

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

Approved
September 23, 2013

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

I. Call to Order:

Chair Andrew Karr called the Development Review Board (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, Cheryl Dorman, Jhuma Chaudhuri, Aaron Woods and City Council Liaison Susie Stevens.

Staff present were: Blaise Edmonds, Barbara Jacobson, Daniel Pauly, and Amanda Hoffman.

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

V. City Council Liaison Report:

Councilor Stevens reported that City Council:

- Held their retreat and adopted the goals Council would be working toward over the next 24 months and several goals would involve the Development Review Boards, including Advance Road, the Frog Pond residential development and the industrial work at Coffee Creek and Basalt Creek.
- Another goal was to do a feasibility study for a recreation/aquatic center, which would also involve the DRBs should the facility come to fruition.
- Would hold first reading on the Transportation Systems Plan (TSP) Updates at the Council meeting this coming Monday. The Planning Department and Planning Commission did a great job updating the 2003 TSP. She encouraged everyone to review the TSP, which could be found on the City's website.
- She appreciated the editorial in *The Spokesman* that commended elected officials for the work they had done. She thanked those on the City's appointed boards, such as the DRB, for also doing a fantastic job volunteering their time to serve the City.

VI. Consent Agenda:

A. Approval of minutes of April 22, 2013 meeting

Chair Karr moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Aaron Woods seconded the motion, which passed 4 to 0 to 1 with Jhuma Chaudhuri abstaining.

VII. Public Hearing:

- A. **Resolution No. 245. Les Bois Row Homes: Polygon Northwest Company – applicant.**
The applicant is requesting approval of Final Development Plan (FDP) for PDP - 1 Central (Les Bois Row Homes) for detached row houses and duplexes. The site includes Tax Lots 14300 – 14400 and 14600 – 15200 in Section 15DB, T3S, R1W, Clackamas County, Oregon.
Staff: Blaise Edmonds

Case File: DB12-0083 – Final Development Plan

This item was continued to this date and time certain at the April 22, 2013 DRB Panel B meeting.

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.

Cheryl Dorman declared that she had been approached by a family friend about the application when they found out she was a DRB member. (Her name had been called at Roll Call at a previous meeting when she was not in attendance.) She told the friend it was something she could not discuss, therefore no conflict should arise.

Dianne Knight and Jhuma Chaudhuri both declared they lived in Villebois.

Blaise Edmonds, Manager of Current Planning stated that the approval criteria applicable to the application were read into the record at the February 25, 2013 hearing, which was entered into the record.

Mr. Edmonds noted the application had been continued several times by the Applicant, who was now prepared to present the revised architectural elevations, which had been DRB's primary concern at the February 25th meeting. He presented the Staff report via PowerPoint with the following key comments:

- Given the length of time since the last meeting, he reviewed the project's location, background, surrounding structures, and key site elements, noting City Council had approved allowing the two banks of row houses to be detached.
- The Applicant did not intend to change the footprint or width of the houses, which matched the original footprints approved for the project.
- As the proposed row houses are built next to the existing houses, the proposed landscaping must blend in to match what exists so there would be a continuum of the same design with no interruption of landscaping and fencing.
 - Most of the landscaping was proposed along Barber St with street trees and some rainwater quality swales at the back corner of the houses. The homes would be alley-loaded and each house would have a two-car garage, although the minimum parking requirement in Villebois was one car per house. Parking would also be allowed along Barber St.
- He briefly reviewed the architectural rendering that were presented in February, noting the DRB did not seem to have any concerns with the proposed duplexes, which had a French design. The concern was that the smaller homes did not match the existing structures with regard to architecture and massing.
 - The Applicant had returned with a new design. The top of Slide 11 illustrated the design originally proposed by Rudy Kadlub with Polygon's new proposal shown below, which was very similar. Polygon's proposed houses would be American-style houses that appeared to be three-stories high and would be a very good match to the existing homes.
- He reviewed the front elevations of two proposed home styles, noting that a condition of approval required the porch to be 2-ft above grade as required by the Architectural Pattern Design Book which mandated certain design elements along the Barber St. Porches also had to be a certain dimension and windows must be placed in an orderly fashion to maintain uniformity.
 - An overtone of the New Orleans/French style was expressed with the second-story balcony on one proposed elevation. The previous design did not have balconies on the second floor.
- The elevation of the proposed French-styled Le Bois duplex was also highlighted, which featured French-style shutters that complimented homes farther up Barber St with regards to building massing and good design.

- Staff believed the Applicant's new design fit successfully with the existing styles on Barber St and recommended approval of the resolution.

Jhuma Chaudhuri asked if the side-yard easement was the small square between the lots. From the diagram, it appeared that Lot 10 would have a side yard and also a yard it could not access, while Lot 3 had no access.

Mr. Edmonds replied each side yard was required to have access. If it did not, the Applicant would need to provide gate access.

Ms. Chaudhuri confirmed there were two different diagrams, which caused the confusion.

Chair Karr indicated the access points on Sheet L1.0, but noted the larger version of Sheet L1.0 showed the access points on the opposite or east side of the house.

Mr. Edmonds noted a letter of testimony was received regarding the issue of whether or not there would be access to the adjacent lots. Stacey Connery, Pacific Community Design, had responded for the Applicant via letter, stating that each side yard would have a gate access. If there was no access, the Applicant would be directed to provide that access to the side yards, so they would not be fenced in with no access.

Ms. Chaudhuri clarified she was also concerned that one diagram showed the existing home on Lot 3 would have no yard and no access to a yard.

Chair Karr noted that Condition PD12 stated, "The active side yards should be located on the east side of each house"; however, the subject drawing showed access on the west side of the house.

Mr. Edmonds corrected that was not where the access should be, all the active yard would be the east side except for a couple lots. In the past, access had been on the on the west side of the house. Another concern raised in February was whether windows would look down on the active side yard of the neighboring house. Subsequently, clear story windows would be in place to ensure privacy on the active side.

Chair Karr asked how the proposed homes would look next to the existing homes, given the colors indicated in Slide 11. He understood two yellow houses would be next to each other.

Mr. Edmonds agreed having a different color scheme was preferable if there was an existing yellow house. and asked if an alternate color was preferred.

Ms. Knight suggested swapping the yellow and blue.

Chair Karr asked if that was a decision the Board could make.

Mr. Edmonds replied the Board was making their comment on the record before the Applicant and audience.

Chair Karr noted the color differences between two existing detached row houses and confirmed that a green house would be built next to a blue house. He noted that color matching or having complementary colors had been a concern raised at the initial hearing.

Chair Karr called for the Applicant's presentation.

Fred Gast, Polygon Northwest, 109 E 13th St, Vancouver, WA, 98660, thanked the DRB and Staff for working on the applications. Regrettably, he was unable to attend the last hearing and was not able to hear the comments firsthand; however, his team had listened to many of the comments that were made. He believed listening to constructive comments resulted in a better home, neighborhood and ultimately a better result for the Applicant and community. As described, the principal issue had been the elevations. The initial proposal was to create a more diverse streetscape but instead, the Applicant needed to create something that fit into the context of the existing homes, in terms of style, height and color. He believed Polygon had achieved the objectives DRB had commented on. He confirmed there would not be two yellow houses beside each other.

Ms. Dorman inquired about the CC&Rs residents would have to abide by and the possibility of someone purchasing the home and then repainting it; the house color could change.

Mr. Gast responded that was always a risk. There were certain design requirements that everyone in Villebois was required to follow, but in reality, it was very difficult to enforce. A homeowners association (HOA) was present, however color was difficult to describe and hold people accountable to. He confirmed with regard to the side yard issue that the asterisk had been on the wrong side of the house in the Site Plan.

Ms. Knight noted this particular section of Villebois had a much more vibrant color scheme compared to the rest of the neighborhood and suggested consulting with the City to ensure the proposed colors fit within that context, not simply falling back on the color of the majority of homes.

Mr. Gast agreed.

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

Jim Lange, Pacific Community Design, 12564 SW Main St, Tigard, OR, stated he was present in support of Polygon. He had expected to provide comment about the side yards, but had nothing to add beyond what was stated.

Chair Karr confirmed there were no further questions by the Board and closed the public hearing at 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Edmonds noted corrections to the Staff report amending Conditions PD7 and PD8 to reflect the minimum distances of the porch elevation and fencing, respectively.

Chair Karr moved to accept the Staff report with the following modifications:

[Note: added language in bold, italicized text]

- Amend Condition PD7 to state, “The ground floor and porch elevation shall be ***at least*** two (2) feet about the front grade...”
- Amend the second sentence of Condition PD8 to state, “The fencing shall be set back ***at least*** two (2) feet from the front building line.”

Cheryl Dorman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Chair Karr moved to adopt Resolution No. 245. The motion was seconded by Dianne Knight and passed unanimously.

Chair Karr read the rules of appeal into the record. [stated between the motions]

The Board took a brief recess and the meeting was reconvened at 7:09 p.m.

- B. Resolution 254. Active Adult at the Grove Apartments: Brenchley Estates Partners, LP and CRP & Holland Brenchley Estates II LP – applicants/owners.** The applicant is requesting approval of a Revised Stage I Preliminary Development Plan for Brenchley Estates, approving a Waiver to the maximum building height, Stage II Final Plan, Site Design Plan, Type ‘C’ Tree Plan for the Active Adult 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: Blaise Edmonds

Case Files: DB13-0008 – Revised Stage I Preliminary Plan
DB13-0009 – Waiver to maximum building height
DB13-0010 – Stage II Final Plan, lot 3
DB13-0011 – Site Design Review, lot 3
DB13-0012 – Type ‘C’ Tree Plan, lot 3

Chair Karr called the public hearing to order at 7:10 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.

Blaise Edmonds, Manager of Current Planning announced that the criteria applicable to the application were stated on page 4 of the Staff report, which was entered into the record. Copies of the report were made available to the side of the room.

Mr. Edmonds entered the following exhibits, which were distributed to the Board, into the record:

- Exhibit B7: Revised memorandum from Brenner Daniels, Holland Development, and Jerry Offer, Otak, dated May 29, 2013 providing additional support for requested revisions to Ordinance No. 703.
- Exhibit B8: Email from Brenner Daniels noting the receipt of a letter of support from Bruce and Barbara Heuer, which was printed on the backside.
- Exhibit D: Letter of opposition from Doris Wehler. Mr. Edmonds read Ms. Wehler’s letter into the record.

Mr. Edmonds presented the Staff report via PowerPoint, reviewing the five application requests as well as the site’s location and surrounding streets and features. His key additional comments were as follows:

- Revised Stage I Preliminary Plan. He noted the number of single-family and multi-family units approved for Brenchley Estates, some of which were completed while others were still under or proposed for construction. The proposed project had 112 multi-family units. Jory Trail was approved for 324 units in 2011 and was approximately 70 percent occupied.
 - He described Ordinance No. 703 (Slide 7) and the proposed changes to the Master Plan that would increase the total units by 66 units. The Applicant’s request for additional housing was based on Comprehensive Plan Implementation Measure 4.1.4.v which allows increased density in the Planned Development process to provide for meeting special needs, such as low/moderate income, elderly, or handicapped residents.
 - Exhibit D referenced the percentage of mobile family units. He noted that when he first began working in Wilsonville in 1986, approximately 12 percent of the density had been in mobile homes/parks. Removing the 270-plus homes of the Thunderbird Mobile Home Club dropped the percentage of mobiles homes/parks tremendously.
- Considering the architecture and requested waiver to allow a maximum building height of 47 ft, exceeding the 35 ft building height maximum, was the Board’s primary role with regard to the resolution.
 - He presented an illustration comparing the building height of the proposed apartments to the Terrene Apartments building height, which was 38 feet, 5 inches at the peak.

- He noted that the proposed building was not out of scale to the adjacent apartments to the north and the west. It was not a standalone building and it blended given the proposed colors and materials. The color materials board was circulated around the room. The building was more urban-looking given the proportion of the windows and flat roof with coping. It was designed to look different from the other buildings but still blend in architecturally in terms of similar materials and colors.
- Stage II Final Plan, lot 3.
 - Reviewing the Preliminary Landscape Plan, he noted the open space provided for the Terrene Apartments and private park proposed for residents of the Active Adult at the Grove. Yellow lines indicated the pedestrian circulation throughout the project. There would be more sidewalks along Ash Meadows Rd that would connect the proposed building to the adjacent parks and parking lots.
 - The proposed building was square, but shaped somewhat like a capital I with lots of angles and different elevations to give it architectural interest and break up the building so it would not be one large rectangular building.
 - The developer was concerned about senior residents of the building having good pedestrian access. The Applicant was conditioned to build a bus turnout and bus shelter off Parkway Ave providing convenient transit access to all parts of Wilsonville. The development was in walking distance to Wilsonville Town Center; ideally located for a multi-family apartment building in terms of providing the livability expected by senior citizens.
 - The Preliminary Site Plan, Sheet P3.0, showed how the project overlapped the PDR-4 and PDR-5 zones. Shaded areas indicated covered carports on the development.
 - The proposed building would have three elevators, internal trash compactors at the base floor with trash chutes and internal bicycle lockers on each floor.
 - At one time, the building was to have a mix of one-, two-, and three-bedroom units, but now only one- and two-bedroom units were proposed.
 - The building was set back away from the Terrene Apartments with the parking lot and open space parks providing good separation.
 - He briefly reviewed the Applicant's summary with regard to parking (Slide 13), noting each unit would have approximately 1.54 parking spaces.
 - Evidence provided by the Applicant suggested the average age of the residents would likely be age 60 or 65, an age at which there would usually no longer be two people working. A traffic report indicated these types of facilities generate less traffic. No school-aged kids were expected to live in the building, although a few high school or college age kids living there might be possible.
- Site Design Review, lot 3. He noted Sheet A5 inaccurately portrayed the I-shaped building as a monolithic building; however, it did show the proportion of windows, doors, colors and textures. Sheet A1 indicated the three elevator shafts, trash enclosures, bicycle storage rooms and the basic footprints of the one- and two-bedroom units.
 - Sheet A9, the Shadow Study, illustrated the shading resulting on the property from the four-story building at various times of the year. Some shading of the half-round park at the north end of the property would occur; however, the building would not shade or take away solar access from any adjacent apartments to the north or west.
- Type 'C' Tree Plan, lot 3. Due to the size of the building, parking lots, drives and utilities, only three 3 out of the 38 significant trees would remain. All 38 trees would be replaced through mitigation either in the form of street trees or parking lot trees, which must be 2-in caliper.
- Staff believed it was the DRB's role to review the architecture and height waiver of the building. If the proposed building was approved, City Council would decide whether they agree with the Applicant's proposal about modifying Ordinance No. 703 to allow for the 66-unit density increase in light of the special needs provision. The Board could choose to not make a recommendation to Council about the density and act on the pure site design criteria and other applications. From his

years of experience working at the City, he believed Council would like a recommendation from the DRB about whether the Board agreed that the Applicant met the special needs test for housing of low/moderate income, elderly and handicapped and disabled people to increase the project by 66 units. Council would make the final policy decision on that issue.

- Typically, City Council would be asked for the density increase first, but in this case, the Applicant wanted to have a site plan or design to show and convince the Council. The developer also wanted to start construction this summer and was concerned that having to go back and forth between City Council and the DRB would cause them to miss the construction window.

Chair Karr asked if the significant amount of shading from the building on the park would impact the landscaping.

Mr. Edmonds responded there were existing oak trees, which was why the park was created. He believed the trees would survive the shading from the proposed apartment building. There would not be much landscaping underneath the trees to avoid over irrigating and drowning the trees. There would probably be native landscaping, such as ferns or something that could survive shady conditions. He confirmed they were the original grove of trees and a water tower was also at that location.

Cheryl Dorman asked what constituted a private park and would it be fenced.

Mr. Edmonds replied the park would be fenced and open to the residents of the Brenchley Estates. There would be no gates or locks. The park would be privately maintained by a property manager. The facility would be managed through a property management company, not homeowners association (HOA). Maintenance of the park would be paid for by residents' lease or rent payments. The single-family lots would have a HOA.

Dianne Knight asked if there were any other four-story apartment buildings in Wilsonville similar in height to the proposed building.

Mr. Edmonds replied the peak of the three-story Jory Trail Apartments was comparable to the coping of the proposed building. Some apartments appear to be four-story because they sat on a slope, such as those at the top of Canyon Creek Rd. However, this would be the first four-story apartment building. The Holiday Inn was about five stories, or 70-ft high. Some industrial and commercial office buildings were taller, but no residential buildings.

Jhuma Chaudhuri asked what the maximum distance was between a unit and an elevator.

Mr. Edmonds deferred to the Applicant, but recalled from the floor plan that the elevators were strategically placed throughout the building.

Ms. Chaudhuri asked about the age and size of the 38 trees that would be removed.

Mr. Edmonds stated that the Thunderbird Mobile Home Club was built in 1967 and the original slide showed hardly any trees. A wide variety of trees had been planted by homeowners over the years. The Applicant had selected and saved some really nice specimen trees, such as maple trees and Japanese maple trees. During landscape planting, trees that had been dug up would be replanted to give a more mature landscaping appearance. Some oaks would be removed because they were dead center of where the building was proposed. He clarified that the Tree Mitigation Plan was based on the Wilsonville Tree Code, which stated that for every tree over 6 inches in diameter, a mitigation tree of at least a 2-in caliper tree was required.

Aaron Woods noted the Applicant proposed 173 parking spaces and asked if visitor parking had been considered.

Mr. Edmonds deferred to the Applicant, but believed standard parking spaces were proposed. The stalls would be 19 ft by 18 ft and some might overhang the sidewalk. The Applicant chose to have a generous parking plan to provide ease of parking for the senior citizens. He believed the Applicant might have dropped the three-bedroom unit from their plan because those units required more parking.

Don Hanson, OTAK, stated that the Applicant agreed with the Staff report language, including the attached findings. The Applicant's intent was to have the DRB approve their design concept and lend support on Ordinance No. 703 as they advanced to City Council. He reviewed a colored version of the Site Plan with these key comments:

- In the original plan, Ms. Dorman commented on how close the four-story building was to Parkway Ave, so the Applicant shifted the use to the center of the site and now the building was 330 ft from Parkway Ave. He made no apologies about the building's height. The Applicant believed the height was very appropriate, the building was about half the height of the oak trees.
- He acknowledged the Applicant had been responsive because it was a five-story building originally, and now it was a four-story building.
- The building was now adjacent to the park, which was perfect for Active Adult residents.

Clyde Holland, CEO and Chairman, Holland Partner Group, 1111 Main St, Vancouver, WA presented the Active Adult at the Grove via PowerPoint with these comments:

- When originally conceiving the master plan for The Grove, the Applicant had a whole series of guidelines and goals to accomplish.
 - One objective was to be respectful of nature and the special nature of the project and site. One element of that was increasing the setbacks in most areas along Parkway Ave from the required 20 ft to 60 ft to 65 ft, particularly along Jory Trail, because the Applicant was able to capture and preserve all of the existing fir trees. Additionally, there were no encroachments into any of the Significant Resource Overlay Zones (SROZs).
 - While they would be removing many of the trees, every tree on the entire site that was a quality specimen that could be saved were dug up and put into an on-site nursery that was created. Once construction was complete, those important landscaping elements would be replanted.
 - The second objective was transportation, which the Applicant completely supported. There was a bus stop at Jory Trail and they agreed to fund a bus stop for this project as well. The bus stop would provide access for families. Part of the Applicant's goal was to find sites that could leverage public transportation and allow families to have one car but still have the means to get two and from work. Providing for the use of public transportation could save families \$600 to \$700 per month in total car costs, including maintenance, insurance, and payments for the car.
 - The walkability to Town Center was another element the Applicant was excited about.
- As building Jory Trail and going through the Terrene project, the Applicant anticipated building the balance of the project as detached for sale. City Council had been thoughtful of wanting to have more for-sale aspects of the project.
 - Once Jory Trail was completed, the Applicant was surprised by the increased demand by mature or experienced renters. Almost 24% of the Jory Trail residents were age 50 or older and almost 15% were age 40 and older. As a project matures, the number of longer-term residents increases and the building was now 93% occupied. He reviewed the demographics provided on Slide 6. With almost 40% of the Jory Trail residents being in the 40 to 50 and older age range, the housing provided previously by the Thunderbird Mobile Home Club, which had also been for mature renters, was being replaced.

- When the project was originally studied with regard to traffic and other impacts, no deduction was taken for senior or age-restricted housing. In reality however, as the project matured and more longer-term renters moved in, the Applicant expected half the project to be mature renters over the next three to five years.
 - Such renters very limited impacts on city services. Emergency 911 calls in the community had been delightfully low. In fact, upon review of police reports, they would probably be one of the lowest impact projects in the city.
- Several focus groups were conducted because Holland wanted to listen and really understand. A number of residents wanted an elevator-served building where they could interact with others their age without having to pay the bundled meals/medical service costs found in most age-restricted projects. Active Adult at The Grove addressed age-restricted and mobility issues without bundling services, making it much less expensive.
- The original concept had been to build 30 single-family homes. However, building 112 age-restricted, accessible units instead would provide a desirable alternative to families and couples who owned homes in Wilsonville, but did not have an opportunity to sell and move into a desirable alternative. Without options, they were basically trapped in the house, which affects them from an income standpoint,
- Similar to the four-story building in Villebois, the Applicant believed the subject Master Plan deserved a building of quality stature.
 - The Applicant agreed with comments that having the five-story building against Parkway Ave was inappropriate from a scale standpoint. The building was lowered to four stories and moved into the heart of the community. It was respectful from both an age and accessibility standpoint and was located adjacent to the park. They were retaining all the beautiful, mature Oregon White Oak trees and activating the park and trail system.
 - A reciprocal easement would make the trails throughout the community available to all units within the Master Plan available to everyone. While the park was not publicly maintained, there would be no restrictions to anyone using the park, as long as it was respected.
- The proposed building would meet a significant unmet need in Wilsonville as the only age-restricted facility within unbundled services and it would be targeted at a level that would provide an opportunity for 112 homes to be sold to new families and allow 112 families to live in Active Adult Apartments and manage their retirement accounts and capital without having it invested in homes.
- He noted that the Master Plan included one, two, three and four-bedroom units. The four-bedroom rental product was in another phase of the development and was not available anywhere else in Wilsonville and was only the second location to provide four-bedroom rentals in the entire Portland metro area. The first location was a project that Holland Partner Group also developed in Tanasbourne called Palladia.
 - Holland Partner Group also had two phases of single-family homes. Polygon was working on the 30 lots south of the SROZ. After Active Adult was built, Holland hoped to build 27 for sale units in Brenchley Estates - North.
 - Active Adult Apartments would serve senior citizens who are nearly 6% of the Wilsonville population and is growing four times faster than other population groups within the City.

Mr. Hanson, Mr. Holland and Brenner Daniels, Development Director, Holland Partner Group, continued the presentation the Active Adult At The Grove Project with these additional key comments:

- The Site Plan was displayed, showing the building positioned 330 ft back from Parkway Ave and the four access points. Parking was distributed evenly around the structure so residents would not have to walk very far to elevators or their cars.
- The shade study showed how the shade pattern followed the area to the north and west outside the existing grove of oak trees that was shown in lighter green. The building also shaded the sports court and playground, which was good because people would be exerting themselves.

- Four different shade studies were conducted because studies were done at the summer and winter solstices as well as the midpoints of the spring and fall. The winter solstice was the only time there would be any significant shading.
- The H or I shaped configuration of the building was very successful. Shorter walls would be closer to the street with the main body of the building set back from the public right-of-ways on all sides. This diminished the scale of the building. LRS Architects did a good job articulating the facades and blending different treatments to the perimeter skin of the building.
- Entries would be located in the front and back of the building. An entry to the south would also be used as a loading area, and another significant entry would go into the park. Common areas exist on every floor of the building with some feeding out into the park site as well.
- Only 15 of the 173 proposed parking spaces would be on-street parking, which would be located on the three sides that the building fronts the streets. Parking spaces on the other side of the streets had not been counted, although there would be good access to many of those spaces as well. The Applicant had a very ample parking proposal that would also accommodate visitors.
 - In meeting with neighbors early on, the Applicant was advised to take care of the parking on the site and not to overflow into their neighborhoods, which Holland had taken to heart on all its phases.
 - Jory Trail, which was now essentially stabilized, had significant distributed excess parking and a number of reserved spaces for visitors. Reserved spaces for visitors would be located at the main entry of Active Adult Apartments.
- The building had been notched out on the north end to save a white oak in an attempt to not intrude on the trees growth. This decreased the number of building units. Because the site sloped 12 ft from the northeast corner to the southwest corner and the way the building would be built and parked, quite a few trees needed to be removed from the main body of the property. However, they were trying to respect the northern edge against the park as much as possible.
 - Images were displayed showing the view from Parkway Ave and the relationship of the building's height and the trees, whose canopies were 10 ft to 20 ft higher than the building. From that standpoint, the building was in character with the trees that had been saved.
- An image showing the view from above project was displayed to show the H-shape of the building would scale down the building on all four sides. The canopy in the visitor loop at the front door was very generous and created an inviting entry.
- A rendering was displayed to compare the height of the proposed apartment building with the existing multi-family Terrene Apartments across the park. The proposed four-story building would be between 45-ft and 47-ft tall due to varying soffit heights.
 - The 47 ft height was to the top of the parapet, which were not consistent. The majority of the roofline would be between 2 ft and 3 ft shorter than the parapet. The building was 2 ft shorter than the peak of Jory Trail.
- From the beginning, the Applicant had always tried to provide diversity in the architecture, design and the type of demographics served in the City, which was influenced by City Staff. Every building should look slightly different and every phase should be slightly different. Also, having a broader demographic group was good for the project, and was a good fit in the city.
 - Holland Partner Group specialized in urban housing and diversity was their significant strength, which was evident in the secure, accessible building, the unbundling of services, and the age in place concept it provided.
 - Cities often ask how a developer's project would impact the cost of provided services versus revenue. Holland was not required to do any age-restricted housing; it was a voluntary effort because they believed they were meeting a need, which was a privilege. With respect to the Comprehensive Plan goals, the Applicant believed this was a win-win situation because no building like Active Adult Apartments existed in Wilsonville and it would be the center point of the site.

- The Applicant was striving to offer a diversity of product types within The Grove community. Both Jory Trail and Terrene were market rate apartments; 30 single-family homes would be for sale; and the proposed project would be age-restricted.
- Statistically, on the north phase, 25 units were originally approved and Holland did not use the density for two units in the area south of the SROZ. Upon review, removing two units seemed provide a better result, so those units were saved, explaining the difference between the 25 and 27 approved units. They had committed to going back to 46 age-restricted units. The difference between the 46 units and 112 units was the 66 units being considered. The proposed increased Age-Restricted Housing is the differences between Ordinance 703 and the current proposal)
- The Traffic Study was conducted for the 112 units, but on existing tenants. It lowered the expected trip count from 267 to 234 trips and did not account for the fact that almost 40% of the existing renters were over 40 years of age. The traffic impacts shown were significantly less than what had been studied. In addition, the actual people occupy the building would impact it much less than what was studied, both from a traffic and student standpoint.
- By allowing the project to move forward, the City would be able to collect additional impact fees of just over \$700,000. Because Active Adult was the center part of the Master Plan, all external connection points to City services had already been paid for, the sidewalks, services, access cuts, bus services; therefore, a majority of the impact fees would be available to meet other needs.
 - Upon review of the incremental tax benefit of the project over a 20-year period, Wilsonville would collect approximately \$5.8 million in additional property tax and more than \$10 million over a 30 year period. While the financial needs of its residents, Active Adult Apartments would also go far in meeting the needs of the City and the State from a tax collection standpoint.

Mr. Edmonds entered the Applicant's PowerPoint presentation into the record as Exhibit B9. He noted that other four-story apartment buildings in town included Creekside Woods, Villebois Village Center, and The Bell Tower Apartments at Old Town Square. Both Village Center and The Bell Tower Apartments had three residential stories over one floor of commercial or understructure parking.

Aaron Woods inquired about the meaning of "secure building."

Mr. Holland answered the building would have a security system and every resident would have a key fob. A primary concern for seniors was they did not want to encounter strangers or those who might not have their best interests in mind. They wanted to ensure their home was secure, particularly when traveling. There would also be a call box, which visitors could use to call the resident to be buzzed in.

Cheryl Dorman asked about the parameters regarding the age requirement of 55.

Mr. Holland stated they followed the federal guidelines, which stated one resident had to be age 55. Originally, they anticipated age-restricting the northern phase at age 50, but were advised that it would be better to move it to age 55 to abide by the federal guidelines than to create new criteria for age 50. Most senior communities require one resident to be age 55.

Ms. Dorman noted the paragraph on Page 10 discussing freeway noise read, "A 16-ft high concrete sound wall was installed along the entire length...." "ODOT has provided a letter that advised the Applicant about potential traffic noise levels that may exceed federal guidelines." The height variance of 45 to 47 ft would far exceed the 16 ft wall. The active adults in the proposed apartments would likely be retired and present all day, she believed the noise might be pretty excessive.

Mr. Holland quickly created a rough diagram showing how traffic noise from a vehicle's wheels would project off the freeway at about a 45 degree angle. The reason 16 ft was used was that the distance between the travel lanes and sound wall was such that the sound would hit the sound wall and bounce up

and back toward the freeway. The project was 330 ft from Parkway Ave.

The sound wall mitigates a lot of the road noise and the Terrene project was about 250 ft from the freeway. Then, there was a 65-foot section of Ash Meadows Rd for a total of 400 ft. So, there was the sound wall; garages behind the sound wall with gabled roofs extending above the 16 ft wall; the Terrene apartments with hipped roofs 40 ft high and then Active Adult Apartments were back another 65 ft or 70 ft and 45 ft to 47 ft high. Given the sound mechanics, the sound would be mitigated off the sound wall first, off the garage roofs second and then off the Terrene buildings. The Terrene buildings were organized with the long building access facing the freeway so freeway noise would only come through the gaps. The proposed apartment building was set back another 75 ft and had dual glazed windows, which would prevent any exterior noise from being heard when shut.

Ms. Dorman asked about any statistics of complaints concerning loud noise from Jory Trail residents.

Mr. Holland responded the four-bedroom building in the southwest corner was the closest to the freeway and was occupied first and there had not been any issues. The only sound issues he was concerned about was from the zip line when it is installed.

Ms. Dorman said she was surprised to see an adult community being bought into the middle of a large community of 600 or 700 other dwellings. It seemed like it was a unique use with older residents in the middle of younger families and generations. She asked if any feedback from the focus groups indicated whether that would be welcome or if residents wanted a more serene setting.

Mr. Holland shared his own transition experience, from independent living to fully skilled care, with his own 81 year old father. As they went through the transition, they attempted to find somewhere located nearby. Feedback indicated that people really value community and that having a place that was part of the community but not necessarily on top of it provided a lot of diversity. With 23% of Jory Trail being over the age of 50, they were seeing tremendous connections occurring across the age spectrum, which was an important advantage. The ability of the senior population to interface with a broad age spectrum kept them active and young. The biggest complaint seniors expressed was that they did not want to live with old people.

Mr. Hanson shared his mother's experience living in a setting similar to Active Adult Apartments. She loved the diversity and activity of the neighborhood and she enjoyed being with the younger age groups. She had also lived in another facility with a Montessori school on site, which she enjoyed because she could interface with the children and help them read. He believed that type of environment helped his mother's morale.

Mr. Holland added the multigenerational housing opportunities had been something society had moved away from post-World War II. Holland was focused on reintegrating all the different housing needs and demands within their master plans and their communities, and this project did a good job of that.

Dianne Knight inquired about meeting the needs of the targeted demographic. A letter submitted by the Heuers listed internal amenities they wanted in the apartments. She asked for more information about the amenities that might support the needs of the demographic.

Mr. Holland responded mobility was one amenity, having elevators allowed residents who had challenges with stairs to have access to all floors, as opposed to only the bottom floor, which was the case at Jory Trail and Terrene. Security was another amenity. Cameras and key fobs would help deter some of the challenges and concerns that someone might have living alone. Professional management personnel would also be available during business hours as well as 24-hour on-call staff who live within 15 minutes of the facility. The inside of the units were targeted to individuals with nice homes as far as the layouts,

appliances, and size. For example, the master bedrooms would be equal to or larger than the size of those found in single-family homes and the living and dining rooms would accommodate their existing furniture.

Mr. Hanson added the Applicant was trying to have amenities and common areas on each floor. On the first floor, there would be a community room and bicycle storage, management offices and a greeter, a fitness center, trash rooms and a lobby. The second floor would have a lobby near the elevators, a business center, and storage. The third and fourth floors would have a lobby, trash rooms, and resident storage. The fourth floor could possibly have a larger lobby area. These things were still being reevaluated and refined but the emphasis was to have social spaces and gathering spaces on each floor.

Mr. Holland stated the notch overlooking the park was being considered as the gathering lobby on each floor to allow people to sit and enjoy being outside while not necessarily being part of the elements.

Mr. Woods asked if the units would be air-conditioned.

Mr. Holland responded air-conditioning would be offered as an option. A high CFM airflow fan would be installed in each unit with ceiling fans in each living area and bedroom, so that opening a window and turning on the fan would quickly cool the building[unit. This saves utilities and makes the units more affordable. Ports would be installed for residents who wanted air-conditioned units.

Mr. Hanson explained the air-conditioner units would not be the style that hung out the window. They would be internal portable systems that would hook up to the duct work. The common areas and corridors would be air-conditioned.

Mr. Woods inquired about laundry facilities.

Mr. Holland answered each unit would have its own laundry facility.

Ms. Chaudhuri requested further comment about one of the main reasons for the four-story building was to financially support elevators.

Mr. Holland replied they considered the distance of travel from parking to the building, where the elevators would be located upon entering the building, and then the distance to the unit from the elevator. It was also important to maximize the amount of green space. He referred to Staff's PowerPoint slide showing the pocket parks, indicating the three pocket parks directly across from the building. The building four-story significantly reduced the travel distance from parking to the units. If the building was spread out, more elevators would be necessary than appropriate and it would also be financially difficult due to the need for more foundation and more roof for the same number of units. The Applicant tried to maintain the appropriate scale, reduce travel distances for the seniors, and allow them to enjoy the parks. He noted that the territorial views from the four-story would be very attractive.

Mr. Hanson explained another added expense involved the amount of communal space provided compared to traditional multi-family project. Elevators, security and the cost of management were added expenses.

Ms. Chaudhuri asked what the maximum distance would be from an elevator to a unit.

Mr. Hanson believed the distance from an elevator to a unit would be 80 ft to 90 ft.

Mr. Holland reiterated they would like to begin construction this summer. One pressure was rising costs. The goal was to construct the building at costs low enough to provide housing in the affordable band to the community. While they were not trying to rush the process, it was more expensive and difficult to build in the winter than in the summer. Delaying the project another year would challenge the affordability, given the rate of cost increases. For example, the cost of lumber had doubled since the start of Jory Trail. Building sooner would give the Applicant the opportunity to create a building that would be thoughtful and appropriate for the center of the community. The single-family units would fill out the balance of the Master Plan.

Chair Karr asked what the distance was between the 27 future houses on Future Lot 2 and the proposed four-story building.

Mr. Holland answered the houses would essentially be on the other side of Ash Meadows Road and the required setbacks would be another 20 to 30 ft for a total of approximately 160 ft.

Mr. Hanson added there would be a 60 ft parking lot, a 60 ft space for roads and sidewalks and 10 to 15 ft of landscape perimeter. Homes would wrap from Lot 2 onto Lot 4 up to Lot 5, which was a nice step down from the building at the center of the site.

Ms. Chaudhuri asked if the Applicant had an idea how much the units would rent for.

Mr. Holland stated they were still trying to figure out how much they would cost. For certain, the cost of an assisted living building bundled between \$1200 and \$1500 per month, which this project would not have, so a \$15,000 to \$18,000 a year delta existed between renting a proposed unit versus an assisted-living facility unit. In addition to the costs, bundled assisted living facilities tended to be small one- and two-bedroom units, while these units were designed with more space. He clarified that the Terrene Apartments had four-bedroom units, not the Active Adult Apartments.

Mr. Hanson stated the largest units in the Active Adult Apartments would be two-bedroom units with a den with about 1,350 sq ft. The two-bedrooms in Terrene were average-sized, at about 1150 sq ft; the one-bedroom dens were about 950 sq ft and the one-bedrooms were about 850 sq ft. The Active Adult Apartment units were generous as far as square footage to accommodate people moving out of houses.

Chair Karr asked if there was a specified time for park hours.

Mr. Holland answered no. The Applicant would be as flexible as people were respectful. If people began playing basketball late into the evening, there would be restricted signs. There would be a security service for the entire master plan. Respect was a big part of the community guidelines so such issues would be addressed. He noted that mature, experienced renters tended to be very vocal and direct and the Applicant appreciated their feedback. Holland's customer service was high because they listen.

Mr. Hanson added the public road around the park would be lit, but no night lighting was proposed in the park. There might be some lighting off the building that faced the park or from the surrounding street.

Mr. Holland added the Dark Sky Ordinance was something the Applicant also respected.

Chair Karr asked if they anticipated that the age 50 and older residents from Jory Trail would move to Active Adult.

Mr. Holland replied the Applicant had received a lot of requests for elevators. Jory Trail residents would have the option of moving, but not an obligation. If the project was approved, the Applicant would begin

a sign-up sheet for those residents who wanted to sign up would get the first pick of the units. Given the level of clear feedback received, he expected to have people on that sign-up list very shortly.

Chair Karr asked about the residents of the Active Adult Apartments not having access to the community centers in the community.

Mr. Holland explained the reason for that language was that each project was financed independently and one requirement of the financing was that the facility could not rely on each other's areas. He noted the Applicant had no issue with sharing community centers as long as the residents were respectful. All trails, sidewalks and access points in the whole community, as well as the park, would be open to everyone. Active Adult would be one of the most open and active Holland Partner Group communities. The best thing for security was to have lots of activity and lots of eyes on all the public areas.

Chair Karr called for a brief recess. He reconvened the meeting at 8:45 p.m. and called for public testimony in favor of, opposed and neutral to the application.

Ken Woods, 8540 SW Ash Meadows Rd, Apt 118, Wilsonville, OR, spoke in support of the project. He was a builder by trade. Having had the opportunity to live in a Holland project, the quality of everything he had seen was excellent. There were 10,000 people retiring each day and he believed the concept the Applicant was proposing was a good one because it would not have the bundling, which appealed to him. He had sat in on some of the other meetings and the Applicant was sincere in what they intended to do with the project and the contribution they would make to the community. He encouraged the DRB to approve the proposal on an expedited basis, if possible.

Grant Emigh, Charbonneau, 7560 SW Fairway Drive, Wilsonville, OR, stated this project was what they had been looking for, but was hard to find in Wilsonville. He believed the project was timely, appropriate and beneficial for the community.

Barbara Heuer, 8710 Ash Meadows Rd, Apt 1115, Wilsonville, OR, appreciated that seniors could voice their opinions and express their needs. They had come to Wilsonville from Arizona to be with their family in their golden years and were unable to find a place to live when they first arrived. They decided assisted living communities were not for them and ended up in the Jory Trail Apartments, where they had to live on the first floor because they could not use stairs. She encouraged the Board to hurry; they needed the elevators, the height and the concept and all that the Active Adult Apartments had to offer.

Bruce Heuer, 8710 Ash Meadows Rd, Apt 1115, Wilsonville, OR, noted that the boomers were coming. He and his wife had been retired for a long time and had lived in similar projects in Milwaukee, WI. He believed the elevators and convenience of living with their peers was nice. They were not opposed to children, unless they were upstairs. He understood Doris Wehler opposed the building height but not everyone could live on the first floor. Wilsonville was a senior-friendly place and seniors are good neighbors. Seniors did not normally travel during peak times or as much, and the travel close; everything they wanted was right here. He hoped the Board would hurry the process along so he could add his name to the sign-up sheet.

Chair Karr said the maximum distance from an elevator to a room would be 80 ft. He asked if Mr. Heuer would request a room close to the elevator or was 80 ft reasonable.

Mr. Heuer responded everyone would want to be close to the elevator, however views come into play. Better views would be out and on the corners, which he believed would alleviate the distance or make it less critical. Where he and his wife had lived before, there had been at least a 90-ft maximum from the elevator to the units, which was not objectionable since they were in a nice warm building.

William Arnold, 25748 Canyon Creek Rd, Apt 8304, Wilsonville, OR, said he was a graphic designer and lived in the Summit Apartments, which were four stories considering the garages underneath. He had been leery when he saw the Jory Trail construction start, however, when the first phase of Jory Trail was completed, he was astounded. The aesthetics were beautiful, the colors were gorgeous, the landscaping was amazing and he was impressed by the placement of the playground and sidewalks. The project was a good approval from the City's planners. Jory Trail was the high quality he expected in Wilsonville, which was why he loved the city. He loved how Wilsonville was planned and the care that went into it. He loved the way the building looked. When he saw the new phase, he was blown away again. He was all about aesthetics and wanted to see something beautiful, creative, and interesting—not an institution. He liked that the building would be set off the road a little ways and plenty of trees would provide some variance and even hide the building a bit. The project was beautiful to look at and fascinating. He searched for months before his parents arrived to find something that even marginally met their needs, but he could not find anything within quite a distance. Seeing this project come to Wilsonville was awesome. The height was nothing compared to other buildings around town, and with the trees, it was great compared to the other building.

Ms. Dorman asked if, as a visitor, he thought the noise level was an issue. She still had concern with the building being so close to the freeway.

Mr. Arnold responded there was so much green space in that entire area. He encouraged her to walk around the development. The traffic could not be heard with so much foliage and trees between the highway and apartment complex. He did not think his parents would hear anything.

Peter Hurley, 28357 SW Morningside, Wilsonville, OR, stated he was a two-term DRB member and current Planning Commissioner. He wanted to read a couple things the Commission was currently going through on Goal 10, the statewide housing study the City had to do every ten years, because it related to density. The Board's one decision was whether or not to grant the height variance. He viewed the Board members as judges. Some things to take into consideration, as judges, was some of the information being imparted to another commission for the City.

- He quoted the April 10, 2013 Planning Commission minutes, stating: "Wilsonville still looked considerably different compared to other broader jurisdictions that used the same data sources. Wilsonville has some very significant differences in housing stock, the characteristics of people and how they choose housing in Wilsonville community compared to the counties in the metro region." Basically, Wilsonville was different and it was not necessarily a positive thing, considering the fact that Wilsonville had almost 60% multi-family units. It was not about this specific project, whether the DRB liked the park's location or the color of the building. He did not realize that the baby boomers were now special needs.
- The Board needed to realize that Wilsonville was an ex-urb, a city beyond the suburbs, therefore, using urban comparisons as Mr. Holland did when he referred to this development as an urban development, was incorrect. The next thing after the end of the urban growth boundary (UGB) was farmland.
- He quoted again from April 10, 2013 Planning Commission minutes, stating: "The consultants were trying to pull and compare key data points, such as comparing Wilsonville to urban areas in the Metro." The Applicant was trying to compare an ex-surb to an urban area, yet Wilsonville still had the highest number of multi-family housing in the entire Metro area, more than Beaverton or Gresham. "We have a very interesting anomaly," say the consultants, "We have a high percentage of renter-occupied units."
- He continued reading from the minutes, stating, "Wilsonville differs from other places in the Metro region. The highest percentage of renters in the region. A more diverse housing stock due to having more multi-family units than any other jurisdiction and a high percentage of renters in apartment

buildings with five or more units."

- The last section he noted from the minutes read, "While there was no perfect correlation between housing types and tenure in Wilsonville, that correlation was starker than many other communities."
- He was not trying to say whether or not they needed a special needs for over 50, but he wanted the Board to consider whether they thought, in the best of Wilsonville, they should grant a height waiver to add more density to a community that already had 58% multi-family housing.
 - Originally, the Comprehensive Plan wanted 40% multi-family. Now, Wilsonville had almost done a complete flip, and the 40% multi-family had also been removed from the Comprehensive Plan.
- He encouraged the Board to remember the saying, "Everything in moderation." Wilsonville did not have that moderation any more.
- He noted that the question about elevators and costs was never answered by Mr. Holland. This was all about development and money and one could not be a good neighbor when they were an out-of-state developer. He noted that the best land use attorney firm in the state was seated in the audience, which meant a lot of money was at stake.
- He reiterated that the Board had to decide if granting a waiver on height, specifically for more multi-family housing, was in the best long term interest for the city of Wilsonville.

Doris Wehler noted her testimony had been read into the record as Exhibit D.

Chair Karr called for the Applicant's rebuttal.

Mr. Holland stated in 1972, Oregon had adopted a UGB to preserve the elements outside the UGB to be rural. Wilsonville was a job-rich regional center with approximately 12,000 jobs and between 2,500 and 2,700 housing units, resulting in one housing unit for every four jobs. Approximately 10% of the people who work in Wilsonville actually live in Wilsonville. Wilsonville sits at a confluence between Salem and Portland, so there were regional aspects of the city's location. Wilsonville also has concentrated retail centers with Town Center, which the proposed project would abut, and the new Fred Meyer development.

- Being able to provide housing close to jobs and close to services was probably the most important thing they could do in the city because it would keep people off of the road. Many of Holland's residents were walking to Mentor Graphics, one of Wilsonville's largest employers and to Oregon Institute of Technology. Many people were also using public transportation, which was a perfect opportunity to allow, particularly seniors in this building, access to all the services and mobility as close to the center of town as possible.
- The objection to the height of the Active Adult Apartments building did not seem to regard the height, but was an element to try and say, "We don't want more of those people in our town." Twenty to 25 years ago, 75% of households in the United States were married with children. Today, only 25% of households had children. The needs of single parent, individual, and retirement households had broadened significantly and the Applicant believed Goal 10 meant that the desire was to provide housing for all of the various individuals or ownership groups. The Applicant provided ownership housing and renter housing, but particularly with this project, the ability to provide seniors an option that did not exist at all within the community.

Chair Karr asked how many applicants the Applicant had before Jory Trail was completed.

Mr. Holland stated about 50 individuals participated in focus groups. Six to ten experienced renters had wanted to move in but needed an elevator, and that element has been echoed and broadened. The more they listened and researched, they discovered how unmet the need was for this type of housing in town. The project had to be profitable in order to be built, but growth was a two-sided deal. The new building would be good for the City and seniors, but had to be good for financial partners as well in order for them to

finance it.

Ms. Dorman asked if there was a commitment to provide elevators at three stories if Council did not approve the waiver or rezoning for the four stories and elevators.

Mr. Holland responded they could not make it work financially. The financial partners had wanted 125 units minimum and the Applicant wanted 100, so they split the difference and proposed 112 units. Given the struggle between the increased cost of what was happening in the marketplace and the dynamics of the cost of the elevators, it would be more profitable financially to build 30 homes. The impacts on the City would be higher and the revenue for the City long term would be lower. Additionally, the Applicant would not be able to meet the senior needs that they had, [which were much more widely available in town](#)

Mr. Dorman asked if any consideration was given for omitting the density in other unfinished projects, Future Lots 2, 4 and 5, to offset the proposed project.

Mr. Holland replied the 27 lots were larger and the living space and master bedroom would be available on the ground floor, because while they were single-family homes, seniors could not transition stairs. The Applicant did not anticipate having anything other than the 27 units, which were relatively low density compared to other master planning communities like Villebois. In Villebois there were a significant number of attached townhomes. A number of seniors had said they wanted to live up in a condominium type environment or independently and not in an attached format.

Mr. Hanson noted the building site was 3.4 acres with 112 units. If the park was included, everything inside of the roadway would be 4.5 acres, which was not that dense.

Mr. Holland stated the City had been great to work with and all the feedback that had been received throughout the process was greatly appreciated.

Ms. Chaudhuri sought clarification about Wilsonville's current percentages in terms of single-family and multi-family housing.

Mr. Edmonds replied the figures he used were based upon the Engineering Staff's bimonthly or tri-monthly report of building permits from the Building Division. The Planning Commission's percentages were based on the periodic review of the last ten years, not the entire city, so it was a slightly different percentage. The consultants were not required to reach back into the history of the city due to cost. His numbers were overall citywide, which was a slightly different. He recalled the percentages were 56% for multi-family, 43% for single-family and 1% for mobile homes, which was fairly close to the City's numbers for their needed housing study. The City goal was done away with in 2000, but used to be 40% for apartments, 50% for single family and 10% for mobile home/manufactured parks. The goal was eliminated because new Metro housing standards had been adopted. However, the City goal was still used as a yardstick as far as the desired balance of housing in the city. The original Comprehensive Plan had been careful to distribute the multi-family and single-family, so it was not all in one geographical area, which would be very problematic. The proposed project was a medium density range to the Comprehensive Plan. Nowhere in the city actually had high density zone; the city was mostly PDR-5 or below. The City was starting to come back a bit with all the single-family construction in Villebois. The tremendous number of houses had begun to lower the multi-family residential percentage a bit and bring it more into balance.

Ms. Dorman asked what impact the proposed development, if approved, would have on the density.

Mr. Edmonds described the calculation, stating the 3.4 acre site would come out to 99 units at PDR-7. He did not calculate the density for the entire 59 acres. The zoning for the property was PDR-4 for the north end and PDR-5 at the south end. The density of 754 units for PDR-4 and PDR-5 was based on the zoning criteria, not the Comprehensive Plan criteria. Council chose to drop it down to 715 units, and the Applicant proposed 112 units, bringing it up to 781 units. The Applicant's position was that it did not look dense given the verticality of the building and because it was all in a tighter building footprint, which created more open-space parking.

Chair Karr asked how many units over the recommended PDR-4 and PDR-5 density was being requested.

Mr. Edmonds responded 66 units.

Chair Karr added if Ordinance No. 703 was not in place, how much over it would be.

Mr. Edmonds answered the difference between 754 and 781, or 27 units.

Ms. Chaudhuri confirmed the ordinance waiver would only be applicable to this development project and nothing else on the property.

Mr. Holland clarified Mr. Edmonds had only addressed the site, he had not included the park. The entire area was 4.3 acres divided by 1500 sq ft per unit would be 127 units, which would be the density. If PDR-7 was applied to the entire 60 acres, it would be 1773 or 1774, depending on how it was rounded and the development was not even half of that.

Chair Karr closed the public hearing at 9:19 p.m.

Barbara Jacobson, Assistant City Attorney noted the order of this hearing was a bit unusual. She advised how to incorporate the exhibits procedurally, and noted that the question before DRB was the approval of the application, which included the waiver. The DRB was not making any finding on density. The Board could only make a decision based on the current regulations; only City Council could increase the density and that proposal would come before them on July 15. The hearing was slightly out of order due to timing and the way that the Applicant wanted to present. If City Council did not approve the density, the Applicant would probably return before DRB with a different plan because they had testified it would then not be feasible to do the four-story building. Therefore, the DRB would be approving the waiver essentially assuming the density increase would be approved. However, City Council does value the opinion of the DRB, so if the Board desired to make a recommendation, they were encouraged to do so. She believed it would be easiest to go through the decision to elect to approve the application, which would only address the waiver and presume the density. Lastly, she suggested making a motion to support oppose or be neutral with regard to the recommendation. A separate motion on the recommendation would result in a cleaner decision and make the most sense.

Chair Karr moved to amend the Staff report to include Exhibits B7, B8, D and B9.

The following exhibits were entered into the record:

- Exhibit B7: Revised memorandum from Brenner Daniels, Holland Development, and Jerry Offer, Otak, dated May 29, 2013 providing additional support for requested revisions to Ordinance No. 703.
- Exhibit B8: Email from Brenner Daniels noting the receipt of a letter of support from Bruce and Barbara Heuer, which was printed on the backside.
- Exhibit D: Letter of opposition from Doris Wehler. Mr. Edmonds read Ms. Wehler's letter into the record.
- Exhibit B9: The Applicant's PowerPoint presentation.

Jhuma Chaudhuri seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Chair Karr moved to approve Resolution No. 254 including Case Files DB13-0008, DB13-0009, DB13-0010, DB13-0011, and DB13-0012. The motion was seconded by **Jhuma Chaudhuri**.

Dianne Knight believed the siting of the building was great because it was not a huge mass and would fit with the surroundings. The testimony that was heard indicated a need for it in the city. She did not see a difference between the three and four stories with regard to density. She was concerned the DRB would be setting a precedent with the project if it was approved.

Ms. Chaudhuri reminded she had asked if the approving waiver for Ordinance No. 703 would affect any other project and the answer was clear that the waiver was only applicable to this application.

Ms. Knight stated that in the future someone could use the approval of the waiver for this project as a point of reference. She wanted the DRB to be cognizant of the fact they were starting down a path, not that it was a bad thing.

Ms. Dorman understood they were voting on the height, but she was concerned about density for all the reasons that were heard. The compelling stories on the other side of it included the need for buildings with elevators. The Board saw that the height was pretty compatible; there were no extreme variances, which was compelling. There was a lot of green space and the density requirements were not that extreme. There was enough park space, the parking lot and single-family dwellings, which was also compelling. However, she did share Ms. Knight's concerns about the precedents they would be setting. She did not like that Wilsonville was so high in multi-family residents compared to single family residents, which had always been a great part of Wilsonville.

Ms. Knight believed Wilsonville had such a high number of multi-family homes because it was an affordable option. More people could afford to rent versus purchasing a home. During testimony, the Board heard that more housing developments were coming, so long term, she believed the types of homes might balance out. The City had just been so focused on this type of product.

Chair Karr added the percentage of multi-family homes was dropping and that did not account for Future Lots 2, 4 and 5, which had not been included in the numbers. There would still be drop in the percentage of multi-family homes based on the fact that additional houses were being added in this development. One compelling argument was that although they were looking at an individual component of a larger complex, a resident of the building would not look at it as an individual component but as their neighborhood. The 60 acres did not feel like it would be overly dense, unlike downtown Portland, where there were ten-story buildings with 500 apartments. Wilsonville still had a suburban feel and he did not believe the Active Adult Apartments building would encroach on that.

Ms. Knight agreed.

Mr. Woods agreed considering the entire structure and the area surrounding the project's location. He believed they needed to think about the future. Considering how Wilsonville was growing, the demographics, etc., this type of building was appropriate for the community. Good information had been presented about density. He had been concerned about the noise but the explanation provided about how the sound would bounce off the wall resonated with him, as a technical person. As far as the construction of the building, he had also been concerned about the elevators. If Council did not approve the density and the building had to be made three stories, that would be a whole new situation, particularly since there would be no elevators and that was the number one component of the project.

Chair Karr believed moving the building 330 ft from Parkway Ave was also a compelling argument because it mitigated the height difference. Standing on the site, one would not be able to visually notice the difference between the Terrene Apartments and the Active Adult Apartments building because there would be no clean line of sight.

Mr. Woods noted a lot of green space was apparent in the Site Plan. The layout was not congested, but was campus-like. He believed the Applicant did a good job with the layout and that it fit very well into Wilsonville overall.

Ms. Chaudhuri agreed with everyone's statements. She believed the building had a nice design and would meet a demographic need.

Chair Karr restated the motion and called for the question.

The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Karr moved that the Development Review Board-Panel B recommend that City Council modify Ordinance 703 to allow for this additional density. Cheryl Dorman seconded the motion.

Chair Karr asked if the Board was concerned about recommending how the Council should vote and would that affect the Board's decision to vote of this particular motion, being that they would now be putting forth an opinion to City Council that they supported the height variance, but believed Council should vote a certain way.

Ms. Chaudhuri believed so, being that the Board had heard several hours of presentation and testimony that led them to their initial decision and it was valid to put that opinion forward.

Ms. Dorman hoped Council would have and read the minutes regarding the discussion to understand the Board's concerns about density for the City of Wilsonville. It was important that Council was aware of those concerns.

Mr. Woods said density and height went hand in hand; there could not be one without the other based on the testimony heard regarding this project due to financial reasons.

Chair Karr noted the building needed to be four-stories with 112 units to be fiscally viable, even though 125 units were initially desired.

Ms. Knight stated it was a unique project and building for the city. She believed it deserved a lot of attention and questioning.

Chair Karr said the City went through the effort of building the Creekside Apartments to address the same demographic as the Thunderbird Mobile Home Club. The proposed project targeted the same people. He hoped some of the Thunderbird residents would return to the area. He liked that the community would be age 55 and older to re-attract those residents that were there originally.

Mr. Wood reiterated that the baby boomer population was growing and he believed having this kind of complex would set Wilsonville apart from other cities in a unique and positive way.

Chair Karr restated the motion and called for the question.

The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Karr read the rules of appeal into the record.

VIII. Board Member Concerns and Communications

A. Results of the May 13, 2013 DRB Panel A meeting

Mr. Edmonds briefly reviewed the approvals by DRB Panel A.

IX. Staff Communications

There was none.

X. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 9:41 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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