

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

**Development Review Board – Panel B
Minutes–February 27, 2017 6:30 PM**

<p><u>Approved</u> May 22, 2017</p>
--

I. Call to Order

Chair Shawn O’Neil 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: Aaron Woods, Richard Martens, Shawn O’Neil, Samuel Scull and Samy Nada.

Staff present: Daniel Pauly and Amanda Guile-Hinman

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

V. Election of 2017 Chair and Vice-Chair

A. Chair

Aaron Woods nominated Shawn O’Neil for 2017 Chair. Richard Martens seconded the nomination.

There were no further nominations.

Shawn O’Neil was re-elected as the 2017 DRB-Panel B Chair by a 4 to 0 to 1 vote with Shawn O’Neil abstaining.

B. Vice-Chair

Shawn O’Neil nominated Richard Martens for 2017 Vice-Chair. Aaron Woods seconded the nomination.

There were no further nominations.

Richard Martens was unanimously re-elected as the 2017 DRB-Panel B Vice-Chair.

VI. Consent Agenda:

A. Approval of minutes of the August 22, 2016 meeting

Richard Martens moved to approve the August 22, 2016 DRB Panel B meeting minutes as presented. Samy Nada seconded the motion, which passed 4 to 0 to 1 with Shawn O’Neil abstaining.

B. Approval of minutes of the September 26, 2016 meeting

Shawn O'Neil moved to approve the September 26, 2016 DRB Panel B meeting minutes as presented. Samy Nada seconded the motion, which passed 3 to 0 to 2 with Aaron Woods and Samuel Scull abstaining.

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

VIII. Board Member Communications:

A. Results of the November 14, 2016 DRB Panel A meeting

IX. Staff Communications

A. Development Code Update Discussion

Daniel Pauly, Senior Planner, congratulated Shawn O'Neil, Richard Martens and Aaron Woods on their reappointments to the Board.

He explained to the Board a change recently made by the City Council concerning the Council Liaison. Council had discussed at length and had decided not to have a liaison attend board meetings, in part because of the time involved and partly due to a concern about Councilors having access to quasi-judicial hearings prior to an appeal to Council and having to declare such at a Council meeting. In lieu, each meeting packet will include action items from the previous council meetings since the last board meeting. In addition, the Council plans to have a summit with boards and commissions once a year to discuss different issues. Councilors are also open to convening joint work sessions on an as-needed basis. Staff will also prepare a report on DRB activity for City Council.

Aaron Woods shared that he felt the Summit was a great idea.

Mr. Pauly shared that the Frog Pond Neighborhood planning process was nearly finished, but that the comment period was still open so Board members were encouraged to share comments and concerns with Staff to be forwarded to the Planning Commission. He shared that the approach to reviewing the Frog Pond Neighborhood differed from other zones as far as density and open space were concerned. Consultants and Staff decided that modifying the existing Planned Development Residential (PDR) process made more sense than adopting the Villebois-style approach.

Richard Martens asked him to explain what he meant.

Mr. Pauly explained that whereas Villebois had a code section all to itself and required an architectural pattern book and had detailed architectural standards to follow, the Planned Development Residential was more focused on density than architectural review. A Frog Pond review would be more similar to the recent review of the project along Canyon Creek Road.

He shared a slide showing the Frog Pond area, depicting sub-districts with small, medium or large lot sizes. Each sub-district had a minimum and maximum number of dwelling units allowed.

Mr. Martens asked how the idea of sub-districts was decided upon. Was it correlated by ownership?

Mr. Pauly replied that it did relate to owner or developer request. It was also related to location. He explained that it made sense that the areas closest to the Town Center and along the SROZ would be higher density with smaller lot sizes. There had been a lot of discussion throughout the process.

Chair Shawn O’Neil asked if Staff anticipated any potential issues that the Board should be prepared for.

Mr. Pauly said that the Board would not be reviewing architecture as they had in previous Villebois reviews. Architecture would be reviewed at the Building permit stage. He also mentioned that the lot sizes in Frog Pond on average would be larger than the lot sizes in Villebois. A small lot size would be, at minimum, 4,000 square feet.

Samuel Scull asked about range: If the low end (small lot) was 4,000 square feet, what was the range at the high end?

Mr. Pauly answered that for large lots, the minimum lot size was 8,000 square feet.

Mr. Martens asked about setbacks and side-yards.

Mr. Pauly replied that those were all established in the table. Side setbacks were typical of other PDR reviews. Front and rear setbacks were typical of current PDR standards as well.

Mr. Woods noted that, according to the slide, manufactured homes were a permitted use. Was this limited to specific lots or allowed anywhere?

Mr. Pauly said that, in his understanding, it was tied to state law. Manufactured homes were considered the same as stick-built homes.

Mr. Woods asked if it was possible to have a stick-built home on one lot and a manufactured home next to it?

Mr. Pauly confirmed. That was true of any of the PDR zones. In reality, it hadn’t happened much in Wilsonville, but it could even happen in Villebois.

Mr. Martens clarified that it was driven by state statute.

Mr. Pauly said that he would have to do some further research, but that it was his understanding that it was driven by state statute.

Chair O’Neil suggested that developers would generally avoid the issue.

Mr. Pauly agreed and said that land values also drove it. It was more common to get finished home developers than individual lot/home developers.

Chair O’Neil rephrased his earlier question regarding potential issues surrounding Frog Pond. He noted that the discussion surrounding Frog Pond had been controversial, and asked if staff anticipated any of that controversy continuing to DRB review.

Mr. Pauly replied that there would likely be a mix. Many of the neighbors had seen efforts to meet their concerns about traffic and were satisfied. As with any project being built next to an existing neighborhood, however, there would be some residents who would feel that one more house and one more car would increase traffic to an unacceptable level. For the most part, those people were involved in the process and were heard. Those efforts should minimize controversy in future reviews.

Mr. Martens recalled that he had heard that utilities may not be underground.

Mr. Pauly assured him that utility placement was a clear standard in the Code. The only case in which a utility may not be underground, aside from Bonneville Power lines, would possibly be for higher voltage PGE lines.

Mr. Martens asked if utilities connecting homes would be underground.

Mr. Pauly confirmed they would all be underground and that the standards would absolutely still apply.

Mr. Pauly continued his presentation, stating that in the past there had been a lot of discussion and lack of clarity surrounding density but that, going forward, it should pretty cut and dried which would allow for more time to focus other design issues. Another issue that had generated discussion in the past was the amount of open space. As drafted now, medium and large districts would not require any additional open space. If there was a clear need, the DRB could still require open space. It was determined that any space declared open space would usable and would need to be at least 2,000 square feet. Fifty percent of that space would need to be programmed for active use.

Samy Nada asked if it would be possible for minimum lot sizes to be changed.

Mr. Pauly said that the minimum lot size had been thoroughly discussed and that changing lot size minimums wasn't enabled. It was still subject to waiver, but he thought that there was precedence in the Master Plan for them to stay as they were planned. Lot types in the Frog Pond plan were more defined so it wouldn't be as easy to change lot sizes.

Chair O'Neil wondered if there would be pressure to reevaluate lot sizes if an economic downturn happened or if interest rates rose similar to what happened in Villebois.

Mr. Pauly answered that lot size changes in Villebois primarily happened independent from the economic downturn or were based on developer request.

Samuel Scull asked, at what point in time or at what percentage of development needed to take place before the City would consider building a school?

Mr. Pauly answered that the school was originally planned to be next to the middle school. Relatively late in the process, the District informed staff that there would be a primary school on this site. It would likely depend on the district passing the school bond needed to develop the school and the needs of the City.

Mr. Woods asked about the "civic" subdistrict classification.

Mr. Pauly answered that it was given the "civic" classification due to the existing church.

Mr. Martens asked how much property was in the hands of the developers versus prior owners or speculators.

Mr. Pauly said that there was quite a bit of activity amongst developers, but was not up to speed about others who had "options."

He went on to discuss design standards in Frog Pond. There were some specific design standards, but there was also a "menu" approach where customers could pick from available options to implement. Staff did not want to recreate Villebois – Villebois was unique and should stay that way. Quality design could still be achieved without as many details, and would be easier to administer. The idea of adjacency

– not having the same floor plan and design adjacent or across the street from – had been very successful in Villebois, so that concept would continue to be implemented. He went on to explain some of the design standards.

Mr. Nada asked when the final decision would be reached.

Mr. Pauly explained that it was scheduled for Planning Commission. There were some questions about the financing plan that could delay the overall project a bit, but this portion of the plan was essentially ready to go in front of Planning Commission.

Assistant City Attorney Amanda Guile-Hinman said that it was going to public hearing on March 8th for the Master Plan, amendments to the Code and the Comp Plan. It was currently scheduled to go before City Council for the first reading on April 17th, but could be pushed back because of questions regarding infrastructure funding. The earliest it would go to City Council for public hearing would be April 17th.

Mr. Pauly said that, later in the year, he would lead a project to look at density inconsistencies. Another big code project being worked on had to do with Old Town. The board had reviewed Site Design Review for single family homes in Old Town in a public hearing, which was not ideal. The plan was to move towards reviewing single family homes administratively by integrating a pattern book into the Code.

Chair O’Neil inquired as to whether there had been follow up discussions between Staff and the people in Old Town.

Mr. Pauly said that there had been some recent discussions with the leaders of the Old Town Neighborhood Association. Staff would continue to reach out to the people in Old Town. One of the big questions was how to integrate different architectural styles into the Old Town Neighborhood Plan.

Mr. Martens referred to a quote from a recent newspaper article, in which someone said “Old Town is a dead end, and we like it that way!”

Chair O’Neil referred to the Subaru Dealership. He remembered that there was a lot of discussion and that everyone was heard. He observed a very cooperative community and it had worked out well, but the press focused on the negative. The people who had complained had not shown up to or testified at the meetings, and it was frustrating.

Mr. Pauly said that any development in Old Town would be sensitive to the Boones Ferry Road/Wilsonville Road intersection due to back-ups on I-5. People often had difficulty thinking of how a development would impact them until it was already impacting them.

Chair O’Neil suggested that most neighbors would not look at the notices posted. Had there been a thought as to how to approach public notices differently, perhaps in the form of electronic notice or even in various open-group formats....

Mr. Pauly said that there was some issue with electronic comments in a public record and the ability to archive those comments. It was a concern.

Chair O’Neil admitted that he didn’t look at the signs for public hearing as he drove by. He wondered if there was supplemental way to communicate with people for people to submit comments. It could be through social media...

Mr. Pauly said that some things were posted to social media. Outside of social media, as with Charbonneau, numerous meetings were held by developers to engage with neighbors. Those meetings were encouraged by Staff. He appreciated the thought as to how to make things better.

Chair O'Neil admitted that, before becoming a DRB member, he did not know that those notices even existed.

Mr. Nada seconded Chair O'Neil's point regarding frustration with the turn out for meetings. For a small project, sometimes 14 people would show. For a larger project/subdivision, sometimes nobody would show.

Mr. Pauly said that a lot of larger subdivisions were bordered by fewer neighbors and that could impact the turnout. New development surrounded by more neighbors would likely have a larger turnout. Smaller projects were more challenging to integrate with adjoining projects, whereas larger projects could be planned altogether to fit together.

Mr. Woods stressed the importance of communication when development (for Frog Pond) did start to happen. Homes that were south of Boeckman Road would possibly be up in arms and have issues with the traffic. It wasn't possible to over-communicate.

Chair O'Neil stressed that preparedness in presentation was also key. He appreciated when Staff was prepared to answer questions. He referenced traffic in particular and said it helped to have oral testimony to back up the information presented.

Mr. Pauly agreed. Staff had been thinking about how to make traffic issues clearer in the staff report in the future, whether by using layman's terms or in presenting the numbers more clearly. Staff would try to find a better way to communicate those facts.

Chair O'Neil said that people wanted to be heard and to hear a well-prepared response. He appreciated it when contractors come in prepared to hold their own. He didn't like it when a contractor came in and simply agreed with the City without stating their case.

Mr. Pauly said the structure made it challenging. He said that Staff knew that if they needed the DRB needed to hear evidence, then Staff needed to address it in their presentation. Developers were coached and encouraged to share their story and narrative for the public.

Chair O'Neil said it was frustrating when the developer didn't come prepared.

Mr. Martens asked in the infrastructure issue referred to earlier was related to improving Boeckman Road.

Mr. Pauly said that it was part of it.

Mr. Scull asked if any of the infrastructure cost was shared with the developer.

Mr. Pauly said that the school district was paying for quite a bit of the improvement cost.

Mr. Scull asked about HOA requirements and CC&R's for Frog Pond since it was a less dense development. Would there be HOA requirements there?

Mr. Pauly anticipated that there would be. Ownership and maintenance agreements tended to work very well to provide clarity for who owned what and maintained what and would likely continue as a model.

Mr. Nada said that most of the complaints were traffic related and wondered if the City had plans to provide more transparency with traffic information, such as supplying live traffic data. Or traffic sensors. Did the City have plans to provide something that people could understand?

Mr. Pauly said that beyond the traffic studies provided with the developments, the City had undertaken a traffic survey and would conduct one every couple of years at the City's expense, to see if traffic had reached the levels predicted by the development studies. It would be best to have clarity in information.

Chair O'Neil asked if it was possible to have someone testify/appear by phone.

Mr. Pauly said that it was.

Chair O'Neil suggested that it could save people money if they didn't have to appear in person.

Mr. Woods suggested Skype might be a good tool to use.

Mr. Pauly said he thought that it was a possibility.

Mr. Nada asked if some changes could be made to the traffic report provided by the third party.

Mr. Pauly didn't think the traffic report itself would change, but that Staff could change the staff report to include a layman's summary at the beginning and present the traffic numbers more clearly rather than having them buried in the Engineering conditions of approval. Presentations could be made more clear as well.

Chair O'Neil said that a thorough presentation with answers to an anticipated criticism might diffuse the criticism.

Mr. Pauly said that Staff realized that traffic was a main topic in most developments and agreed that presentations and the report would better reflect that going forward.

He mentioned that there would likely be another meeting soon. An appeal had been filed for a recent Planning Director's Interpretation.

X. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:49 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Shelley White, Planning Administrative Assistant