adjacent to landscaping as there might not be enough sight clearance. He had not seen the parking lot at capacity and asked if a couple spaces could be eliminated for safety.

**Mr. Rappold** responded the design could be looked at if it was an interest of the DRB. They were trying to maintain the highest number of parking spaces possible. The original design had 143 spaces and now there were 121 spaces.

**Mike Ward, Civil Engineer**, understood the concern but believed the spaces of concern were the furthest from the park uses and would not likely be used. He noted the City receives complaints a couple times each year when people park on the access road when the lot was at capacity. For those occasions, there was benefit to getting as many spaces as possible in the parking lot, but the cost benefit ratio was open to discussion.

**Mr. Ruud** stated as one of those people who parks furthest away to make sure their nice truck did not get dinged, he believed those would be the first accessible spots. In looking at traffic flow entering and exiting each area, those were the only spots of concern.

**Mr. Greenfield** asked the height of the landscape feature.

**Mr. Rappold** stated the Landscape Plan indicated two trees located within the landscape islands in question.

**Ms. Keith** asked if putting in a speed bump in that location had been considered.

**Mr. Brokaw** explained the pedestrian pathways would be raised to act as speed bumps

**Mr. Ward** stated they would be similar to those at Lamb's Thriftway with ramps leading up to the raised pedestrian crossing. While not a speed bump per se, people would slow down. Two were on the lower drive and two on the upper, more pedestrian centric areas.

**Mr. Rappold** added 15 mph speed limit signs would be posted throughout the entire park.

**Chair Fierros Bower** asked if the raised pathways would be a different color.

**Mr. Ward** replied most of the pavement would be asphalt and the pathways would be concrete, so they would be more visible.

**Ms. Keith** inquired about studies as far as the number of accidents in parking lots with two-way aisles versus one-way aisles.

**Mr. Brokaw** said he did not know of any studies, but believed one-way stalls were safer due to vehicles having fewer points of conflict. On a two-way, drivers pass cars and taking a stall on one side or the other, requiring drivers to look in more directions compared to a one-way parking lot.

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

**Mark Pledger, 30850 SW Salmon St, Wilsonville**, stated his backyard looks out where the second pathway to the south runs across. He has been a resident of Day Dream Ranch since 1988. He asked about the hours of construction and what measures would be taken to minimize dust and noise coming into the neighborhood. He knew special lighting was being considered, but hoped the light coming into the neighborhood was kept at a minimum. He asked how long the lights would be on and whether they would be subjected to the light for prolonged periods of time. He asked how tall the cedar trees being planted would be considering they were to block foul balls. They would have to be pretty tall, unless they were willing to wait 20 years for them to reach an adequate height. Regarding speed, he wished speed limits were posted now; he did not recall ever seeing a sign in the park. From the riverfront shelter, it was a speed straight away. He was glad the elevated walkways were being installed, but he would like to see more installed to keep the speed down.

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

**Mr. Ward** stated that typically, construction hours in the city take place no earlier than 7:00 am and are usually done by 4:00 pm. The City allows construction up until 6:00 pm or 7:00 pm in the evening, but most construction firms were typically done by about 4:00 pm.

**Mr. Rappold** stated the City would have requirements in the plan set that the contractor must comply with for dust abatement. Typically, that is handled with a water truck. The Applicant would ensure the site was adequately wet when needed and that no more area is disturbed than necessary. If noise issues arise, they would work with the contractor to help them minimize noise as much as possible; but as a construction site, certainly some noise levels would exceed the usual. Regarding the height of the trees, certainly 30-ft trees could not be planted, but the objective was that the trees would be much taller than the existing trees in 10 to 15 years.

**Mr. Ward** added that construction is allowed on Saturday, subject to City approval, but not on Sunday. The lighting in the park would be fairly Dark Sky friendly and be about half the intensity compared to the lights in the City Hall parking lot. PGE would not shut off the lights off at night. The 14 lights would be directed and concentrated; 20 ft away from the light, the moon would be a more significant light source. They were very conscious about where to place the lights to create a safe environment while not causing light pollution. Speed limit signs are posted for 15 mph at the bottom of the hill and at the first crosswalk. The raised crosswalks would help enforce the speed limit.

**Mr. Springall** asked if there would be two or three raised sidewalks, and if the bike/pedestrian lane mentioned as part of the Trails Plan on the south side would be raised.

**Mr. Brokaw** replied there would be two on the east side and two on the west side. Originally, the pathway at the south entrance was raised, but now it was not.

**Mr. Springall** asked if the divider at the entrance to Day Dream Ranch would stay in place, forcing people to get off their bikes.

**Mr. Rappold** confirmed the bollards would remain, but were removable in case access to the park was needed.

**Mr. Springall** asked which area trail it was a part of.

**Mr. Rappold** responded that the 2004 Trails Plan considered the possibility of a perimeter trail that would parallel the access road, and this 10 foot section was one of the links envisioned as part of that trail. However, at this point, the pathway would connect to the Day Dream Ranch neighborhood. The trail ultimately leads to Boones Ferry Park. He confirmed there was no traffic calming at that particular place.

**Mr. Springall** inquired about signage for the pedestrian/bike crossing.

**Mr. Ward** replied the intention was to put yellow pedestrian diamond sign with an arrow indicating that pedestrians could be at that location. He added that the City would prefer to put the park lights on a timer and continued to see if that option was available.

**Keith Smith, 30824 SW Salmon St, Wilsonville**, said he was also concerned about the lighting. He noted diagrams showed existing lights and he was unclear what new lights, if any, would be placed and where. He was concerned about one of the existing lights along the fence line and next to his backyard that was very bright at night. He noticed a possible proposal for a light screen that would block properties from the light that he was very interested in. He wanted to learn more about the proposed green screen and confirm the new sidewalk and shrubbery bordering the residential properties would divide them from the parking lot.

**Bill Brun, 8285 Rogue Lane, Wilsonville**, said he lives on the property furthest north on the park boundary. He asked where the boundary was between his property and the park. There was a very steep grade and a lot of weeds and junk. He also inquired about the status of the woods just north of his lot and whether it was part of the park. Lastly, he asked if he would still be able to have a gate in his fence.

**Mr. Brokaw** explained that the Applicant was still discussing the light locations with PGE. A photometric analysis was being done of the lighting levels throughout the parking lot. If lights were placed along the boundary, they would be shielded. The Applicant could not exceed the 0.1 foot-candle maximum along the property line.

**Mr. Rappold** explained the landscaping strip along the boundary of Day Dream Ranch was a 5-ft wide section that would be densely planted with shrubs that would ultimately reach 5 ft to 6 ft high to provide screening to and from the adjacent properties. The Applicant established and verified that all the improvements involved with the project were clearly on City property and they were limited in how far north the project would span. He believed Mr. Brun's fence was set back from the wall adjacent to it on the property to the south. He did not have the information to confirm the property boundaries. There were no plans to remove the trees north of the parking lot. The arborist would look more closely at three trees closest to Mr. Brun's property as Parks Supervisor Steve Munsterman was concerned about them being potentially hazardous. The Applicant would ensure there were no issues with the trees as the project moved forward.

**Mr. Ward** stated the City would be happy to stake out the boundaries of the properties so property owners would clearly know their property's limits.

**Mr. Ruud** noted Mr. Brun's comment about his gate and asked if there were any observations of the area properties being at risk of encroachment with the current boundaries.

**Mr. Rappold** replied nothing had been seen in the survey work. The wall along the south edge was not on City property, but it has been confirmed that the work being done was on City property.

**Mr. Brun** assumed that the boundary was an extension of the entire back wall. His fence was 6 ft in on his own property and had a gate, so it was a gate from his property to his property.

**Mr. Ward** believed that wall was within about 1-ft of the property line, which could be confirmed by a surveyor. There would be nothing to keep Mr. Brun from having a gate, as there were no plans to put shrubs that far north.

**Mr. Brun** said that area has been an eyesore, which he suspected was his, but he does not take care of it.

**Mr. Ledger** inquired why the pedestrian crossing at Daydream Ranch would not be raised when the greatest amount of traffic would be coming from the neighborhood.

**Mr. Brokaw** replied that crossing was not raised due to the proximity to the other raised crossing in the middle of the parking lot, which was prioritized as a raised crossing; however, it could be done if the Board and Council so desired. He confirmed there would be pedestrian crossing signage at that point.

**Ms. Keith** assumed the pedestrian walkway would be concrete and therefore a different color, so although not raised, it would be separated visually.

**Mr. Brokaw** replied the intention was to strip the walkway, but it could be concrete if needed.

**Mr. Ward** added the current plan was to stripe the crosswalk similar to a Continental-style crosswalk with 2 ft by 10 ft bars.

**Mr. Brokaw** confirmed the existing four lights would be replaced with 14 new lights as shown in the Lighting Plan to light as much of the parking lot and make it as safe as possible, but not make it too bright

**Mr. Rappold** stated the existing lights were 35-ft high and 25-ft high LED lights were proposed. Lights along the west side would be shielded.

**Mr. Ward** added that the lighting along the City Hall building at night was an example of a .1 foot-candle.

**Mr. Ruud** asked if the technology for timers and dimmers was available.

**Mr. Ward** confirmed the technology was available, but buy-off from PGE was needed because they owned and maintained the lights. PGE has a policy option that LED lights could be owned and maintained by the City, which costs the City much more capital up front as well as the design. Most of the lights in the city are owned by the City and maintained by PGE with a flat power rate on it. Because the LEDs cost significantly less and the life was significant, PGE had not yet worked out those costs, so they do not allow a City-owned, PGE-maintained flat rate. The City's cost was low for PGE to own and maintain the lights, which removed some options.

**Ms. Keith** asked if PGE had a say in what kind of lights would be installed.

**Mr. Ward** replied yes to some degree. PGE had about ten different light types they own and maintain, so they could quickly replace damaged lights. The City could choose from those ten light-type options.

**Chair Fierros Bower** closed the public hearing at 7:44 p.m.

**Jerry Greenfield moved to approve Resolution No. 257. The motion was seconded by Simon Springall.**

**Mr. Ruud** stated he would still like to see the raised area modified where the neighborhood pedestrian access was versus at the center of the lot. He would also like to amend the proposal to remove a couple of the end parking spaces and install more landscaping because of the sight lines with the trees, the traffic flow and limited distance.

- He clarified that rather than double raised crossings, he would like to see it moved to where the majority of the pedestrian access would be so drivers are cognizant of slowing down where pedestrians would be crossing.

**Mr. Springall** stated that he did not agree with that proposal. He was comfortable with the two east/west cross connections, as well as that one on the end. If the raised crosswalk were removed [inaudible], that pedestrian crossing across the parking lot might not be so viable.

**Ms. Keith** asked if he wanted to add one raised crosswalk to the south end, resulting in a total of five raised crosswalks.

**Mr. Springall** responded that he had discussed that with Staff and it did not seem necessary because signing would be provided. He proposed keep the Staff report as presented. He vouched for the fact that the parking lot did fill to capacity at least twice a year and did not want to see any less parking than what was proposed.

**Chair Fierros Bower** believed the proposed site plan worked. The yellow striping at the Day Dream Ranch crossing would alert drivers about the potential for pedestrians crossing. She believed the speed bumps were adequately placed and that the parking count was adequate. The signage would help make pedestrians aware that other vehicles were coming into the parking lot and people were backing up and turning in the turn aisles. She hoped people would not be speeding with the signage posted throughout.

**Mr. Greenfield** said he had no problem with the two existing raised pathways in the plan. His only reservation was the danger on the end of second drive aisle and the need to keep that sight line as clear as possible; however he did not believe this could be addressed.

**Mr. Ruud** confirmed there were four raised pedestrian crossings and verified their locations.

**Chair Fierros Bower** confirmed the parking lot was asphalt and the four pedestrian walkways were concrete. The entrance to the south was signed and striped white.

**Ms. Keith** asked if the crosswalk to the south was the only one that would be striped.

**Ms. Hoffman** stated it was possible to stripe the sides of the raised walkways.

**Mr. Ruud** said he understood the parking lot filled on occasion, but he would rather see the parking lot extended and more spots put in rather than having spaces that were unsafe. He was concerned about trees' placement and the sight lines affecting the parking spaces at the ends of the second parking aisle, which he indicated on the slide. Vehicles backing up would have difficulty seeing traffic in the main traffic lanes along the perimeter of the parking lot. The trees would block visibility for both parties and could result in accidents. He understood the City did not have the luxury of underground parking, which would be great.

**Mr. Springall** added the City did not have the luxury of suggesting smaller parking lots or spaces because the City Council had gone in the opposite direction.

**Mr. Greenfield** called the question.

**Motion passed 4 to 1 with Ken Ruud opposed.**

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

The Board took a brief recess, reconvening at 8:05 p.m.

- B. Resolution No. 258. Villebois Phase 4 Central: Stacy Connery, Pacific Community Design, Inc. – representative for Fred Gast, Polygon at Villebois II LLC/Polygon at Villebois III, LLC - applicant.** The applicant is requesting approval a Zone Map Amendment from Public Facilities (PF) to Village (V), a Preliminary Development Plan, SAP Refinements, SAP Amendments, Tentative Subdivision Plat, Type C Tree Plan and Final Development Plan for Parks and Open Space for a 57-lot residential subdivision and associated improvements in Villebois PDP-4 Central. Properties involved are Tax Lot 2919 and portions of Tax Lots 2916 and 2922, Section 15, Township 3 South, Range 1 West, Willamette Meridian, City Of Wilsonville, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Daniel Pauly

*The DRB action on the Zone Map Amendment is a recommendation to the City Council.*

Case Files: DB13-0013 – Villebois SAP-Central PDP-4C, Preliminary Development Plan  
DB13-0014 – SAP-Central Refinements  
DB13-0015 – SAP-Central Amendments  
**DB13-0016 – Zone Map Amendment**  
DB13-0017 – Tentative Subdivision Plat  
DB13-0018 – Type C Tree Plan  
DB13-0019 – Final Development Plan for Parks and Open Space

**Chair Fierros Bower** called the public hearing to order at 8:05 p.m. and read the conduct of hearing format into the record. All Board members declared for the record that they had visited the site. No board member, however, declared a conflict of interest, bias, or conclusion from a site visit. No board member participation was challenged by any member of the audience.

**Daniel Pauly AICP, Associate Planner,** announced that the criteria applicable to the application were stated on page 2 of the Staff report, which was entered into the record. Copies of the report were made available to the side of the room.

**Mr. Pauly** presented the Staff report via PowerPoint, noting the location of the project site and briefly reviewing the Villebois planning terms and process. He explained that Villebois Phase 4 Central includes two areas: one along the future Costa Circle and one near the future Villebois Drive Costa Circle roundabout. He reviewed each application request with these key additional comments:

- Preliminary Development Plan (PDP 4C). The majority of the 57 total units would be attached row houses, as called for in the Villebois Village Master Plan (Master Plan). Being on the edge of SAP-Central, it was planned as a denser part of the development. Most of the row houses would be located in Phase 1 along Costa Circle and Dundee Lane with four in Phase 2 near the roundabout. Small cottages and small detached homes were indicated in blue and light brown, respectively.

- He displayed and briefly described preliminary elevations of French and English row houses, which were being reviewed through the Architectural Pattern Book and by the consultant architect.
- He reviewed the memorandum regarding courtyards dated June 10, 2013 that was distributed to the Board and entered into the record as Exhibit A4 with these key additional comments:
  - Staff recommended changes to certain conditions of approval regarding courtyards to enhance the consistency with Pattern Book and match the pattern created by other developers in Villebois over the years.
  - In visiting Villebois, he discovered that courtyards faced the linear green and pocket parks consistently, which created a semi-private outdoor space. The percentages recommended in the Staff report were indicative of the idea of encouraging courtyards facing linear greens. However, courtyards did not only have to be on linear greens. The Applicant desired flexibility to put the courtyards where they made sense and according to consumer preferences.
  - There was a real mix of courtyards on typical homes fronting the sidewalk, in particular alley-loaded houses. On streets where there were courtyards, the houses were typically setback further than others. Therefore, Staff supported having significant flexibility on whether or not to put courtyards on those houses, which was also reflected in the recommended final condition of approval.
  - Attached row houses built by Arbor consistently have courtyards, which had a significant function because there were limited other private or semi-private outdoor space for those homeowners.
  - He displayed and discussed visual samples of courtyards versus porches, noting a porch did not necessitate a courtyard because there was already a semi-private space, while homes with no porch had no real semi-private outdoor living area.
- Construction Phasing must be identified according to the Development Code. Slide 13 indicated the phasing for this phase and the next application, which showed that the row houses along Costa Circle would be a part of the first phase of the larger development along with PDP-2N. He understood Polygon hoped to get that work started this year.
  - The blue section of the diagram near Costa Circle and Villebois Drive was closely associated with PDP3 East, which was approved last year. That section's phasing would coincide, almost like an extension, with the development of Phase 3 East.
  - A pocket park and a roundabout are on the property that the houses were proposed on, however were approved as part of PDP 3 East. A condition of approval required these improvements to be developed in concert with PDP 3 East..
  - Portions of the project had significantly steeper areas than other parts of Villebois. As currently proposed, Dundee Lane had an 11.87% slope, which was within what is allowed to be approved as an exception by the engineers.
- Refinements to SAP. He described the differences between refinements and amendments to an SAP and reviewed the types of refinements being requested with these comments.
  - A number of linear greens or pocket parks not shown in the Master Plan were being added as an additional amenity.
  - The other refinements regarded land use and density. Slide 21 identified the ranges identified in the SAP for each block as well as the changes proposed in the PDP plan. Overall, the change would result in a .04 percent increase in density, well within the limits allowed for a refinement.
- Amendments to the SAP regarded phasing and changes to the Pattern Book.
  - These properties were part of a larger property bought by Polygon but were shown in the Master Plan within the SAP Central boundary, which was why a separate PDP was being reviewed tonight. The proposed phasing reflected the ownership and reality that the phases were being developed with adjacent properties. Otherwise, the phasing remained consistent with what was previously approved, including that The Piazza was developed as a separate little phase.

- Previously in SAP South, East and North there were Pattern Book amendments that allowed a new product type of Polygon, called the small cottage or detached row house in portions of SAP Central. That same change was proposed in the Pattern Book, which only applied to these lots, the one phase of SAP-Central. Staff supported this change.
- Zone Map Amendment. The public facility zone was a remnant of the old Dammasch State Hospital and being rezoned was consistent with the Village designation in the Comprehensive Plan.
- Tentative Subdivision Plat showed the row houses, alleys, public utility easements and everything else required. Pocket Park 12 was created as a tract as part of the subdivision being divided out of the parcel, but had been approved as part of PDP 3 East.
- Type C Tree Plan. Most of the Xs shown on the Tree Plan were outside of the confines of PDP-4C, where only five trees were proposed for removal.
- Final Development Plan for Parks and Open Space. Features included turf grass areas and walkways with a variety of trees to the fronts of all of the homes.
- Both the roundabout and Pocket Park 12 would have a site identifier called for in the Master Sign and Wayfinding Program, which would identify the different areas of Villebois at the entrance of that key intersection.

**Ken Ruud** asked if there would be a net gain of trees with five trees being removed and the new trees being planted the Applicant.

**Mr. Pauly** responded by many times, the project would be very well mitigated.

**Simon Springall** asked if the steep slope of Dundee Lane would affect the architecture and design because of the houses creeping up the hill.

**Mr. Pauly** answered the row houses would be stepped to some extent and the Applicant would probably discuss other design considerations.

- As was approved in PDP 3 East and 4 East, which also had more slope, there would be some split-level houses in this PDP as well as in PDP-2N. He deferred to the Applicant for more details.
- Another concern was the engineering works to make sure the intersections met ADA access standards.

**Mr. Springall** noted Costa Circle seemed wider at one point with bike lanes on both sides and the narrower point might not, which was confusing being that Costa Circle seemed to be one of the main routes around Villebois.

**Mr. Pauly** said the areas with bike lanes were well-defined in the Villebois Master Plan and sometimes different areas of the same street have bike lanes while others do not.

**Mr. Ruud** asked if residential and visitor parking for the row houses was addressed in the Master Plan.

**Mr. Pauly** responded that in Villebois, the Development Code only called for one parking space. However, most of the row houses had two-car garages and on-street parking. Because of the dense urban feel in this area, there would not be as much parking as a larger lot area. The proposed parking met the Code standards. The street designs in the Master Plan considered parking.

**Mr. Greenfield** asked if the row homes were two-bedroom.

**Mr. Pauly** believed there was probably a variety, but deferred to the Applicant.

**Lenka Keith** inquired about Condition PDA 3, which discussed landscaping and park improvements being completed before 50% of the homes were occupied. She asked about the thinking behind being occupied as opposed to being completed.

**Mr. Pauly** responded the building permit was not issued for 50% unless it was completed. He cited PFA 63, which stated, "All construction work in association with the Public Works Permit and Project Corrections List shall be completed prior to the City Building Division issuing a Certificate of Occupancy" which is not done for single-family homes, "or a building permit for the housing unit(s) in excess of 50% of the total (29th lot)." He agreed Condition PDA 3 should be made more consistent with that engineering condition to say "issued building permits" rather than requiring occupancy. In reality, that was how it was done because a Certificate of Occupancy is not granted for a single-family home.

**Chair Fierros Bower** asked if measures had been taken to slow down traffic on the Dundee Lane, the steeply sloped street.

**Steve Adams, Development Engineering Manager**, responded that stop signs were required at the top and bottom of the street. The street between the stop signs was barely only about 300 ft. To make the stop signs more apparent, a street light must be placed above them. According to National Standards, the curvature of the street at the top and bottom were slightly less than desirable; more gradual curves would be better. However, an exception was given if a street light was placed there to be able to clearly see pedestrians walking across the street.

**Mr. Pauly** noted the following changes and entered the following exhibits into the record:

- Correct PDA 3 to state, "...shall be completed before 50% of the homes are ~~occupied~~ *issued building permits* for the PDP..."
- Exhibit A3: Planning Division Memorandum dated June 7, 2013 regarding various corrections to the Staff report.
- Exhibit A4: Planning Division Memorandum dated June 10, 2013 regarding changes to Conditions of Approval, Discussion Topics, and Findings Related to Courtyards.
- Exhibit B7: Three-page memorandum from the Applicant dated June 9, 2013 including comments and requested edits initially requested to the Conditions of Approval with 8 by 11 ½ inch sizes of Sheets F and G.
- Following discussion between the Applicant and Development Engineering Manager Steve Adams it was determined that PFA 39 should not be removed.
- Exhibit B8: Three-page memorandum from the Applicant dated June 9, 2013 regarding requested edits to the Conditions of Approval with 11 by 17 inch sizes of Sheets F and G.
- He confirmed that the courtyard fencing referenced in Exhibit A4 also included small cottages. Phase 4 Central had 17 detached homes: nine small cottages and eight small, detached single family units.

**Mr. Springall** said he was glad they were no longer called detached row homes, which was rather confusing.

**Mr. Pauly** responded that Code relevant to Central only applied to the Village Center, which this project was not a part of so they were identified consistent with the rest of Villebois.

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

**Fred Gast, Polygon Northwest, 109 East 13th St, Vancouver, WA, 98660**, thanked Staff for the work and effort put into the proposals, adding Staff and the DRB played an integral role in helping Polygon develop the very best neighborhood community. He offered the following comments and addressed

questions posed by the Board as follows:

- Polygon Northwest started building in Villebois approximately two years ago, and much had transpired in that time. When they first looked at Villebois, it did not look like it did today. While the community had a great strategic plan in its Master Plan, there were a lot of problems associated with it, namely that not many sales were occurring. However, there was a lot of promise.
- Polygon started its first development with 81 homes, done on the faith that the City had developed a solid Master Plan and the belief that the community would be strong coming out of the downturn, which in fact has happened.
- Today, Villebois had more regional parks and The Piazza, which were both significant organizing elements to what Polygon wanted to capture in the neighborhood and community. There was also a swim center, which has been built and is frequently used, and a new school which completed its first year of classes. A lot of these things were to the credit of the City of Wilsonville, which held fast to the Master Plan and the community. Being a prescriptive plan, there was little flexibility and for good reason. While many communities abandoned plans to sell homes, the City held true to the Plan.
- Two years ago, they were fortunate to get four or five sales per month out of Villebois. Today, those sales numbers had nearly tripled, some of which he attributed to the sheer power of the community drawing people to it and the number of different housing types and products available.
- The cottages had been well received so the proposal included more.
- The Applicant believed they could now add more townhomes. The level of distressed in the attached, for sale environment was less than it had been.
- There were more smalls, mediums and standards in the package of proposals. The Applicant was broadening its spectrum of the types of homes it could offer in Villebois, because the market had various levels of demand.
- Buyers come from many different places spanning the country and included empty nesters, brand new homeowners and move-up buyers, many with kids, without kids and with grandkids. Buyer profiles covered the full spectrum, which was the vision of what Villebois had intended to accomplish. Many competing interests must be balanced when a Master Plan like that for Villebois is created.
- He noted that courtyards were not necessarily a required component, but were more of a desired or suggested feature in the Pattern Book. Staff actually approached the Applicant six to ten weeks ago and suggested courtyards be built. Polygon always looks for ways to innovate and add value, so they agreed as the market seemed strong enough to add more features to homes.
  - Polygon wanted flexibility to add features to both single-family homes and cottages in various locations in order to have a differentiation between their product offerings.
- Although an odd property, this was a keystone site, which was one reason why Polygon wanted to buy it. The Applicant had believed it would be an integral part of Villebois and its success.
  - From a vehicular perspective, it had a significant linkage for Costa Circle. While Polygon did not control all of it, they wanted to make the vehicular connection to enable access to get around the central part of Villebois. In many ways, the Applicant was advancing the development of this site over others in order to create that vehicular connection and draw people to the Village Center.
  - This site also had a significant component of parks and open spaces. Although Regional Park 3 (RP3) was just completed, Polygon had an opportunity to then go to Regional Park 4 (RP4), which was part of the proposal that would be addressed later. There was also significant tree growth on the site, so developing this area earlier was important.
- Regarding the 50% standard normally applied in Wilsonville, the Applicant had done RP 3 and other significant open spaces with the current development all upfront. Before a house was built, the Regional Park was substantially complete, which was to set good expectations with customers. It was also a significant advantage for Polygon from a marketing perspective. Therefore, in addition to the vehicular linkage, they wanted to continue to the park linkage so people got the idea of what happens in the Master Plan.
- Having built many townhomes and condominiums or attached homes in master planned communities, Polygon did not believe the requirement of one parking space per home was enough.

- While it would probably not be a popular decision with urban planners, Polygon designed homes with excess parking in order to have homes that would live well and please customers. Fortunately, there was also a lot of opportunity for off-street parking in Villebois. The project met the minimum requirement of one parking space, and in some tight cases, there might only be one parking space but in most cases there would be two or three parking spaces available, depending on the number of bedrooms.
- Most of the homes would be two-bedroom and some would be three-bedrooms due to market demand.
- More than half of the 35 acre site, 20 acres, was open space and parks.

**Chair Fierros Bower** called for public testimony in favor of, opposed and neutral to the application. There was none.

**Mr. Springall** asked about Costa Circle showing bike lanes in some sections, but not in others. He also asked how the Applicant pictured non-motorized traffic moving around Costa Circle; whether it would weave in and out of bike lanes, etc.

**Jim Lange, Pacific Community Design, 12564 SW Main St, Tigard, OR** displayed Sheet 7.1 via PowerPoint and explained that on the west side of the street labeled G2 was Regional Park 4 and the bike trail was in the park, so bicyclists on the west side of the street would enter into the park. This was part of the second application.

- He agreed it was confusing. The Applicant had to separate the applications along the Specific Area Plan, which did not match the property line and therefore created a two-application process.
- Using Sheet 7.1, he confirmed the regional trail would go through the regional park area on the left-hand side of Ravenna Loop and right side of Costa Circle.

**Mr. Edmonds** confirmed the trail going through the park was 12 ft wide and was a multi-modal trail.

**Chair Fierros Bower** closed the public hearing at 8:59 p.m.

**Jerry Greenfield moved to accept the Staff report as amended with the addition of Exhibits A3, A4, B7, and B8 and modifying PDA 3 to state, “All landscaping, and park improvements approved by the Development Review Board and Engineering Division Public Works Permit punch list items for the specific phase of the PDP shall be completed before 50% of the homes are occupied-issued building permits for the PDP...” The motion was seconded by Ken Ruud and passed unanimously.**

**Simon Springall moved to adopt Resolution No. 258. Jerry Greenfield seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.**

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

- C. Resolution No. 259. Villebois Phase 2 North: Stacy Connery, Pacific Community Design, Inc. – representative for Fred Gast, Polygon at Villebois II LLC/Polygon at Villebois III, LLC - applicant.** The applicant is requesting approval a Zone Map Amendment from Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) and Public Facilities (PF) to Village (V), a Preliminary Development Plan, SAP Refinements, SAP Amendment, Tentative Subdivision Plat, Type C Tree Plan, Final Development Plan for Parks and Open Space and SRIR Review for a 90-lot residential subdivision and associated improvements in Villebois PDP-2 North. Properties involved are Tax Lots 2915, 2992, 2995, and portions of Tax Lots 2916 and 2922, Section 15, Township 3 South, Range 1 West, Willamette Meridian, City Of Wilsonville, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Daniel Pauly

*The DRB action on the Zone Map Amendment is a recommendation to the City Council.*

Case Files: DB13-0020 – Villebois SAP-North PDP-2N, Preliminary Development Plan  
DB13-0021 – SAP-North Refinements  
DB13-0022 – SAP-North Amendment  
**DB13-0023 – Zone Map Amendment**  
DB13-0024 – Tentative Subdivision Plat  
DB13-0025 – Type C Tree Plan  
DB13-0026 – Final Development Plan for Parks and Open Space  
SI13-0001 – SRIR Review

**Chair Fierros Bower** called the public hearing to order at 9:01 p.m. and read the conduct of hearing format into the record. All Board members declared for the record that they had visited the site. No board member, however, declared a conflict of interest, bias, or conclusion from a site visit. No board member participation was challenged by any member of the audience.

**Daniel Pauly AICP, Associate Planner**, announced that the criteria applicable to the application were stated on page 2 of the Staff report, which was entered into the record. Copies of the report were made available to the side of the room.

**Mr. Pauly** presented the Staff report via PowerPoint, noting the proposal had a similar list of applications as PDP-4C, but only a single SAP amendment and the addition of the review of a Significant Resource Impact Report (SRIR). He reviewed the application requests with these key additional comments:

- Preliminary Development Plan. He noted that SAP North already had the Pattern Book amended to include the cottage unit in a previous application.
  - All 90 proposed homes were a mixture of detached single family units. He reviewed the locations of the lots, large forested area and regional park on the west side of the project, as well as the product types and locations of the north east part of the project.
  - Nineteen acres of the almost 29-acre site would be parks and open space.
  - Staff's memorandum regarding courtyards dated June 10, 2013 was distributed to the Board and entered into the record as Exhibit A5. Because there were no row houses in this proposal, Staff recommended amending Condition PDA 5, which he briefly noted, and adding Condition PDA 8.
  - Due to site grading issues, some small cottages would have a split level design with the garage as a third level and a standard two-story house across the alley. A related condition stated the third story was required to be enhanced because the house across the alley would not fully shield it from the public view. Steps or some kind of terraced garden or planting area would be in the side yard between these homes.
  - A lot of the site grading issues were driven by where the streets extended from the Villebois Drive/Costa Circle roundabout. A significant amount of fill would be added, which the Applicant had worked to minimize from the original proposals. The striped area on Slide 14 indicated the fill dirt to be added with the final phase of the development. A retaining wall would be erected along the property line and be buried when the property to the north developed.
  - Construction Phasing. Homes along Costa Circle and the small cottages along Geneva Lp would be developed at the same time as the row houses in PDP-4C. Regional Park 4, a significant amenity would be part of the initial phase, as well as the significant connection of Costa Circle. The second phase involved the improvement of the trails through the forested open space as well as the homes backing up to Grahams Ferry Rd. The final phase would include homes to the north and east of the project.

- He noted the five SAP refinements being requested and discussed the key drivers behind the requests with these additional comments:
  - He discussed the proposed changes to the street network, noting that because of the topography, neither what was shown in the Master Plan nor the SAP would work in terms of building a street that would meet the grade requirements. Staff supported the Applicant's request to essentially not have any streets going through the block bounded by Geneva Lp.
    - Pedestrian paths would pass through the block in both locations where streets were shown in the Master Plan. One pedestrian path ended at the retaining wall, so the Applicant agreed to put in a temporary asphalt path to connect the end of that pathway to the sidewalk along the front of the homes on Stockholm Ave until the property was built in the future.
  - The utilities refinements were related to the street realignment.
  - Linear greens were added south of Geneva Lp and along Stockholm Ave.
  - He briefly reviewed the details of refinements regarding land use and density. Slide 21 identified the ranges for each SAP as well as the changes proposed in the PDP plan. Row houses and small cottages were both in the same aggregate land use category, which allowed some flexibility in terms of the cottage versus the row house. Overall, the density would decrease 1.5 percent, which was well within the limits allowed for a refinement. Staff found that all the qualitative criteria were met for refinements as well.
- The SAP Amendment regarded changes to the phasing reflected in Slide 23. Polygon was building Phase 1 now. Phase 2 included the standard homes in the Upland Forest and a portion of Regional Park 4, as well as the property to the north going up to Tooze Rd. Phase 3 included the remainder of the proposed PDP east to 110<sup>th</sup> Avenue. As proposed Phase 2 would be the proposed PDP 2 North. Phase 3 would be the remainder of the previous Phase 2. Phase 2a would be renumbered to Phase 3a since it was related to Phase 3. The other phases would remain as approved. Zone Map Amendment. The Public Facility Zone stemmed from the Dammasch State Hospital and some land was still zoned Exclusive Farm Use from when it was in the County. This area was always planned to be developed as part of Villebois and rezoned according to the Comprehensive Plan designation for Villebois.
- Tentative Subdivision Plat. The large tract on the east portion was being preserved for the Upland Forest. The Applicant provided an easement for Tract AA due to an existing farm outbuilding that overhung the property line. When the outbuilding is removed with the development to the north, the easement would no longer be necessary.
  - Tract Y would be future Regional Park 5, which involved a number of properties. Many of the amenities in the preliminary drawings would be to the north of the subject property; therefore, the City believed it was best to plan Regional Park 5 as a cohesive unit when all the property owners were involved to provide the best location for the different amenities called for in the Master Plan. For now, Tract Y would be left as a rough, sodded area.
  - Similar to PDP-C, a couple tracts were part of parks approved for PDP-3 East: Linear Green 15 and Neighborhood Park 5.
- Type C Tree Plan. Many of the trees being removed were due to the street alignment as Palermo St extended toward the northern property line along the west side of the site. A number of trees were being removed because of health issues within what would be the regional park.
- Final Development Plan for Parks and Open Space. He explained that regional parks are part of the Villebois Greenway, noted in black on Slide 36, so Regional Park 4 (RP4) was an important link toward completing the Greenway, which would extend from Grahams Oaks Natural Area almost to the northern city limits.
  - He reviewed and described several key amenities for RP4 and Open Space 2, noting the horseshoe pit in RP4 was not being included because one was added to RP3 to the south. The child play structure and benches were being deferred to the development to the north because some of the preliminary drawings showed these amenities along the northern edge, where visibility might be an issue.

- Conceptual Design from the Master Plan Appendix was displayed, showing that everything called for in the Master Plan could fit, but still left flexibility for the final design.
- The Master Plan called for a shared use connection path. Given the way the roads were laid out, a road would go through the middle of RP4 to connect Ravenna Lp to Palermo St. In lieu of that, the Master Plan called for an 8-ft paved minor pedestrian connection, which was being proposed.
- He described the features proposed in the oak leaf-shaped plaza and noted that as funding became available a par course could potentially be added within the Upland Forest in the future.
- The Significant Resource Impact Report (SRIR) Review regarded the Upland Forest. He displayed an aerial photo of the Upland Forest and deferred any questions or concerns about the impact to the natural resources to Natural Resources Program Manager Kerry Rappold.

**Mr. Pauly** entered the following exhibits into the record:

- Exhibit A4: Planning Division Memorandum dated June 7, 2013 regarding various corrections to the Staff report.
- Exhibit A5: Planning Division Memorandum dated June 10, 2013 regarding changes to Conditions of Approval, Discussion Topics, and Findings Related to Courtyards.
- Exhibit B12: Three-page memorandum from the Applicant dated June 9, 2013 including comments and requested edits initially requested to the Conditions of Approval with 8 by 11 ½ inch sizes of Sheets F and G.

**Ken Ruud** asked if the park had been reviewed by the Parks and Recreation Board and whether it was a public park that would be publicly maintained or a community park maintained by HOA dues.

**Mr. Pauly** responded that RP4 would be accepted and maintained by the HOA for five years, after which it would become a public City park. It was reviewed by the Parks Board as noted in the Staff report with recommendations related to some changes to the basketball court to reorient it and make it a full court, the placement of doggy bags, and seating beside the picnic shelter. It was still unclear whether the Upland Forest Preserve would be public or private. It was an extension of RP4, but most open spaces were private. In Villebois, there were open spaces that were both public and private. He believed it would be public in terms of concerns about maintenance costs, et cetera.

**Mr. Springall** noted the area along Palermo St was a wetland of some kind, but not a significant wetland. He inquired as to what that meant exactly.

**Kerry Rappold, Natural Resources Program Manager**, explained the wetland was not locally significant, because typically, the threshold was that the wetland must be half an acre or larger, along with meeting some other criteria. However, it was a jurisdictional wetland, so it was regulated by the Oregon Department of State Lands (DSL) and possibly by the Army Corps of Engineers. He believed the Applicant had submitted their permit applications and may have actually received their permits to fill the wetland area. The City did not have any regulatory authority over the wetland.

- He clarified that the Applicant would have to comply with the Corps and DSL mitigation requirements. The mitigation proposed as a part of the Applicant's proposal was actually for the impacts to the SROZ. A mitigation bank may have been used to meet the requirement, which was typical for a smaller impact.

**Mr. Springall** noted that within RP4, the Tonquin Trail went up and came out mid-block on Ravenna Lp, but the last map showed a spur that appeared to go back to Costa Circle.

**Mr. Pauly** explained that the SRIR Review slide was a drawing that had not been revised. At the point that revision was made, the mitigation was the same so the drawing was not changed.

**Mr. Springall** referenced a displayed plan of RP4 (Slide 48) and asked if the intention was to have people who wanted to ride along Costa Circle go up the spur that ran east/west and then down to the Tonquin Trail.

**Mr. Pauly** responded yes, it was a multi-modal connection designed to provide access from the intersection, but could serve as a connection. He understood the draw to get over to the forested edge, because it was such a beautiful area. People going south of Barber Rd would be on the Tonquin Trail in RP3.

**Mr. Springall** said the circulation plan for Phase 2 North did not show the east/west connection to the Tonquin Trail. He confirmed there was no way to join the Tonquin Trail coming south from Costa Circle, adding that right now, Ravena Lp went nowhere.

**Chair Fierros Bower** asked if there were specific hours of operation for the regional park.

**Mr. Pauly** replied it would be the typical city hours when it became a City park.

**Chair Fierros Bower** asked if there was adequate lighting.

**Mr. Pauly** responded that lighting along the Tonquin Trail was called for in the Master Plan.

**Mr. Ruud** asked if Polygon had bought 29 acres and then dedicated and gave the City 19 acres for the park.

**Mr. Pauly** answered, yes, essentially. The park was an amenity that would help Polygon sell homes as well. There was a premium to be right next to that park.

**Lenka Keith** asked if there was any plan for public restrooms.

**Mr. Pauly** replied a series of public restrooms existed in the Master Plan typically around the commons, which are located in each quadrant of the development. The neighborhood commons in Regional Park 5 (RP5), the next park to the north, included plans for a restroom.

**Mr. Pauly** entered the three-page memorandum from the Applicant dated June 9, 2013 into the record as Exhibit 13, noting that it replaced Exhibit B12, which was distributed to the Board just prior to the meeting.

- He concurred that PDA 3 should be modified to state “All landscaping, and park improvements approved by the Development Review Board and Engineering Division Public Works Permit punch list items for the specific phase of the PDP shall be completed before 50% of the homes are ~~occupied~~ *issued building permits* for the PDP...”
- He explained Condition PDA 3 related to newly renumbered PFA 58. As detailed in Exhibit A4, Condition PFA 55 was removed and the subsequent PF conditions renumbered.

**Mr. Ruud** asked if it was conceivable that RP4 would be completed before RP5.

**Mr. Pauly** answered RP4 would be completed before RP5 because RP5 was not yet planned to be built. He confirmed RP5 was where the restrooms would be located. The Master Plan anticipated that these were moving up and that RP4 would be built before RP5, so there would be park usage before the restrooms were available to the north.

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

**Fred Gast, Polygon Northwest, 109 East 13th St, Vancouver, WA, 98660**, commended Mr. Pauly for his report and referenced the comments he made for the prior application. He addressed comments from the Board as follows:

- With regard to the wetlands, Polygon had submitted a concurrence with their delineation to DSL, which started the permitting process. A permit was issued to fill the wetland and he believed the mitigation had occurred for the fill of the wetland, but the wetland was never filled. Polygon was going back through the process because the permit had expired.
- A bathroom was in Regional Park 2, which would be a short walk. The parks were phased depending on the level of costs associated with what would be in the parks and Regional Park 4 would be fairly excessive, so they were broken up to share the cost evenly.

**Chair Fierros Bower** called for public testimony in favor of, opposed and neutral to the application. Seeing none, she closed the public hearing at 9:45 p.m.

**Jerry Greenfield moved to accept the Staff report as amended with the addition of Exhibits A4, A5, B12, and B13 and modifying PDA 3 to state, "All landscaping, and park improvements approved by the Development Review Board and Engineering Division Public Works Permit punch list items for the specific phase of the PDP shall be completed before 50% of the homes are occupied issued building permits for the PDP..." Ken Ruud seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.**

**Simon Springall moved to approve Resolution No. 259. 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**

##### **A. Meeting notes from May 30, 2013 DRB Panel B Meeting**

**Mr. Edmonds** briefly reviewed two items approved by DRB Panel B, the Le Bois Row Homes, which matched the homes along Barber St, and the Active Adults at The Grove Apartments, a 112-unit, four-story elevator equipped apartment building designed for occupants 55 years and older. This application required an amendment to a previous Council ordinance to add density. That Council hearing would be held July 15, 2013.

#### **IX. Staff Communications**

There was none.

#### **X. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 9:49 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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