

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

<p>Approved February 25, 2013</p>
--

**Development Review Board – Panel B
Minutes–January 28, 2013 6:30 PM**

I. Call to Order

Acting 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, and Aaron Woods. City Council Liaison Scott Starr was absent.

Staff present were: Blaise Edmonds, Barbara Jacobson 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. City Council Liaison Report

No City Council liaison report was given due to Councilor Starr's absence.

VI. Election of 2013 Chair and Vice-Chair:

- Chair

Dianne Knight nominated Andrew Karr as the DRB Chair for 2013. Cheryl Dorman seconded the nomination. Andrew Karr was unanimously elected the 2013 DRB Chair.

- Vice-Chair

Dianne Knight nominated Cheryl Dorman as the DRB Vice-Chair for 2013. Aaron Woods seconded the nomination. Cheryl Dorman was unanimously elected the 2013 DRB Vice-Chair.

VII. Consent Agenda:

A. Approval of minutes of October 22, 2012 meeting

B. Resolution No. 240. Brenchley Estates Five (5) Year TUP - Jerry Offer, Otak – representative for John Hendry, SF 30 Investors LP – owner/applicant. The applicant is requesting approval of a **Five (5) Year Temporary Use Permit for the use of a modular structure as a real estate sales office, associated parking and three (3) model homes in the Brenchley Estates Subdivision.** The subject property is located on Tax Lot 104 of Section 14A, T3S, R1W, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Amanda Hoffman.

Case Files: DB12-0069 – Five Year Temporary Use Permit

Dianne Knight moved to adopt the Consent Agenda. Cheryl Dorman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

VIII. Public Hearing:

- A. Resolution 241. Tonquin Woods at Villebois No. 1 – Polygon Northwest Company – applicant.** The applicant is requesting approval of a modification to the Preliminary Development Plan - 5 South and an amendment to the architectural pattern book of Specific Area Plan – South. The property is located on subdivision lots 19 – 27, Tax Lots 19900 - 20700, Section 15CB, T3S, R1W, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Blaise Edmonds

Case Files: DB12-0064 – Modify PDP-5 South
DB12-0065 – Amend Architectural Pattern Book – SAP South

Chair Karr called the public hearing to order at 6:34 p.m. and read the conduct of hearing format into the record. Dianne Knight and Jhuma Chaudhuri disclosed that they reside in Arbor Villebois. 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, Current Planning, noted that DRB meetings would not be televised as had been anticipated. He welcomed new DRB member Aaron Woods, noting his experience will be a tremendous asset to the City. He announced that the criteria applicable to the application were stated on page 2 of the Staff report, which was entered into the record. Copies of the report were made available to the side of the room.

Mr. Edmonds presented the Staff report via PowerPoint with the following comments:

- Board Member Dianne Knight's questions and the responses from Staff (Exhibit A3) as well as the Applicant (Exhibit B3) were presented in the email dated January 28, 2013 and had been distributed to the Board. Her questions pertained to both applications. He noted Staff and the Applicant's responses were consistent with one another.
- The Applicant's first proposal was to modify the Master Plan for Villebois by amending PDP-5 SAP South to change Lots 19 through 27 to allow small, detached cottages instead of the attached row house units that were previously approved for this property.
- The second application would amend the Architectural Pattern Book for SAP South to include the small cottage type house which was not previously included as part of a design or a house in the Architectural Pattern Book.
 - According to marketplace demands, the Applicant believed small cottages would be more marketable to first time buyers, young professional couples, and people who are downsizing and want smaller homes requiring less maintenance. Based on other projects the Applicant has developed, attached row houses are difficult to sell because the current marketplace is seeking small detached homes.
 - The challenge when shifting away from attached, row type housing to small, detached cottages is to reflect the character of a row house, picking up some of the architectural clues of other attached row houses and giving the appearance of homes being close together, while still making the homes distinctively different from other small, detached houses seen throughout Villebois.
- He displayed elevations of the attached row houses currently approved for Villebois (Tonquin Woods Villebois PDP 5S), noting that unlike other row houses, these homes look like single-family, detached homes from the street with fences and side yard areas, created by a shared easement. The homes were only attached at the garages. He noted if the proposed application were denied, the Applicant could still build the approved product. However, the Applicant sought approval for small, cottage houses.
- Sheet A1.7 of the Applicant's submittal depicted the proposed streetscape along Palermo St. illustrating the detached, small cottages with similar architectural character and curb appeal in a variety of architectural styles including American Modern, English revival, and French revival homes. Because the proposed homes were similar to those approved a year ago with the attached

garages, there was not much deviation in terms of street appearance.

- The Applicant did not build any French Revival homes in Phase 6 of SAP South, but was introducing French homes and returning to the Villebois character of having a variety of French, American, Modern Classic and English revival homes. Bringing diversity back into the project was good news.
- He indicated how the side yard areas of the proposed detached homes would be used by the homeowners. Although not stated in the Staff report, the Applicant's easement agreement should include an additional 4 feet on the adjacent subdivision, SAP Phase 1 North, so the owner of Lot 27 would have the full 8 to 9 feet of side yard, rather than only 4 feet.
- Because the private side yard areas would be maintained and landscaped by the homeowner, he recommended a condition to install a solid, side yard fence, similar to the universal variety currently seen in Villebois, two feet back along Palermo Street to screen these areas from the public view. A transparent fence could be used along the alley side, since it was not a public view shed.
- The Applicant indicated having a wall treatment along the frontage of the houses to tie the homes together. A continuous two- to three-foot high wall treatment along the frontage would also help the proposed detached, small cottages look different from the other detached homes.
 - The site plan indicated an approximate two to three foot grade change between the street and the front yards of the homes, which could be incorporated into the wall treatment. A picture of the attached row houses farther south on Palermo Street was displayed to show the wall treatment used.
 - Staff proposed that the wall be dried stack rock or brick to match other treatments in Villebois and retain a continuous quality throughout the development. Examples of other rock and brick treatments used in Villebois were displayed.
- The Applicant's proposed houses were elevated approximately one to two feet above grade. The Architectural Pattern Book required at least a 10-inch raise to the front stoop of the house, which gives prominence and height to the house compared to other detached style houses.
- Although an added cost, the Applicant was encouraged to include a small patio in front of their English classic homes that do not have covered porches. This element would pick up architectural notes from other Villebois projects to give the appearance of being a row house product.
 - Arbor built its English-style detached row homes in Villebois with a small patio in the front in lieu of constructing a covered porch, giving the appearance of a semipublic space in front of the house.
- Although an added cost, the Applicant was encouraged to consider adding wrought iron fencing. Some type of rail system was required for retaining walls that exceed 30-inches in height; otherwise the fencing would be more decorative.
- The Staff report also discussed planting street trees near the side yard areas to fill the gap between the homes. The trees foliage would fill the gaps between homes that are close together, giving the illusion of attached row houses although the homes are actually detached.
- He entered the following exhibits into the record with additional comments as noted:
 - Exhibit A3: Email discussion dated January 28, 2013 noting Mr. Edmond's responses to questions posed by DRB Panel B Member Dianne Knight, which included the correction of a typo, deleting "what" in the sixth sentence of Finding A23 on Page 14 of 29.
 - Exhibit B3: Email discussion dated January 28, 2013 noting the Applicant's responses to questions posed by DRB Panel B Member Dianne Knight.
 - Exhibit C4: Memorandum dated January 23, 2013 included revised language to Condition A8, replacing "Village Center Architectural Standards" with "***Master Fencing Plan in the respective Architectural Pattern Book***" as proposed by the Applicant.
- He noted the developer had obtained a 5-year temporary use permit in prior approvals last year to build a sales office and a temporary parking lot on the south portion of the property so the first three lots of row houses would not be built until the sales office is no longer needed. The sales office would be used to market the new row house product and homes in SAP 1 North.

- The Community Center swimming pool is located on Palermo Street opposite the row houses.
- Staff recommends approval of the proposal in that for all aesthetic purposes, the design was similar to that previously approved. The homes along Palermo Street would look very similar if the proposed small, detached cottage homes were approved.

Cheryl Dorman understood the reason for going to detached as opposed to attached homes was due to marketability, but she was interested in hearing more about that from the Applicant. She questioned the use of street trees to make the homes look attached, which seemed to be the opposite of what they wanted to accomplish. Were the trees recommended to bring continuity of appearance with other row homes along the street?

Mr. Edmonds responded that street trees are required, specifically white oak trees, which are large. He explained he was trying to find a bridge to make the concept of going from attached to detached more palatable because the Villebois Village Master Plan intended the block of homes to be row houses. He looked for as many architectural and landscape devices as possible to make the proposed detached homes more row house in character to respect and honor the Master Plan's intention for that length of the block.

- He noted Webster's dictionary said nothing about row houses being attached, but defined them as similar, like-size in shape and volume, and built side-by-side. The concept of detached row houses was first brought to the DRB in 2009, when the same argument was presented for the Le Blanc row houses developed by Rudy Kadlub on Barber St. The developers had the same argument, that they could get financing easier if the homes were detached; however due to various issues, this was not accomplished. He deferred to Mr. Gast of Polygon Northwest to more articulately discuss the economy and financing of houses.
- Another reason for the change is that people like detached houses; they want their own house on their own property that is not attached to anyone else.

Dianne Knight inquired about the success of the Le Blanc row houses and asked if anything could be learned from that project. Did detaching the homes a successful process?

Mr. Edmonds replied he could not speak for Mr. Kadlub's business, development or financing plans, and he did not know enough background information as to why the Barber St homes were not successfully completed. Three of the approximately 20 plus detached and duplex homes approved in 2009/2010 were built, but the City had not seen any further building permits for detached houses from that development since 2009. He did not know why the homes could not be marketed, but many variables were involved.

- He again deferred to Mr. Gast to address questions about what most new buyers and people who are downsizing were looking for in the housing market.

Chair Karr asked if Staff addressed the easements on the north side to allow for the side yard on Lot 27.

Mr. Edmonds deferred to the Applicant or his consultant, Jim Lange. The Applicant mentioned that the easements would be created at the time of building permits. He noted this design was not uncommon. The Canyon Creek subdivision off Canyon Creek Road has a similar design with alley-loaded homes and easement private yards on adjacent properties. Although there is narrow space between the homes, the nicely landscaped development is very successful. The Copper Creek subdivision with houses currently under construction also has a similar small product arrangement with side yard, private space easements.

Jhuma Chaudhuri noted 90 to 100 attached row houses were currently sold in Villebois with one sale pending. She requested more data regarding why the attached row houses were not marketable, especially when so many have recently sold successfully. Additionally, if the goal was to make the structures look like row houses, they should have the same architectural style or pattern, as was done in San Francisco with the detached row homes shown in the example. She believed maintaining the row house feel would be

difficult because the proposal was moving away from the same architectural style or pattern.

Mr. Edmonds believed these were two very good questions for the Applicant.

Aaron Woods asked if the front view would noticeably change aesthetically from what the current plans showed.

Mr. Edmonds displayed PDP 5 South Front Architectural Elevations, explaining the only change to the frontal view would be that the garage structure would not be seen, resulting in a larger gap and more air circulation for the side yard area which would no longer be framed on three sides.

Chair Karr called for the Applicants' presentation.

Fred Gast, Polygon Northwest, 109 East 13th Street Vancouver, WA 98660 thanked Staff for working with Polygon over the past two years and for their contributions toward making Polygon's proposals' better and more interesting. He also thanked the Board for their service to the City and community. He agreed the Staff report was complete and stated that Polygon Northwest agreed to the conditions of approval. Rather than reviewing the Staff report and Polygon's proposal, he provided more perspective about the project and how Polygon arrived at the subject proposal via PowerPoint with these comments:

- As an organization, Polygon Northwest is constantly trying to improve and innovate and has extensive experience in successfully building lateral row homes and condominiums over the past decade, and even currently in other communities. Therefore, he was able to speak of the successes and difficulties experienced in these submarkets.
- Polygon is working to continue adding other housing styles and opportunities to Villebois, which maintains its constant theme of diversity by adding other products. He displayed a slide comparing depictions of the proposed architectural styles along the top with those currently approved along the bottom. The idea was to change the approved styles to something more interesting and diverse along the streetscape.
 - While Polygon could have continued with the approved craftsman-type styles, the Applicant wanted to innovate and add character and greater context to the community, including additional elevations of English and French styles that Polygon had not yet done yet in Villebois. Some features include more stone and steeper pitches.
- Row homes are a perfectly acceptable housing style. Polygon has built many row houses and never built a house that has not sold; what is important is how well a product sells versus the cost to build it.
 - At this point in time, 60 percent of the sales in the attached market on the west side of Portland was still distressed, which he expected to continue for a number of years. This is not the case with single-family homes, which are the preferred alternative and currently comparably priced to the sale price of town homes. Therefore, the distressed inventory in single-family homes has decreased considerably.
 - Repressed sale prices are still being seen in attached homes. Some attached homes recently built in Villebois are priced 20 to 25 percent below what they were selling for four years ago before the turn in cycle.
- Polygon's alternative is superior. For example, Polygon was building the lower-style product at a community in Hillsboro which was successful. The project was located next to a light rail station in a zone that precluded any detached housing, so it was an alternative Polygon pursued to fill a market-niche wherein many people wanted a single-family home but could not afford one in that particular submarket. Locationally, the City of Hillsboro made adjustments; they wanted something new and as detached as possible so that was the balance Polygon tried to achieve with the subject product.
- Because the currently approved product was attached, Polygon could not market it to those wanting a single-family home. The attached product could not be listed RMLS as a detached alternative, precluding Polygon's sales velocity because the product had to be sold via the realtor community or

word-of-mouth. Without use of RMLS, Polygon had to do a lot of outreach to get the traffic to recognize the product as a good, single-family alternative.

- Detaching the homes provides the same alternative to the customer, greater exposure to the marketplace, as well as an enhancement to the streetscape.
- Regarding previous experiments with this product in Villebois SAP Central, Polygon believed it was the right idea but a difficult floor plan, particularly on the main floor where not enough space existed for anything more than a kitchen, eating area and a place for a chair. To have single-family opportunity, a solid living space was needed, inclusive of kitchen and eating area, but also a real living space for people to gather, which was what the current proposal provided.

Ms. Knight asked if the proposed homes would be part of Polygon's existing single-family homeowners association (HOA) system or would they be separate, like the town homes in Villebois.

Mr. Gast responded the proposed homes would be part of the larger existing HOA at PDP 1 North and PDP 5 South.

Ms. Knight inquired about the price point to the buyer of a real house compared to a single-detached house.

Mr. Gast responded the current price points for attached homes in Villebois are in the low \$200,000 range, about \$209,000 to \$220,000 as a high. The price points for the proposed homes would be a small step up, ranging from \$229,000 to \$239,000. Since there are not many of the proposed homes, how long they would last was uncertain. The Applicant believed they would sell very quickly because work force housing, where teachers, police officers and fire fighters are able to find single-family homes, is difficult to find in the Metro area. While better in last four years, work force housing availability would likely change over the next four years.

Chair Karr asked about the easement on the north property, Lot 27.

Mr. Gast explained that while Polygon understood that two applications exist for PDP 5 South and PDP 1 North, the Applicant considered them as one development or one community, so placing the easement on the other phase was easy.

Chair Karr called for public testimony regarding the application. There was none.

Mr. Edmonds noted that in the packet, the Applicant showed French and English houses with similar roof pitches, forms and shapes, but had also included American Modern, which has a slightly lower pitched roof. He asked if more of the French and English homes with similar pitched roofs were being proposing and not the American Classic or American Modern.

Mr. Gast replied the preponderance of what was being proposed was the English and French, which have steeper roof styles.

Mr. Edmonds clarified that response differed from the material in the packets that showed a variety of American, English and French.

Mr. Gast explained that a snapshot of four homes was included, however the proposal included one.

Mr. Edmonds confirmed that one American style home was proposed at the end on the very north site.

Chair Karr closed the public hearing at 7:20 p.m.

Dianne Knight moved to amend the Staff report to include Exhibits A3, B3 and C4 and correcting the sixth sentence of Finding A23 on Page 14 of 29 by deleting the word “what”. Jhuma Chaudhuri seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Ms. Knight understood there would be several more similar projects throughout neighborhood and she wanted to confirm the Board was comfortable with the direction of the approved proposal.

Mr. Edmonds responded that the current application was for nine lots on the east side of SAP 5 South and the upcoming application would be for an additional twelve lots in SAP 1 North. He understood these were the only additional lots in the 160-plus lot subdivision to the north.

Ms. Knight understood additional applications were expected for similar small cottages in the central area.

Mr. Edmonds responded those were different applications that would come to different public hearing, either to Panel A or Panel B for similar product types, the small cottages in SAP Central 1 and SAP Central 2.

Ms. Knight queried if the subject hearing was laying the groundwork for that upcoming development.

Mr. Edmonds responded he did not see it as laying groundwork, but did not want to get into discussion about applications not currently before the Board. He confirmed that those applications would have to come before the DRB.

Cheryl Dorman moved to adopt Resolution 241. Aaron Woods seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Chair Karr read the rules of appeal into the record.

B. Resolution 242. Tonquin Woods at Villebois No. 2– Polygon Northwest Company – applicant. The applicant is requesting approval of a modification to the Preliminary Development Plan - 1 North and an amendment to the architectural pattern book of Specific Area Plan – North. The property is located on subdivision lots 28-39, Tax Lot 2921, Section 15, T3S, R1W, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Blaise Edmonds

Case Files: DB12-0066 – Modify PDP-1 North
DB12-0067 – Amend Architectural Pattern Book – SAP North

The following exhibits were entered into the record:

- Exhibit A3: Email discussion dated January 28, 2013 noting Mr. Edmond’s responses to questions posed by DRB Panel B Member Dianne Knight, which included the correction of a typo on Page 14 of 29.
- Exhibit B3: Email discussion dated January 28, 2013 noting the Applicant’s responses to questions posed by DRB Panel B Member Dianne Knight.
- Exhibit C4: Memorandum dated January 23, 2013, noting revised language to Condition A8.

Chair Karr called the public hearing to order at 7:25 p.m. and read the conduct of hearing format into the record. Dianne Knight and Jhuma Chaudhuri disclosed that they reside in Arbor Villebois. 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, Current Planning, announced that the criteria applicable to the application were stated on page 2 of the Staff report, which was entered into the record. Copies of the report were made available to the side of the room.

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

- He noted that Exhibits A3, B3 and C4 were also applicable to this application as the Staff reports were essentially duplicated. He corrected the same typographical error involving the deletion of “what” on Page 14 of 29, and noted that Condition A8 would be revised to reflect the Applicant’s proposed language in Exhibit C4.
- He displayed the twelve row house lots previously approved for PDP 1 North, noting these were the only row houses in the entire northern part of that project. The DRB’s action would only address those lots facing Palermo Street and a public park, Regional Park 3 (RP3), on the east side.
- As presented in the previous hearing, this proposal involved a similar housing project by the same developer who chose not to build the row houses attached at the garages the same houses Mr. Gast testified about in the previous hearing.
- Mr. Gast considered this as a continuation of one project, even though it was in two different subdivisions, so in terms of the row houses, it was a continuation of what would have been seen in Phase 5 South.
- The street view of Tonquin Woods No. 2 was displayed. Most of the houses per previous testimony in the public hearing were French and English with taller, steeper roof pitches with a very occasional lower pitched American Modern House. The proposal also had the same arrangement in terms of private yard use.
- Staff had the same concerns about elevating houses, creating patios, fencing, and a continuous rock wall. He noted the subject application was the same presentation as the previous public hearing because it was a continuation of same row house product, detached small cottages.
- Staff recommended approval of the applications.

Chair Karr asked why was the project was broken into two applications; he realized it was two different segments.

Mr. Edmonds replied that technically, because of the City’s ordinance regarding the land use. Because the projects were in two different specific area plans (SAPs), they could not be put into one application.

Chair Karr called for the Applicant’s presentation.

Fred Gast, Polygon Northwest, 109 East 13th Street Vancouver, WA 98660 stated that his prior comments regarding the previous applications addressed what Polygon was proposing in the subject application. He thanked Staff, adding he would be happy to answer any further questions.

Chair Karr confirmed there were no questions for the Applicant and no public comment. He closed the public hearing at 7:30 pm.

Dianne Knight moved to amend the Staff report to include Exhibits A3, B3 and C4 and correcting the sixth sentence of Finding A23 on Page 14 of 29 by deleting the word “what”. **Cheryl Dorman** seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Cheryl Dorman moved to adopt Resolution 242. The motion was seconded by **Jhuma Chaudhuri** and passed unanimously.

Chair Karr read the rules of appeal into the record.

VIII. Board Member Communications

A. Results of the November 15, 2012 DRB Panel A meeting

IX. Staff Communications

There were none.

X. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:34 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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