

**Wilsonville City Hall  
29799 SW Town Center Loop E  
Wilsonville, Oregon 97070**

**Development Review Board – Panel B  
Minutes–September 23, 2013 6:30 PM**

<p><b>Approved</b> October 28, 2013</p>
---

**I. Call to Order:**

Chair Andrew Karr called the DRB-Panel B meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

**II. Chairman's Remarks:**

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

**III. Roll Call:**

Present for roll call were: Andrew Karr, Dianne Knight, Jhuma Chaudhuri, Aaron Woods, and City Council Liaison Susie Stevens. Cheryl Dorman was absent.

Staff present were: Chris Neamtzu, Barbara Jacobson, Michael Wheeler, and Amanda Hoffman.

**IV. Citizens' Input:** This is an opportunity for visitors to address the Development Review Board on items not on the agenda. There was none.

**V.**

**VI. City Council Liaison Report:**

Councilor Stevens reported that City Council:

- Held First Reading at the last Council meeting on a new ordinance regarding regulations for commercial filming on public property, following in Clackamas County's footsteps. The filming industry was gaining traction in Oregon and could come to the City in one form or another. Council wanted to be careful about protecting City property as well as citizens' rights. The ordinance was well written; Council only made a few adjustments. The second reading would be held in early October. She believed it was important to be proactive rather than reactive on such matters.
- Heard reports from Kristin Retherford regarding the Tax Increment Finance (TIF) Zones, which had received a lot of press. The TIF Zones would help grow under-utilized buildings of 100,000 sq ft or more in Wilsonville. Everyone hoped the program would attract more good businesses to the city.
- She updated that the Memorial Park Parking Lot Project would be a big project this fall. The project would disrupt the park, but the redesign was much needed and would be safer and better accommodate park users.
- The Boeckman Road Bridge is on track to be open by Thanksgiving.
- The City purchased the Apache Sculpture near Town Center Park and would be moving the sculpture onto the grassy area near the sign to help minimize pedestrian damage.

**VI. Consent Agenda:**

**A.** Approval of minutes of May 30, 2013 meeting

**Chair Karr moved to approve the May 30 2013 meeting minutes as presented. Dianne Knight seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.**

**VII. Public Hearing:**

**A. Resolution 261. Miley Road Office Building Master Sign Plan: Cetacea Holdings, LLC – owner.** The applicant is requesting approval of a Master Sign Plan for the property located

at 8995 SW Miley Road. The subject property is located on Tax Lots 15700 and 16100 of Section 25BC; T3S R1W, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Michael Wheeler.

Case File : DB13-0005 – Master Sign Plan

**Chair Karr** called the public hearing to order at 6:37 p.m. and read the conduct of hearing format into the record. All Board members declared for the record that they had visited the site. No board member, however, declared a conflict of interest, bias, or conclusion from a site visit. No board member participation was challenged by any member of the audience.

**Michael Wheeler, Associate Planner**, announced that the criteria applicable to the application were stated on page 1 of the Staff report, which was entered into the record. Copies of the report were made available to the side of the room.

**Mr. Wheeler** presented the Staff report via PowerPoint with these key additional comments:

- The requested Master Sign Plan approval was for an office building approved in 1998 and occupied by tenants in 2001. The prior owners of the property chose not to pursue a Master Sign Plan, but the new owners now wanted to make that opportunity available to the tenants. The proposed Master Sign Plan before the Board was the result of working with the Applicant for months.
- He reviewed two issues regarding the request, discussed on Page 3 of the Staff report, as follows:
  - The tenant allocations are used, as found in the text of the Development Code, to identify the size of a sign and can play a role in what that sign area might be. After the Staff report was written, the Applicant provided Exhibit B2.2, which indicated a total of twelve tenants enabling Staff to understand how the Applicant wanted to demonstrate compliance. Having the Applicant provide the tenant spatial layout for the record would be helpful.
  - The second issue was that the proposed freestanding pole sign with a 35-ft sign height exceeds the maximum allowed by the Development Code. The Staff report's findings noted the calculations relative to the contour near the front of the property which yield a maximum height of 25 ft instead. A recommended condition of approval addressed the issue.
- The Applicant proposed four wall signs and two freestanding signs, one short format monument sign and one pylon or pole sign, which would be 25-ft as discussed. The wall signs would be in four blocks on the west wall of the existing building.
- Staff recommended approval with Condition PD 7, correcting the height of the freestanding pylon sign to be not more than 25 ft, along with other conditions typical for signs being placed on a site. (Page 4 of 51 of the Staff report)
- The Applicant elected to do a Master Sign Plan, but could have done Class 3 Sign Reviews at one time per proposal, but would have to return for review for each new sign. Instead, the Master Sign Plan, which is composed of graphics and specifications for the three types of signs, could be considered.
- The location of the subject site was indicated on a vicinity map and a tax map as being just north of Miley Rd and east of I-5.
- He clarified that the total area for the two wall sign areas was 120 sq ft, not 60 sq ft as indicated in the table on Slide 7. Subsequently, the total square footage in the Max Square Ft column should state 248 sq ft, not 188 sq ft. The proposal still complied, but the correction should be noted.
  - The Applicant proposed two areas of wall sign with four signs within each wall sign. Each wall sign totaled 60 sq ft and had area blocks of 32 sq ft for the upper portion and 28 sq ft below as illustrated in Slide 9.
  - He also corrected the Max Height in the table for the freestanding sign from 35 ft to 25 ft as conditioned.
- The Site Plan, as shown on Exhibit B2.3, noted the proposed locations of the wall signs on the building, which were located at either end of the project property.

- The proposed monument sign and its construction details were displayed. The monument sign would be located at the south entrance of the property on Miley Rd. The total height from the base was 10 ft and the sign would be 8 ft by 8 ft.
- The pylon sign was shown at 35-ft high on Slide 12 at the northwest corner of the site making it visible from I-5, primarily by northbound traffic.
- Signage specifications were available should there be any questions.
- With the exception of the condition addressing the incorrect height calculation methodology on Page 15 of 21 of the Staff report, the proposal complied with the requirements of the Master Sign Code and Sign Code specifics with regard to the PDC Zone as well as the provisions of the Development Code, so Staff recommended approval.

**Chair Karr** asked if both the top and bottom of the 25-ft high sign would still be easily visible from I-5.

**Mr. Wheeler** believed so, adding that the correction reflected the methodology expressed both in the Development Code and the graphic as to how that is supposed to be measured. I-5 frontage sites benefited by having an additional 5 ft from the rising grade being measured from the travel lane rather than from the grade at the sign's location. He did not have first-hand knowledge if the sign would be visible, but it appeared from the Applicant's graphic that while the sign would be shorter it would still be easily visible for those traveling northbound.

**Chair Karr** called for the Applicant's presentation.

**Savannah Myer, Rudnick Electric Signs**, stated the Applicant had no questions or concerns. She would provide an updated drawing showing the sign's height changed to 25 ft, about which they were in agreement.

**Chair Karr** confirmed there was no comment from the audience and closed the public hearing at 6:55 p.m.

**Mr. Wheeler** clarified that the corrections he made were to the Master Sign Plan table description, which was in the Applicant's material not in the Staff report. He confirmed the Applicant had only calculated the area for one wall sign and not two, but it was not an issue because the proposal still complied.

- On Page 33 of 51 of the Staff report, he corrected an error in the Applicant's Exhibit B2.4 stating that the second sentence under "The allowed square footage:" should state, "Places ~~b1~~ **a2** & b2 are allowed 28 square feet for each sign."
- He confirmed no condition was needed; it was just a matter of pointing out the typographic implication.

**Chair Karr** understood that none of the mentions needed to be changed or corrected in the Staff report.

**Mr. Wheeler** agreed the corrections were not errata as much as a notice of the inconsistency that should be corrected as long as the 35-ft sign height was being reduced to 25 ft.

**Chair Karr moved to approve Resolution 261 with modifications to the Staff report that the Applicant submit new drawings to reflect the 25-ft total height of the pylon sign; the second reference to "b1" in the allowable square footage of the Wall Sign Criteria, Exhibit B2.4, be changed to "a2"; and that any references showing the total sign square footage as "188 sq ft" be changed to "248 sq ft". The motion was seconded by Jhuma Chadhuri and passed unanimously.**

**Chair Karr** read the rules of appeal into the record.

- B. Resolution 262. Active Adults at the Grove Apartments Revisions: Brenchley Estates Partners, LP and CRP & Holland Brenchley Estates II LP – applicants/owners.** The applicant is requesting approval of a Revised Stage II Final Plan and Site Design Review for Active Adults at the Grove Apartments. The subject property is located on Tax Lots 100, 103, 104, 105 and 200 of Section 14A; T3S R1W, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Amanda Hoffman

Case Files: DB13-0036 – Revised Stage II Final Plan  
DB13-0037 – Site Design Review

**Chair Karr** called the public hearing to order at 6:59 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 3 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 regarding the revisions to Active Adults at the Grove via PowerPoint with these key additional comments:

- The project, a four-story building with 112 multi-family dwelling units for occupants 55 years of age and older, was originally approved in July of this year. Subsequent to that DRB approval, the Applicant and prospective developer continued meeting with a focus group that urged the developer to add more covered and garage parking, as well as more outdoor usable space. Tonight, a revised Stage II Final Plan and Site Design Review were being presented as a result of those focus group requests.
  - She reviewed the subject site and the surrounding properties and key features, noting that construction of the Terrene Apartments was further along than what the picture indicated. The main revision was proposed on the west side of the site, facing the Terrene Apartments currently under construction.
- The Stage II Final Plan included the increase in parking and in the onsite outdoor recreation area, which included a 5,945 sq ft, second floor sky deck. The sky deck would be an outdoor recreation area only accessible to the residents of the apartment complex.
  - The sky deck would face west and also act as a carport for parking underneath. The doors of the detached garages, which were part of this revision, faced east and therefore, the sky deck.
- Landscape Plan also captured the proposed changes. The main change was a little landscaping would be lost on the south end of the site where the building had to be extended about 50 ft to incorporate an extra stair enclosure and a living unit on the upper floor.
- On the Site Design Review, the most significant change compared to before was the look of the building with the garages on the first floor rather than the units below.
  - The sky deck did not show up on the elevations displayed on Slide 9, but she showed indicated where the ramp out to sky deck was located.
  - No change was proposed in the number of units from the original approval; however the number of bedrooms in some of the units had changed.
  - Sheet A1 illustrated the 30 attached garage units and 13 detached garage units toward the top of the sheet. (Slide 10)
- She reviewed the amenities shown on sky deck, noting the screens that would provide privacy from the west for sky deck users; planter beds that would be available for the residents' use; and barbeques and seating areas that would provide a lot of extra outdoor recreation use for the residents. (Slide 11)

- An inset photo of planter beds featured on an existing sky deck in Hillsboro provided more detail about how the planter beds are used.
- Other slides displayed a plan view of the proposed sky deck along with the terrace screen and a night photo of the existing sky deck in Hillsboro, as well as a view of what the proposed sky deck would look like from the west looking east.
- The Applicant was required to provide minimum of 168 parking spaces but proposed 203 parking spaces, 188 onsite and 15 on street spaces, which was 35 spaces above parking minimum.
- Lighting was not included in ~~any~~ of the proposal, so no lighting was being approved on the sky deck or above the garages.
- Staff suggested having a more permanent structure on the sky deck to provide for year round use, but it was only a suggestion noted in the Issues Section of the Staff report.
- Staff recommended approval with the conditions beginning on Page 6 of the Staff report.

**Dianne Knight** asked how many egress points were on the sky deck in Hillsboro, adding that it did not seem sufficient to have only egress points near the center and at the end. It seemed like a long span to not have another egress on the other end.

**Ms. Hoffman** clarified there would only be one egress point on the sky deck. She believed most people would enter and exit the sky deck through the building itself, not through the parking lot.

**Ms. Knight** asked if just having the one egress point would be enough in the event of an emergency.

**Ms. Hoffman** replied that she did not receive any comments from the Plans Examiner after he reviewed the proposal so she believed having one egress was suitable.

**Chair Karr** asked about the security present at that entrance into the building.

**Ms. Hoffman** deferred to the Applicant.

**Aaron Woods** noted no lighting was proposed and asked if there was already lighting on that side of the building that would shine down on the sky deck.

**Ms. Hoffman** confirmed that no lighting existed on the building and the Applicant was not proposing any changes from what was originally approved. If the Applicant wanted to change the lighting, they would have to return before the Board.

**Jhuma Chaudhuri** asked for clarification about the second reading held at City Council after Council had already adopted Ordinance 717 in July.

**Barbara Jacobson, Assistant City Attorney** explained it was normal protocol to have a First Reading, a preliminary approval, followed by a Second Reading, the final approval, of the ordinance at a separate meeting. She believed additional information came forward at the Second Reading. Another purpose of the Second Reading was to address questions or provide information that needed to be heard before a final vote was made.

**Ms. Chaudhuri** noted page 5 of 52 discussed the changes to the number of one-, two-, and three-bedroom units and asked for clarification on the original number of units because she believed no three-bedroom units were proposed originally.

**Ms. Hoffman** agreed it had been unclear but three-bedroom units were originally proposed, which was clarified at the City Council meeting.

**Chris Neamtzu, Planning Director**, commented that the Staff toured the Hillsboro facility and the existing sky deck. The sky deck in Hillsboro was larger than the one proposed in this project.

- The Hillsboro sky deck had a single external stairway in addition to the internal second floor entrance into the building. There appeared to be a magnetic keycard type of access on the locking gate at the ground level for security. The building had a perimeter security system as well. As described by the Applicant, security is very important.
- The Building Division reviews access and egress and the capacity of a room or project. In this case, there would be an occupancy load for the sky deck. Calculations are made based on the number of doors and exit points.
  - The proposed project was smaller and therefore did not need as many access points for emergencies. The fire department would review the plan to make sure emergency access was adequate.
- He was also curious about lighting. Low level, bollard-type lighting was shown in the photograph of the Hillsboro sky deck that gently illuminated the deck and surface area and was tastefully done. The Hillsboro facility also had wall pack lighting above every other garage. He would like to hear more about lighting with regard to the Wilsonville project.
- He added the Hillsboro sky deck also had an all-weather, flat panel television.

**Chair Karr** called for the Applicant's presentation.

**Don Hanson, OTAK, 808 SW 3<sup>rd</sup> Ave, Suite 300, Portland, OR 97204** stated Otak was the planners and engineers for the project. He stated Staff's presentation was thorough and the Applicant agreed with the Staff report. He stated that he and the Applicant would provide a brief overview and clarify questions from the Board.

**Brenner Daniels, Holland Partner Group, Project Development Director, 1111 Main Street, Suite 700, Vancouver, WA 98660**, explained the reason for the revisions, noting that in going through the process of designing the building, the design had clearly evolved.

- Two focus group hearings were held with residents of Holland's current Wilsonville projects and residents of the greater community. The overriding response from the focus group was that they wanted additional covered parking and even direct access parking in the project. The initial 30 carports clearly were not sufficient for the project.
- The Applicant responded by increasing covered parking and adding direct access garages now placed under the building.
- He noted that the revised design was a direct result of feedback from the focus groups as well as the Board and City Council.

**Mr. Hanson** reviewed the proposed changes via PowerPoint, using exhibits already provided in the public record.

- Increasing the onsite parking had been great idea and he believed the City agreed, since there was no overflow parking capability in neighborhood.
- They increased covered parking onsite and now provided secure garage parking with direct access into the buildings, which was very important for the demographic as noted by the focus group.
- The sky deck helped increase the usable open space onsite.
- Common area facilities had also increased in the building that are secure and accessible for the residents. Some of these facilities were moved to the second floor to relate directly to the sky deck, providing a nice indoor/outdoor combination.
- The prior Site Plan showed the parking lot wrapping around the building. He noted all the proposed revisions did not face Parkway Ave or amend anything previously approved by the DRB on the most visible parts of the building. The proposal reorganized the rear portion and southwest corner of the

site.

- The current proposed Site Plan showed the sky deck, garages on the perimeter of the parking area, as well as how cars tuck under the building at the main level.
  - The building had been pushed out toward the southwest a bit to compensate for the main level units that were lost. As a result, the Applicant believed they had better units and provided a better situation for the residents.
- He compared the two Site Plans, confirming the only changes were confined to the rear portion of the building.
  - He noted the addition of a hobby room on the Main Level floor plan that would have a roll-up garage door facing the parking area.
  - One of the access drives was eliminated to the west leaving only one access drive coming into the parking commons, which would improve the walkability along the sidewalk and also help screen off the project better.
  - Three remote garages were positioned along the west property line, which also helps with visually screening the parking zone in the back of the building.
  - The Main Floor Plan indicated that all the tuck-under garages on the main level were tandems in the rear. The main level also included a leasing area, management office and functioning mailroom.
    - The exercise room and community room had been moved to the second floor to relate directly to the sky deck area.
- A visual of the back of the building was displayed, showing the three detached garages along the edge of the site and the sky deck positioned in the center of the building.
- He explained that the sky deck was placed at the second level because it was the most adjacent and accessible location to all the community facilities and most of the residents in the building.
  - The sky deck provided for 30 covered parking spaces.
  - Having the sky deck at the second level would help eliminate and protect residents enjoying the deck from the freeway noise. If the sky deck were on the roof or higher up it would be more susceptible to freeway noise.
  - The Applicant strongly believed the sky deck would be a more enhanced, interesting view from the units with nice furnishings, plant material, as well as the activity of other residents.
- Concept drawings closely depicted what the sky deck would look like once completed, which included seating areas. The Applicant proposed furnishing the sky deck with umbrellas for weather protection. While the Applicant might consider covering part of the sky deck in the future, they did not want to be mandated to do so before they could see how it functioned without any cover.
  - The sky deck was considered an outdoor area and had been included under the recreation area calculations, so the Applicant preferred that the deck be open to the air.
- As noted in Staff's presentation, a series of smaller trellises were proposed along the western edge of the sky deck, where the brightest, hottest sun would come from, so people could retreat from the sun when needed.
- Images of the existing sky deck at the Orenco Station project in Hillsboro were displayed. He noted that the Orenco sky deck included bollard lighting, which was what the Applicant wanted to use on the proposed sky deck. The Applicant did not have any details about the lighting, but knew that information must be presented to Staff.
  - He suggested that the Applicant present both the Site Signage and lighting details about the bollard lighting on the sky deck to Staff in one application.
    - No big, bright lights would be installed on the sky deck; the goal was to illuminate the surface so people did not trip.
  - He showed an image of the raised planters which were very popular for gardening and would be enjoyed by the residents.

- One image showed the relationship of the sky deck in relation to the adjacent building. He noted that Levels 2, 3 and 4 had very nice views of the sky deck and the Applicant wanted to emulate that same configuration for the proposed sky deck. Level 1 was garages.
- The Applicant liked that the sky deck was going to be secured. They did not want it to be an area for people to just walk through. They wanted the residents to walk out to the sky deck from the building interior and use it. The sky deck should feel defensible and for the use of the residents.
- The proposed changes and refinements responded to the future residents of Active Adults at the Grove. He commended Holland for conducting the focus groups and listening to what future residents really wanted, which Otak had executed.
  - He added that the refinements were true to the initial DRB Panel B decision and comments made by the panel.

**Chair Karr** confirmed there would be a gate at the bottom of the stairway to make the sky deck secure.

**Mr. Daniels** noted it was a one-way, exit only gate at the stairway.

**Mr. Hanson** noted there were no fire protection issues with the sky deck, so having that exit gate would work quite well.

**Mr. Woods** asked what the actual use would be of the sky deck, and if it would be a year-round area for the residents.

**Mr. Hanson** replied it would not be an area residents would want to occupy when it was raining heavily, but the Applicant would like to see how well the area works with the umbrellas.

**Ms. Chaudhuri** asked how the sky deck was used at Orenco Station during the rainy months.

**Clyde Holland, Holland Partner Group, 1111 Main Street, Suite 700, Vancouver, WA 98660**, replied Holland actually completed a study and found that on average, there were 512 wet/dry cycles annually, meaning it could be raining in the morning and by afternoon it could be sunny.

- Holland proposed having complete weather protection furniture, as well as trex decking, which is non-flammable and all the water drains through it. A putting green would be installed that would be self-sufficient in terms of draining as well. The plant materials and resident gardens would be available for enjoyment whenever there was a break in the weather.
- An outdoor covered area was anticipated since Holland expected to have a large, flat screen television on the sky deck. Most likely, the sky deck would not be used about three months out of the year, but the sky deck would be extremely, actively used during the other nine months, especially in summer.
- One key, positive aspect at the Hillsboro facility was that instead of having to discount the units that previously would have looked down onto the parking lot, residents in Hillsboro were requesting these units for the view of the sky deck. It was the first vertical green space anywhere in the northwest that Holland was aware of and it had been an enormous hit with the residents.
- The direct access garages would allow vehicles to circulate, but not be the focus of the project. The focus of the project was the residents, the outdoor space and the activity going on.
- The Applicant was really excited about the refinements and all the main program elements that the Board asked Holland to be careful of had been reserved.
- By moving the units off the ground floor that looked at the parking lot and putting the activity on the second floor, all of the focus for those units on the interior would be on the outdoor active space of the sky deck. And, if the sky deck was quiet, it would still look nice and be a nice view for those units.



**Mr. Daniels** added another benefit of the sky deck was that it was accessed by the club room, similar to Platform 14. Residents could barbeque year round and also utilize the full kitchen and entertaining area in the club room.

**Mr. Holland** noted this active space would be significantly more accessibility than the typical open space, walkways or parks. The sky deck space would be 100 percent accessible throughout the whole area. The Platform 14 Apartments in Hillsboro had several, accessibility challenged individuals that were very grateful for this type of area where they could move around, host, barbeque and get together with friends. The sky deck would really invite the entire community to get out, gather and partake in the activities.

**Mr. Hanson** added that if there were any covered area, it would be in the central barbeque area where some seasonal cover might be installed.

**Mr. Woods** asked if any fire pits would be located on the sky deck.

**Mr. Daniels** replied they were considering adding a double-sided fireplace and noted that multiple, gas-generated fire pits were on the Platform 14 sky deck at Orenco Station which create good gathering areas.

**Ms. Knight** asked if lighting would be put into the project.

**Mr. Holland** replied that installing low-level, bollard lighting was anticipated, but no up lights would be proposed, when the entire lighting package and the final plans for the landscaping and signage were all submitted to Staff when the Applicant applied for the building permits.

**Mr. Hanson** clarified that the Applicant had submitted site lighting for everything but the sky deck.

**Ms. Knight** asked if the proposed lighting would be sufficient for the demographic.

**Mr. Hanson** replied the bollard lights would pool light out onto the walking surface really well and should be very effective without glaring in people's eyes.

**Mr. Holland** added they anticipated closing the deck about 10 pm most nights, and maybe 11 pm on weekends, at which time the sky deck lights would be extinguished.

**Ms. Knight** asked if the exit stair would have lighting.

**Mr. Hanson** confirmed the stairs had to be lit as required by the Development Code.

**Chair Karr** asked if the Orenco Station was an active adult building.

**Mr. Holland** replied it was not, the Orenco facility was not restricted to active adults only.

**Chair Karr** asked if Orenco had any noise challenges or if all residents had the same curfew.

**Mr. Holland** replied they had not had any issues in Orenco.

- He added that Holland views this project as its flagship, because there is a real need in the western U.S. for age-restricted communities that allow active adults to live with their peers and have a building that is programmed for them and give them a lifestyle opportunity that would be respectful and inviting for children to visit. The Applicant felt very strongly that this project should be a part of Holland's long-term portfolio, and significant amenities were being added to feature the project,

which Holland viewed as real investments. The incredible working relationship Holland enjoyed with the Board, Staff and the City gave them such confidence. Active Adults at the Grove would be the crowning element of the entire Master Plan and they were committed to bringing something that would be very attractive and a showcase for the city.

**Chair Karr** expressed curiosity in what was actually stated in the focus groups because one individual testified about the advantage of the first floor and how those units would be the most attractive, and the focus group seemed to be saying the opposite.

**Mr. Daniels** replied that the building was served by three elevators. A significant senior demographic live in both of Holland's projects now, and most congregate to the first floor because they do not want to have to navigate the stairs. However, this project eliminates the stair navigation issue by providing three elevators for the residents.

**Mr. Woods** asked what the thought was behind having 29 compact car spaces versus all regular-sized car spaces.

**Mr. Holland** confirmed that for the 112 units, they now had more than 200 parking spaces. Holland had gathered from surveys that most seniors have a full size car, so more than one full-sized space was provided for every car. The garages would have 12-ft wide spaces.

- Holland also believed the number of spaces and the number of small compact cars was increasing. Many seniors have one larger car and a second, run around car, which allowed Holland to add a higher number of spaces, but on a percentage basis; the compact spaces would only be about 15 percent of the total spaces. Holland was matching the car size with the right space, allowing residents to have more parking spaces.

**Mr. Hanson** noted Sheet P3.0 indicated that half of the spaces under the sky deck would compact, and those on the other side of the aisle, outside the three garages on the property's perimeter would be compact as well. The 33-ft wide drive aisle would be important for the circulation of the compact cars. The goal was to do the parking geometry and still have good perimeter landscaping along Ash Meadow Rd. The parking spaces were compact for length, but not for width.

**Mr. Woods** asked if any charging stations would be available for electric cars.

**Mr. Hanson** noted that the prime location for the electrical plug-in stations would be under the sky deck where the compact parking spaces would be located. There were enough columns under the sky deck to mount the stations and make them work well.

**Mr. Holland** added that all of Holland's projects include electrical charging stations. The infrastructure is installed so the capability exists to add stations with no problem as needed.

**Chair Karr** called for public testimony in favor of, opposed and neutral to the application. Seeing none, he confirmed there was no Applicant rebuttal and closed the public hearing at 7:45 p.m.

**Ms. Chauduri** believed several details were discussed about the sky deck that were not included in the application, for example, the umbrellas, lighting, and fire pits. She asked if more information was needed before the Board could approve.

**Mr. Neamtzu** explained it was not uncommon for a lot of details to be merged in the final design, so Staff includes a boilerplate condition of approval that allows Staff the ability to process those changes and get them into a final form. If the Board wanted to see certain items prior to granting final approval, that

were appropriate to request. For things like lighting, Staff would run it through the procedural check of Dark Sky compliance. He believed everyone understood the description about the bollard lighting. Staff would not get to the level of reviewing the type of furniture used; the photos gave a sense of the umbrellas the Applicant described. The Applicant would flesh out more details about the fire pits and submit that to Staff, who would grant approval according to as Class 1 review, which would be documented for the record. He understood the concerns being expressed were minor issues that Staff handles on a regular basis.

**Ms. Knight** asked if that included the issue of installing a shelter.

**Mr. Neamtzu** responded that would depend on the size of the shelter. Staff had area thresholds or certain square footage limitations that dictate different processes. Staff could not review anything larger than 1,250 sq ft, and at some point a shelter changes the feel of the sky deck. Staff might do a Class 2 Review which is a notification of the surrounding property owners. A shelter would probably rise above Staff's normal final review under a Class 1 review and would likely fall under a Class 2 review with notification and a comment period. If the Board did not like it, they could call it to a hearing. Adding a shelter would most likely be handled through a higher review process.

- He confirmed that the Board could add a recommendation. Staff had offered the all-weather protection as a suggestion which would act as a placeholder condition for Staff to consider as the project moved forward.

**Ms. Knight** noted that any recommendation or added condition of approval would need to be discussed by the Board. She was concerned about this demographic being exposed to high heat in the summer with the sky deck facing west, and that it would be too cold to use the space in the spring and winter months.

**Chair Karr** asked if she thinking about a gazebo or completely enclosed shelter for the sky deck.

**Ms. Knight** replied she was unsure, but she strongly believed some type of shelter should be added; perhaps some heat needed to be provided or something.

**Mr. Woods** agreed her concerns were valid because of the residents' age. Perhaps the Applicant could have portable heaters that could be rolled in and out easily as needed. However, he believed that the Board needed to be careful not to change the entire look and feel of the sky deck being presented. He would like some kind of shelter, but still wanted to retain a feeling of openness.

**Ms. Chaudhuri** agreed, adding especially because the sky deck was an important view point for the second, third and fourth stories; looking out onto a shelter would take away from their view. She believed installing fire pits would help add heat on the sky deck, but she was unsure that could be added as a condition of approval.

**Mr. Neamtzu** noted that area warmers were used and well placed throughout the Hillsboro site. One concept that was discussed at the Hillsboro site was having retractable feature, such as an awning, which could be utilized when needed. This would address Ms. Chaudhuri's comment about impeding the line of sight or causing other unintended aesthetic consequences. He clarified that rather than making a condition, the Board would encourage the Applicant to consider x, y, or z.

How make a recommendation without of

**Mr. Woods** stated that if the Board agreed, that language should be included in its recommendation.

**Ms. Jacobson** clarified that if the Board was just making a recommendation, the specifics regarding a retractable feature were not needed. It would be different if the Board wanted the Applicant to return with a specific design.

**Chair Karr** stated the Board was looking for something that would basically shade residents in the summer and cover them in the winter.

**Ms. Jacobson** stated Chair Karr could reopen hearing and discuss the issue with the Applicant.

**Chair Karr** reopened the public hearing at 7:55 p.m.

**Mr. Hanson** understood the Board was requesting a seasonal type of shelter. He referred to project's architect to discuss a type of seasonal facility that would not block the views or make the sky deck too dense or heavy.

**Dan Purgiel, LRS Architects**, replied that he could attest to this issue since he had previously been married on an outdoor deck that had large retractable umbrellas to shelter them from the rain. He believed those umbrellas would be an appropriate type of shelter for this situation. Some sort of a retractable cover could also be integrated around the barbeque area where the trellises were proposed. Further consideration was needed, but the retractable cover would extend a bit farther than and over the wood frame to create a covered area for an adequate amount of square footage.

**Mr. Holland** noted Holland has found that people want to congregate in groups of six or eight, and on a number of projects, they use the larger umbrellas that cover a table for eight. The larger umbrellas can swing out and open when people want cover; but when they want a more open look and feel, they can easily retract the umbrellas. The larger umbrellas would be a safer option than a shelter in the event of a storm since they could be retracted and put away.

**Mr. Woods** asked if the Applicant would consider having portable heaters as well.

**Mr. Holland** replied that portable heaters were already programmed in the project. They were not included in the sketch of the proposed sky deck but were shown in the photo of Orenco Station's sky deck. The photos depicted how this project would be programmed.

- Details regarding furnishings typically came at a later date, but the Applicant would review the different areas with Staff and ensure that the correct amount of umbrellas, heaters, access points, fire pits, etc. will be programmed along with input from the residents.

**Ms. Knight** encouraged the Applicant to consider the demographic when selecting the furnishings. Orenco had a lot of cushy, soft, deep seating and she did want those same furnishing used here. She asked them not to lose sight of the unique demographic for which the area was being designed.

**Mr. Holland** reminded that the demographic at Orenco Station was for all ages and there were a lot of chairs and cushy things that the residents really enjoyed by the fire pits; however the Applicant would absolutely take into account the furnishings as they related to the specific demographic.

**Chair Karr** closed the public hearing at 8:00 pm and summarized the comments heard from the Board to recommend to the Applicant. He confirmed the Board was not making a condition, only a recommendation.

**Aaron Woods moved to approve Resolution 262 with the recommendation that the Applicant install portable heaters, bollard lighting, large retractable umbrellas, and retractable covers for the**

**trellises and consider the residents' demographic when selecting furniture for the sky deck. Jhuma Chaudhuri seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.**

**Chair Karr** read the rules of appeal into the record.

**VIII. Board Member Concerns and Communications**

- A. Results of the June 10, 2013 DRB Panel A meeting
- B. Results of the September 9, 2013 DRB Panel A meeting

**IX. Staff Communications:**

**Mr. Neamtzu** stated that the Active Adults Holland project would begin quickly, as the application was already submitted the Building Division.

- He noted that activity could be seen west of Memorial Park at the Willamette Landing neighborhood, where Willamette Boat Club, a 33-lot project, would be constructed on the Willamette River by Renaissance Homes.
  - The site was an old tree plantation that was a little more than ten acres. The development would include a pond feature and community boat dock that would be immediately west of the tree row near the large picnic shelter. The area looked much different because the trees at the upper side of forested envelope near Memorial Park were removed. Some pockets of trees remained and new landscaping would be planted along the back of the homes going down the hill toward the shelter.
  - The property was in a timber tax deferral situation with rows of Douglas trees that were left to grow for way too many years, but the logging had been completed and the site secured for winter weather.
  - The 33 lots were very high end and the site had a lot of open space. The center of the site would have a big lake, or wetland feature, with a pier feature that would be used as a detention basin. The water feature would be filled from an artesian well and used for storm water and recreation
  - A new, 34-slip boat dock would be built out into the Willamette River; one slip for every home. Homes would be priced starting at \$800,000 to \$1.4 million.
  - He briefly described the history of the project's review process, noting the approval went back six years. The project would have expired in October after extensions allowed under the Development Code and the one-year blanket extension granted by Council for all projects during the recession. However, starting substantial construction vested the project's entitlement. Staff was really pleased that Renaissance Homes was in a strong enough financial position to make the project happen. The homes would start being built next spring.
  - The site was formerly Joy Abele's property, a former City Council member from the early 1970s.
  - Value-added amenities included trail connections to Memorial Park so people could walk into the development and see the greenway.
  - The neighborhood was well notified of the project and the residents did participate in the process. More than 1,000 trees were harvested from the site that were always intended to be harvested, but they were always intended to be harvested as part of the tax deferred position.
  - He received one phone call and there was a negative article in *The Spokesman*. Staff had all the files if the Board was interested in any specific information about the project.
- He updated that the row homes on Barber St were getting very close to submit to the Building Division, so it appeared they would be constructed during the winter.
  - He offered to have the Board members come view the homes, knowing they were interested in seeing the specific architecture, adding it would meet every aspect the Board already approved.
- A number of land transactions were happening in the Village Center that should be finalized soon. It appeared that a number of new investors were coming into the project from out of state, which was encouraging.
  - There was a lot of interest by one company in particular that had a very big portfolio of many different things that might provide some exciting new opportunities.

**X. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 8:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paula Pinyerd, ABC Transcription for  
Shelley White, Planning Administrative Assistant