

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

**Development Review Board – Panel B  
Minutes–July 25, 2016 6:30 PM**

**Approved**  
August 22, 2016

**I. Call to Order**

Acting Chair Richard Martens 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: Richard Martens, Aaron Woods, Samy Nada, Samuel Scull, and Council Liaison Julie Fitzgerald. Shawn O’Neil was absent.

Staff present: Daniel Pauly, Barbara Jacobson, and Steve Adams

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

**V. City Council Liaison Report**

**Councilor Fitzgerald** reported that on July 18, 2016 City Council held a lengthy work session and discussed the following items:

- The Transit Master Plan Committee presented its continuing to work in the community interviewing people on how the public transit system was serving the community and changes that could be made without a budget increase, such as changes to routes and how the system connected with TriMet. The committee would continue doing surveys throughout the community.
- Although Wilsonville Road Corridor Traffic Management was discussed, it was too early to know what changes would be made. Staff did present numerous options for addressing the congestion that resulted primarily from I-5 running through the city.
- Following discussion, the Council decided to apply for an Equitable Housing Grant to fund a study to assess what housing needs Wilsonville had. She understood interviews would be conducted to find out where there were gaps and then Council would consider how to increase options for people that were tailored to the community.
- Council also discussed the legislative matters the League of Oregon Cities (LOC) was considering and each Councilor identified the areas they believed were most important. The LOC asked that all cities identify legislative priorities and Wilsonville supported and voiced interest in needed housing assistance programs, restoring recreational immunity, and looking at rights-of-way for municipalities and how those should be handled. There was also a lot of interest in the LOC addressing transportation funding policies, which related to Wilsonville’s interest in freeing up traffic.

**Aaron Woods** asked if Council would take more citizen input when improvements that address traffic congestion were being considered.

**Councilor Fitzgerald** confirmed that citizens could always provide input to the City via emails sent to the city manager, adding that all citizen complaints and input were tabulated. She explained the City was currently looking for relatively simple adjustments that could be made and tried out, such as signage.

Initial cost estimates were also being considered, and while the City had a certain amount of money to spend, if a significant investment were involved, there likely would be public hearings; however, they were not yet at that point. Much of the issue related to ODOT and the availability of different options. Council would love input and she encouraged citizen input via meeting attendance, email, phone calls, and letters, adding that hopefully, another article would appear in the *Boones Ferry Messenger* soon to keep the dialogue going.

**VI. Consent Agenda:**

A. Approval of minutes of April 25, 2016 meeting

**Aaron Woods moved to approve the April 25, 2016 DRB Panel B meeting minutes as presented. Sammy Nada seconded the motion, which unanimously.**

**VII. Public Hearing:**

**A. Resolution No. 330. Mont Blanc No. 2 – Villebois Phase 10 Central: Polygon WLH, LLC – Applicant.** The applicant is requesting approval of a Zone Map Amendment from Public Facility (PF) Zone to Village (V) Zone, a Specific Area Plan – Central Refinements, Preliminary Development Plan, Tentative Subdivision Plat, Tentative Condominium Plat, Type ‘C’ Tree Plan and Final Development Plan for the development of condominiums and row houses in Phase 10 of SAP-Central. The subject property is located on Tax Lot 2900 of Section 15AC, T3S, R1W, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Daniel Pauly.

Case Files:	DB16-0020	Zone Map Amendment
	DB16-0021	SAP Central Refinements
	DB16-0022	SAP Central PDP 10, Preliminary Development Plan
	DB16-0023	Tentative Subdivision Plat
	DB16-0024	Tentative Condominium Plat
	DB16-0025	Type C Tree Plan
	DB16-0026	Final Development Plan

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

**Chair Martens** called the public hearing to order at 6:40 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.

**Samuel Scull** declared that he was currently a Villebois resident and served on several of the homeowners association (HOA) committees and boards; however, he had no conflict with the subject proposal.

**Daniel Pauly, 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, briefly reviewing the site’s history and the project’s location and surrounding features, and describing the Applicant’s requests with these comments:

- Zone Map Amendment. As with other Villebois developments where the land was formally the Dammasch State Hospital campus, the site was proposed for rezoning consistent with the Comprehensive Plan to allow for development consistent with the Villebois Village Master Plan.
- SAP Central Refinements & SAP Central Preliminary Development Plan (PDP). The Applicant proposed a total of 92 units on the 3.2-acre site, which included 82 for sale, stacked, flat-type condo

units. There were two, 24-unit, three-story buildings, and one, four-story 34-unit building. The PDP also proposed 10 row houses, which would be in five-plexes along Villebois Dr. In addition, there were proposed pathways, parking areas, open spaces, and garage structures that would serve the development.

- Circulation. The block sizes and shapes were all consistent with what was previously planned for the Specific Area Plan (SAP) for this portion of Villebois. A pedestrian alley was an important part of the designed connection from The Piazza to Montague Park and would provide a nice pedestrian connection. Campanile Ln would also be a more pedestrian-friendly corridor for connections between the key parks as part of the main bike/pedestrian thoroughfare through the Village Center. A mid-block crossing was also provided from Villebois Dr to Campanile Ln, just south of the condo building and row houses.
- Parking. A number of parking spaces were required for the many proposed units. He reviewed the number of off and on street parking spaces required by the City, and the number of parking spaces proposed by the Applicant. (Slide 10)
  - The row houses had garages designed to be used for parking, but even if the garages were used for storage, the minimum would still met with the exterior driveway space and off street parking.
  - For the condo buildings, 132 spaces would be provided, a number of which were in garages. However, if garages were not used for parking, the minimum parking requirement would not be met, so a condition was proposed to provide additional surety that the garages were kept clear for parking, and that those parking areas in the garages were kept clear enough of items to meet the minimum dimensional standards for a legal parking spot per City Code.
    - Exhibit B5, which was emailed to the Board after the packet was distributed, showed that the Applicant had increased the size of the garage space to ensure there was room for items, such as trash bins and bicycle parking, while still allowing room for vehicle parking.(Slide 11)
    - The condition also required the homeowners association (HOA) control whether garages were used for storage and people signage would be provided in the garages where it would be actively controlled to educate people. The signage would be tasteful, while specifying the dimensions that would need to be kept clear for parking to ensure the garages were available to meet the minimum parking standard as designed.
  - These requirements were reflected in Condition PDC 6 of the Staff report; however, the City’s legal counsel proposed the following amended language, which he read into the record as follows:

“The covenant restriction shall be recorded with the Final Condominium Plat and included in the Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions (CC&Rs) for the development in a form to be approved, in writing, by the City that requires garages be used for parking a vehicle and not for any other storage, except as provided herein. The Plat and CC&Rs shall provide all garage spaces for the Condominiums must meet minimum dimensional requirements for parking spaces, as defined by the Wilsonville Code and must be kept “usable and accessible for parking at all times.” Garages shall be subject to inspection by the homeowners association and the City. Each garage must have a sign interior to the garage that is clearly visible reading “9 foot by 18 foot minimum area must be kept clear at all times for vehicle parking and no storage is allowed within this area” or where the space is among the 40% allowed to be compact “Compact Vehicles Only: 7.5 foot by 15 foot minimum area to be kept clear at all times for vehicle parking and no storage is allowed within this area”, or substantially similar language to be approved, in writing, by the City. The homeowners association may approve temporary use of garage space, not to exceed ten (10) days, for storage while actively moving without further approval from the City. No other storage shall be

allowed without written homeowner association and City approval. See also Finding C5”.

- Because this was a dense area of development, and to assure that parking was met and did not spill out and affect nearby projects, an additional 36 on street spaces could, per Code, be considered available parking to be used to meet parking requirements for the project. However, the Applicant provided the required parking onsite and conditions assured that it would be perpetually provided onsite.

**Aaron Woods** stated it seemed that the HOA and the City would have the responsibility of ensuring that the residents did not use their garages for storage. He asked what a homeowner would be liable for, noting it seemed somewhat restrictive since the vast majority of people use their garages for storage. He believed it would be almost impossible to enforce such a restriction on a homeowner purchasing this particular property.

**Mr. Pauly** responded that as part of the condition, including the signage and the clarity of the restriction in the CC&Rs, the City hoped it would be clear to the purchaser that this was a special requirement due to the dense urban nature of this residential area. Because other nearby projects were dense as well, there would be vehicles on the street due to the urban design of the area.

**Chair Martens** offered he lived in a condo development with an almost identical restriction, and they made it work. His HOA had reviewed the restriction within the last year and found widespread support for it. Their language, however, was slightly different in that it stated the garage could not be used for storage if it displaced one’s vehicle to the driveway or guest parking, which would accommodate those with only one or no automobile.

**Mr. Pauly** agreed that was a good condition, adding if the Board wanted Staff could work on drafting addition language to address that. As far as the City’s and HOA’s authority, typically such restrictions were an HOA responsibility and the City would not be actively enforcing it. If for some reason, the HOA was nonfunctional or there was a major issue, the City might get involved. The City did not have a large Code enforcement staff because most of those issues were enforced through HOAs. Issues that did not go through HOAs or issues in areas without an HOA would come to the City. Primarily, the HOA would be dealing with the parking enforcement.

**Barbara Jacobson, City Attorney** confirmed that was correct, noting it was a violation of CC&Rs, which typically included remedies. She agreed modifying the language to clarify that storage could not displace a vehicle was a good idea to accommodate homeowners without vehicles and that the Board could make that proposal later if they would like.

**Samy Nada** asked how the City Code described or defined a required parking spot, including the dimension.

**Mr. Pauly** replied parking spaces had two parts, its dimension, and that it be usable and accessible for parking.

**Mr. Nada** asked how the garage could be counted as a second space if it was blocked by another car in the driveway.

**Mr. Pauly** replied tandem parking counted because typically, the same unit was assigned both spaces, so one spouse would have to move their vehicle so the other could move theirs. He would not expect that two strangers would be assigned tandem parking without some sort of agreement. Tandem parking was

not a standard of perfect accessibility, but even though someone had to move one car for the other to be accessed, it was still considered accessible and usable for parking.

**Mr. Nada** asked if the space that blocked a driveway was counted as a parking space.

**Mr. Pauly** responded no. The only spots that would be counted were tandem exterior spots behind garages where cars were both pulled in the same way. He confirmed that with a one-car garage, there would be one space in the garage and one space in the driveway for a total of two parking spaces. No parallel parking behind those spaces that would block the driveway would be counted.

**Mr. Nada** stated it did not seem practical to count the tandem spaces as two spots. Perhaps one or two people would do that, but it would be a big hassle. These spaces were being counted just to get to the minimum, and even with off street parking, the Applicant would be 12 spots short.

**Mr. Pauly** clarified that of the 48 spaces, half were one-car garages. Removing all the driveway spaces behind the one-car garages would only remove 24 spaces. The proposal was already 14 parking spaces above the minimum, and 36 extra spaces on the street could also be counted. Even with the driveway spaces taken away, the proposal would still meet the minimum parking requirements.

**Mr. Nada** responded removing those spaces would take away 48 spaces, not 24 because it was a one-car garage and one driveway space. If the one driveway space was taken away, there would be 48 less parking spaces than the 96 spaces.

**Mr. Pauly** said he understood. The City considered those spaces usable and accessible, so even if 48 spaces were removed the proposal would still be 14 spaces above the minimum with the 36 on street spaces plus the 132 spaces already counted.

**Mr. Nada** stated it was two spaces according to his calculations. He asked what size car the required parking spaces were designed for.

**Mr. Pauly** replied that per Code, a standard-sized parking space was 9-ft by 18-ft was being used, so obviously, if someone chose to have a king cab dually in this urban location, they would most likely be parking on the street. The City could not plan for everyone owning such a large vehicle. The Code also allowed up to 40 percent compact spaces, which are 7.5-ft by 15-ft. Most small-to-medium sized sedans or small SUVs fit into those spaces.

**Mr. Martens** asked if any of the 36 designated off street parking spaces might have been counted for neighboring developments as well.

**Mr. Pauly** replied no, because off street parking spaces are all on the frontage of each property. Previous projects reviewed by the Board were only able to count the spaces adjacent to their properties; spaces across the street could not be counted.

**Samuel Scull** inquired if Staff had been taken into consideration that parking was already a problem in Villebois because people failed to use their garage or had more than two cars, which resulted in those cars being parked long term on the street. Add visitors to the mix and parking then overflowed to other parts of the neighborhood, and this neighborhood was two to three times denser than other area neighborhoods.

**Mr. Pauly** replied all that was certainly considered. He noted this area was the Village Center, which was designed to be the densest part of the development, although it was slightly less dense than originally planned. In fact, the overall density of the Village Center would be at or below what was originally

planned. Even back then, it was acknowledged that such density came with vehicles, and the worst-case scenario could not be planned for, only what was reasonable, which the Code standard provided. When the Villebois Code was established, it was thoughtfully put together and it was a denser neighborhood, so there would be some overflow parking, and Staff understood that was an issue. In the Village Center, most of the street parking would probably be used on most evenings or weekends when most people were home. In this case, the Applicant exceeded the parking requirements and Staff was making reasonable and prudent conditions to ensure, as much as possible, that garages were not being taken up for other uses but preserved for parking. A predominant concern throughout many HOAs in the city and multifamily projects was that garages were not being used for parking, so Staff was trying to make sure garages were being used for parking.

**Mr. Woods** asked what the short- and long-term bicycle parking spaces were on Page 5 of 20 of the Preliminary Development Plan.

**Mr. Pauly** replied when the City adopted the new Transportation System Plan (TSP) recently that new Code standard was added. The Code stated that once a project met a certain threshold of required bicycle parking, which he believed was six, a certain percentage of that bicycle parking needed to be long-term. Short-term bicycle spaces involved a bicycle rack intended for quick visits or shopping, for perhaps an hour or two; whereas long-term was for all-day employees, for example, or where bikes would be stored overnight in residential multifamily project. There were specific standards in the Code differentiating those scenarios.

**Mr. Woods** asked how short-term and long-term bicycle parking was managed in the Code since he could park his bicycle all day in short-term parking.

**Mr. Pauly** clarified that as managed in the Code, avid bikers probably had a valuable enough bike that they would have a natural tendency to put it in the more secure place and not have to worry about it. However, if someone wanted to put a bike out on the street all day with minimal security, there was nothing to stop them, as that was not a management issue addressed in the Code or on any projects to his knowledge.

**Mr. Nada** stated he might have miscalculated when counting the garages. There were two extra garages than the number of condos, so would every condo have a garage or would someone receive an extra garage?

**Mr. Pauly** deferred to the Applicant, noting they had done similar projects, so it had all been thought out. He continued his presentation of the Staff report as follows:

- SAP Central Refinements & SAP Central Preliminary Development Plan (PDP). He displayed an image from Exhibit B5 that showed how garages could be switched around to accommodate parking and trash storage. Some garages were 21-ft deep with a 3-ft area for trash bins and bicycle storage. Other garages were wider with an 11-ft parking bay, as well as the 3-ft area for trash cans.
  - There had been a lot of discussion about whether to have a central trash enclosure as seen at apartment complexes. The Applicant explained that in their experience it worked better if people in a condo complex were responsible for their own trash, so they could control the amount of trash they generated, similar to a single-family homeowner, rather than having a central dumpster.
  - Staff had worked with the Applicant and Republic Services to see how the collection routes would lay out. Ultimately, the drive aisles ended up being two-way, the same width as a typical Villebois alley. Putting out the trash at collection was very typical of Villebois, as could be seen in the alley between the row houses and the other condo building. Republic

also used smaller trucks in Villebois. Staff had been sure to coordinate closely with Republic Services on trash collection for the proposed SAP.

- He noted Republic Services submitted a letter dated July 19, 2016 that signed off on the Applicant's proposed plan, which he entered into the record as Exhibit B6.
- Traffic. A previous traffic study had been done for the entirety of the central area of Villebois. When comparing the last Traffic Impact Analysis from 2013 to the current plan there was actually one less trip, so there would be a slight reduction of traffic, so no traffic issues were identified with the proposal.
- Density and Housing Mix Refinement. One component of the plan was a refinement to the SAP, which allowed for a change of up to 10 percent in density. All the housing units in Villebois were grouped into two aggregate land-use categories, one being medium-sized single-family and larger and the other being small lot, single-family and smaller. All the units in the SAP Central were in that smaller category; therefore, changing from one product to another did not affect that because they were all in the same bucket, so Staff looked at unit count. The Applicant proposed a reduction of six units, .5 percent, which was well within the percentage change allowed through a refinement process. He noted that at this point, they were very close to the original unit count expected for the Village Center.
  - Staff also considered the housing mix within that category, especially in terms of urban design and variety of housing. Originally, the area was planned for specialty condos, which would have preserved some of the Dammasch State Hospital buildings and adaptively reused them for housing. At one point, that was determined to not be feasible so the buildings were demolished, and therefore the specialty condos could not feasibly be built.
  - The Village Apartments, more traditional condos, and some mixed-use condos currently existed due to the orientation of a potential L-shaped building along Villebois Dr. Eventually that building's property was subdivided into different lots, and so the subject lot included a portion of that building; however, mixed-use was planned for the remainder of that lot.
  - The proposal had a very similar density and urban design with three- to four-story buildings close to the street to create a dense urban feel as contemplated at the Village Center. In Villebois, a transect concept was contemplated where the densest, highest buildings were in the Village Center and the least dense, larger homes were on the edges, such as along Grahams Ferry. The proposed project, Mont Blanc No. 2, would be right at the center of Villebois and was expected to have a dense urban feel.
  - Given how the buildings were oriented toward Paris Ave and to the south, the garages on the northwest side, which had a 15-ft buildable front, would face Campanile Ln. These perspectives would be shown later in the presentation.

**Samy Nada** asked if the one trip decrease in the traffic analysis was in comparison to what was planned or existing conditions.

**Mr. Pauly** replied it was against what was planned. The expected road capacities in Villebois were planned and built based on the planned density, the number and type of units initially assigned in the Master Plan and SAPs for each area. The most recent traffic study update for the area was in 2013, and compared to the current, there was one trip less. In short, the traffic impacts from this project had been planned as the infrastructure had been built and planned for the Villebois development.

**Mr. Nada** stated he did not see an actual traffic study, as seen in previous projects that identified the different intersections and the ratings of each intersection.

**Mr. Pauly** explained that because a previous traffic study had been done, only a memorandum was provided. He noted when a scope of a traffic study was requested, one of two things would happen. There could be a full Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA), which contained the intersection studies, tables, diagrams

and details. But if it was a small project with minimal impact or a previous study existed, only a memo that explained the impacts was provided. In this instance, since the impacts were so minimal from the previous in-depth study, the City's traffic engineers did not believe it made sense to have the Applicant go through the expense of doing a full study, so only a memo was necessary to explain the change from the previous study. He confirmed the original Traffic Impact Analysis was done in 2013.

**Mr. Scull** asked if increased or added public transit had been considered in the traffic study, relative to the density in the center of the development.

**Mr. Pauly** replied there was a public transit component in the Master Plan. Bus stops were planned for specific areas; however, none of those bus stops impacted this project. He believed bus stops were planned in the circular park currently under construction north of the school, adding that essentially, each neighborhood would have a bus stop. SMART was currently reviewing its routes to determine how they could best serve the city, and whether SMART would serve Villebois with more frequency. The Master Plan did contain an appendix that addressed public transit and bus stops had been contemplated and planned throughout the Villebois community.

**Mr. Pauly** continued his presentation of the Staff report via PowerPoint with these comments:

- The Final Development Plan (FDP). Landscaping. The Applicant's proposed street trees and open space landscaping matched the Community Elements Book, which described the different planting and landscaping materials and street tree options for Villebois. Basalt benches would provide a unique look, while being consistent with the overall design, and planters would add greenery in an urban nature. (Slide 16)
  - He noted the pedestrian paver alley would be along the southeast side of Campanile Ln. The alley was the connection going up from the Piazza through an approved, but not yet built, development and into Montague Park. Campanile Ln was what was called The Courtyard address, which had been designed as a mixed pedestrian/bicycle/car area and a main outdoor room in the Village Center.
  - Architecture. He reviewed the architectural elements of the Applicant's proposed buildings, which Staff had gone through in detail to ensure they met all the various Village Center Architecture Standards for articulation. The buildings had also been reviewed by Consultant Architect Steve Coyle, the same architect who had reviewed all of the Villebois homes' architecture.
    - He noted the Village Center was unique in that no specific architectural standard or style, such as American Modern or English Revival, for example, was required. The architecture only needed to meet a checklist of certain design elements, which included articulation on the face, a clearly defined bottom, middle, and top of the building, window treatments, balconies, clear entries, and the use of brick.
    - The five-plex row houses would have a London design, which would provide consistency with neighboring projects. The front courtyards along Villebois Dr would provide a ground floor area that could potentially be used for small business, which was an idea in the Villebois Master Plan.
    - The four-story, 34-unit building, was similar to the three-story, 24-unit condo building, but also included the additional architectural difference at the top to break up the mass of the building.
    - The garages along Campanile Ln and Collina Ln were also enhanced with windows, brick treatment, and indentation to break up the long façade, as well as some additional architectural detail on the roof to provide architectural interest along the roads they faced.
- The Tentative Subdivision Plat would dedicate the right-of-way, establish the public utility easements, and create the ten lots for the row houses that would have individually owned, similar to

most row houses in the Village Center and elsewhere in Villebois. The plat would also create the tracts for the open space, alley, and future condo development.

- Tentative Condominium Plat would create the condo plat, including the garages and separating out the ownership on each floor.
- Type C Tree Plan. All of the trees on the site were proposed for removal and a couple adjacent trees would be protected. Though some trees were rated Medium to Good, they were not a desirable species and some trees had Verticillium wilt or other issues, so no trees on the site were desirable to preserve to the point of changing a building design, even though Villebois had a history of designing around Good and Important trees.
  - He noted an Important tree in the middle of Paris Ave was preserved as part of a previous proposal and that some trees to the south in an area not yet approved for development would be protected during development of the subject project.
- He clarified that he had read the revised Condition PDC 6 into the record, adding the language could be revised further to reflect those homeowners who did not own vehicles if the Board wanted. He entered the following exhibits into the record:
  - Exhibit B5: Revised drawing submitted by the Applicant for garages and parking spaces.
  - Exhibit B6: Letter and two signed exhibits from Frank Lonergan, Operations Manager, Republic Services dated July 19, 2016.

**Chair Martens** noted the Staff report conditioned that language in the CC&Rs would be agreeable to Staff, so he did not believe the Board needed to approve specific language.

**Ms. Jacobson** agreed, adding the condition's language did say, "or substantially similar language to be approved, in writing, by the City." However, if the Board wanted Staff to address homeowners who did not own a vehicle that would make sense.

**Mr. Pauly** believed that flexibility was there.

**Chair Martens** stated he was comfortable leaving the recommendation as presented in the Staff report. He called for the Applicant's presentation.

**Jim Lange, Pacific Community Design, 12564 SW Main St, Tigard, OR 97223** introduced himself.

**Pamela Verdadero, Polygon NW, 109 East 13<sup>th</sup> St, Vancouver, WA 98660**, thanked the Staff for the wonderful job on the detailed Staff report. The Applicant was very excited about introducing another home style into the mix at Villebois and felt that it met the needs of the neighborhood, specifically single-level living which was in need at Villebois. The proposed plan transitioned nicely from the less dense part of the neighborhood into the core at the Piazza. And with the retail shops, it would be a great walkable area of the neighborhood.

- In addition to the row homes, single-level one-, two-, and three-bedroom homes with detached garages were proposed that would be served by elevators and enclosed corridors. These buildings would have more of an urban edge since they were at the core of the neighborhood. The Applicant believed they would attract people who wanted to downsize, as well as first-time homebuyers.
- Since this would be primarily an owner-occupied neighborhood the Applicant would do a lot of counseling upfront regarding parking and the intended use of garages, including what to do with oversized vehicles, boats, or RVs. Expectations were set regarding the type of neighborhood and whether it was the right fit for a particular individual.

**Mr. Nada** asked if any condo owner could buy more than one garage.

**Ms. Verdadero** confirmed it was one garage per condominium.

**Chair Martens** confirmed the three-story buildings would also be served by elevators and interior corridors.

**Ms. Verdadero** added that being an owner-occupied neighborhood, there was an active HOA and while homeowners would not be involved in the policing of the garage space, they were very passionate about parking. If it became an issue, it would be definitely be brought up and evaluated at meetings.

**Mr. Scull** asked if the proposed development would have an independent HOA separate from the other HOAs in the neighborhood.

**Ms. Verdadero** replied that she believed so.

**Mr. Pauly** added the HOA was also required to contribute to the Village Center maintenance of some of the shared facilities.

**Mr. Nada** stated he was not very familiar with how different HOAs interacted with each other in Villebois. If there were parking issues in the plan, it would not be a problem inside because there was no place to park, although it might affect other HOAs. He asked who people would complain to so the HOA could enforce the parking requirements.

**Ms. Verdadero** replied an HOA liaison sat on each of the active HOAs and went back and forth between the homeowners and the different neighborhoods.

**Mr. Nada** asked if there was currently a parking problem in Villebois.

**Ms. Verdadero** answered not that she was aware of or heard about specifically. With the owner-occupied component, especially with downsizing homeowners who were already getting rid of extras, letting prospective homeowners know upfront, and setting the expectation that the garage needed to be used for parking, there had not been any issues. Polygon NW had been very successful in the past at setting that expectation at the time of sale.

**Chair Martens** called for public testimony in favor of, opposed and neutral to the application. He noted for the record that no one was in the audience and closed the public hearing at 7:41 pm.

**Samuel Scull moved to approve Resolution No. 330 with the addition of Exhibits B5 and B6. Aaron Woods seconded the motion.**

**Mr. Nada** asked if the Board could see a more recent traffic study than the one done three years ago that included the different intersections and current traffic patterns because fewer houses were actually being built than had been planned three years ago. People were complaining about traffic and he wanted to see what traffic would be like today.

**Mr. Woods** confirmed Mr. Nada wanted the City to do another true traffic study that included the density and new housing being proposed versus the updated traffic study from 2013.

**Mr. Martens** understood that study would be based upon the number and type of units being built.

**Mr. Pauly** offered to further explain how traffic studies were done and how they worked internally.

**Mr. Nada** understood from a previous project that traffic studies were done by counting how many cars crossed a given intersection at a given time of day and were not based solely on the number of units.

**Mr. Pauly** explained that when traffic studies were done, the City considered how much capacity was used up by what was currently built, and by Stage 2 approvals, projects that were approved, but not yet built. These figures were calculated and put in a spreadsheet for each of these projects. He asked Mr. Adams to explain how decisions were made regarding whether to use a memo or a traffic study on projects like that proposed.

**Steve Adams, Development Engineering Manager**, stated it was decided at the inception of the Villebois project that there would be a main traffic study for the entire subdivision, and a traffic study for each of the SAPs. SAPs East, North, Central, and South each had a traffic study that anticipated so many types of homes being built in that area, so each traffic study was unique for what was planned in that SAP. In the interim, as long as the development came in for a specific PDP, that SAP's traffic study would be reviewed. Each traffic study considered the overall flow and the main intersections both onsite and offsite. What was agreed upon was if, for example, SAP Central 10 was planned to have X units which anticipated X trips and the developer deviated from that a bit based on the current market conditions, Staff would go back to the traffic study and anticipate how that deviation would reflect on the traffic patterns.

- Traffic counts at Villebois Drive were completed approximately one month ago to ascertain the impacts that occurred once the bridge going across to Kinsman Rd opened on Barber St. The last full-blown study in Villebois was associated with Grande Pointe in 2013. When Grande Pointe came in it was a yet-to-be-determined area of Villebois, so the City talked with the developer about updating the traffic study to know how much Grande Pointe would impact everything else. The City did counts at Grahams Ferry Rd and Tooze Rd, and at some of the major intersections, such as Brown Rd and Wilsonville Rd, to determine traffic flow and whether they were within the projections anticipated when the first traffic study was done in 2003. At that point, no red flags were raised as far as the capacity of the streets to handle the traffic, therefore, the City back to providing memos on each small sub phase to determine how well traffic was performing and the anticipated demands.

**Mr. Nada** asked how often a big study like the one conducted in 2013 should be done.

**Mr. Adams** replied the City anticipated that the last big study had already been done for Villebois because each SAP had a study and now, it was just a matter of tracking the trips and looking at truck traffic, volume, capacity, etc. Speeds were also reviewed to determine if a specific area had a speeding problem. Currently, 80 to 90 percent of the traffic memos were done and completed, so even though Villebois was only about 60 percent built out, the City was ahead as far as what had been approved by DRB, what was under construction, and what had actually been built. He asked if there was a specific traffic issue in Villebois that raised concerns.

**Mr. Nada** replied not in Villebois specifically, but other nearby major intersections, such as Wilsonville Rd and Brown Rd. Even though those intersections were not in close proximity to the project, the project would still have an impact, so he wanted the Board to see the numbers and the Level of Service (LOS) rating seen in other studies that indicated wait times and etc. He wanted to know what those wait times were currently and what impact the proposed project would have on surrounding intersections and even those intersections to I-5.

**Mr. Adams** replied Staff felt pretty comfortable, adding DRB-Panel B had missed the traffic study training work session that explained all these details. He noted that in the last couple years, the City had done a project called Transportation Performance Modeling. The City hired DKS to study key intersections to see how they were performing and see what the model said they would perform at over the last ten years to determine whether the City was staying ahead of traffic.

- Projects were very large or major, so as traffic builds and builds, incremental increases in delays were seen at intersections. Then various City projects would be completed, for example, the Barber St connection through Villebois to Kinsman Rd, or the I-5/Wilsonville Rd Interchange Project, and traffic numbers would drop back down again. Over the last ten years, studies have shown that overall, most intersections were well below the LOS D that the City required. For example, Barber St just opened last September. Counts done in May showed 5,000 to 6,000 vehicles crossed that bridge per day and those cars used to go down to Wilsonville Rd or up to Boeckman Rd, the bridge removed those 6,000 vehicles off Wilsonville Rd between Brown Rd and the interstate, or at least to Boones Ferry Rd. Concurrently, the City did a count on Boeckman Rd, which was carrying 6,000 vehicles per day between the Villebois Dr roundabout and Kinsman Rd. Although the Boeckman Rd project caused major traffic problems for the 15 months it was closed, once completed, those two roads combined pulled 12,000 vehicles daily east/west that would have either gone north or south. The City had just broken ground on the Kinsman Rd connection between Barber St and Boeckman Rd, and that project, which was anticipated to be completed in the fall of 2017, was expected to take traffic pressure off other roads. Extending Kinsman Rd to Boeckman Rd should eliminate vehicles cutting through the Villebois subdivision from Sherwood since there would now be a direct route. So, again the City anticipated the Kinsman Road Extension would pull more traffic from busier areas.
- He offered to give Mr. Nada a copy of the Transportation Performance Modeling Report. The City would repeat the study every two to three years and then refer back to it to ensure the City was staying ahead of traffic issues. One reason the report was triggered was because Day Rd hit capacity way before the City anticipated it would. When Day Rd was built in 2001, the City had not anticipated the amount of cut through traffic from Tualatin. The study gave the City an idea of why the traffic was there, and why it was increasing. The City wanted to stay ahead of that traffic situation because Washington County was currently building 124<sup>th</sup> Ave which would bring more traffic down to Grahams Ferry Rd. The City wanted to keep an eye on that area to ensure the major street upgrades were done in time to handle the expected traffic counts.
- He confirmed that the Board would not see full traffic studies for any further projects in Villebois, only memos. However, if something else came in that was a major change, a complete traffic study would be required.

**Mr. Pauly** added something on the level of a Master Plan amendment would trigger a complete traffic study, but for something within the confines of the approved Master Plan or an approved SAP, there would be a memo.

**Mr. Adams** agreed if it was a change that fell outside the 10 percent change, such as putting in 400 apartments rather than 100 homes, a new traffic study would be required because such a major change would result in a lot more traffic.

**Chair Martens** confirmed there was no further comment. He repeated the motion on the floor and called for a vote.

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Chair Martens** closed the public hearing at 7:57 pm and read the rules of appeal into the record.

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

- A. Results of the May 9, 2016 DRB Panel A meeting
- B. Results of the June 13, 2016 DRB Panel A meeting
- C. Results of the July 11, 2016 DRB Panel A meeting

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

**Daniel Pauly, Associate Planner**, noted the only large application Panel A reviewed was the Republic Services Digester.

**X. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 7:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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