

**PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 14, 2013
6:00 P.M.**

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

Approved
September 11, 2013

Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

Chair Altman called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m. Those present:

Planning Commission: Ben Altman, Eric Postma, Ray Phelps, Marta McGuire, Peter Hurley, Al Levit, Phyllis Millan, and City Councilor Julie Fitzgerald.

City Staff: Chris Neamtzu, Barbara Jacobson, Nancy Kraushaar, Kirstin Retherford, Kerry Rappold, Katie Mangle, Steve Adams, and Daniel Pauly.

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

III. CITIZEN'S INPUT - This is an opportunity for visitors to address the Planning Commission on items not on the agenda. There was none.

IV. CITY COUNCIL LIAISON REPORT

A. City Council Update

City Councilor Fitzgerald reported that at its August 5th meeting, City Council:

- Updated the Council goals, which were being reviewed quarterly to check on Council's progress.
- Approved a contract to complete the Boeckman Bridge repair. The bridge should be drivable by December.
- Approved a resolution to execute an intergovernmental agreement (IGA) between Metro, Washington County, Tualatin, and Wilsonville that acknowledges the Basalt Creek Transportation Plan. The IGA would guide even more future collaboration on that big project.
- Approved an increased number of units at Brenchley Estates in the Active Adult Community.

V. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES

The July 10, 2013 Planning Commission minutes were approved 6 to 0 to 1 as presented with Chair Altman abstaining.

VI. WORK SESSIONS

A. Goal 10 Housing Needs Analysis (Mangle)

Katie Mangle, Long-Range Planning Manager, stated they were nearing the end of the analysis portion of the Goal 10 Housing Needs project. The consultants would walk through bringing the needs together with the capacity and a preliminary estimate of how many housing units Wilsonville could accommodate on its available property. As noted in the packet, Staff and the consultants were interested in getting the Planning Commission's feedback on the assumptions that were built into the analysis.

Beth Goodman and Bob Parker of ECONorthwest presented Wilsonville's Housing Capacity, a component of the Goal 10 Housing Needs Analysis, via PowerPoint.

Discussion and feedback from the Planning Commission about the presentation and assumptions used in the Goal 10 Analysis for future housing density and housing mix for new homes built in Wilsonville, namely for Frog Pond, over the next 20 years (Slide 11) was as follows:

- The assumptions would provide important guidance for concept planning Frog Pond, which would involve many factors, including the cost of infrastructure, so these suggested assumptions would not be the final answer. The assumptions would also establish with the State that Wilsonville had a certain capacity for residential development, and one of the ranges would work in that sense.
- Based on the feedback from the Commission and City Council, the proposed densities were targeted that reflected a majority of single-family detached homes.
 - The mix of housing could be as important as the actual densities because different densities and single-family units would be allowed, and the mixture of that housing could have a more significant impact on the average density of Frog Pond than the specific numbers.
 - The five dwelling units per net acre was based on internal assumptions, but did not necessarily mean a mix of 90% single-family detached and 10% of another housing type would result in five dwelling units per gross acre; it could be something different in the end.
- Gross acres did not include municipal parks, but may include dedicated open space and definitely included yards. The examples pictured in the PowerPoint reflected gross per acre.
 - The pictures were visually deceptive; those that appeared most dense had the least dwellings per acre. The sizes of the buildings, housing types, and lot sizes in the examples were not clear.
- The 90 percent and 75 percent for single-family detached was the average; a rough estimate based on five dwellings units per acre, not necessarily a mathematical formula. Housing densities below five dwelling units per acre would certainly be single-family detached. How low the density was depended on how the housing was zoned. One or dwelling units per acre was not a consideration, but having three or four dwelling units per acre would depend on how it was zoned.
 - A little bit of lower density, multi-family housing, such as single-family, attached townhomes and duplexes was also a possibility. The 8.5 dwelling units per gross acre allowed potential for large lot, single-family detached housing, as well as denser of the lower-density types of multi-family housing, like duplexes, tris or quads, single-family attached, garden apartments, etc.
- When the density was implemented at five units per acre, it referred to gross acres, but the Code used net acres to determine density so, the numbers did not play out right. The numbers shifted as they are implemented.
 - At this point, this discussion only regarded the Comprehensive Plan level. It was not yet known whether the Planned Development Residential Code would be applied to Frog Pond. All of the Comprehensive Plan designations were based on gross acres, which was how it was currently discussed.
- The concern was that the numbers look okay on paper on the Comprehensive Plan, but when actually delivered and applied, it would be much denser because of the net acres. If a five unit per gross acre density was applied to a net acre of 32,000 sq ft, a much smaller lot would result. Considering the historic ranges in the Comprehensive Plan could be deceiving. How the Development Code implements the density might be one reason Wilsonville had a relatively high average density.
 - Staff conducted some empirical analysis about the conversion factors used to get from net acres to gross acres. In many cities, those conversion factors were approximately 20 percent, meaning 20 percent of the land was dedicated to rights-of-ways, and sometimes, dedicated open space, which was a difficult piece to tease out. In Staff's analysis, Wilsonville came to about 10 percent to 15 percent net to gross conversion, which was relatively small.
 - ECO Northwest used Metro's assumption of 18.5 percent net to gross conversion because it seemed reasonable. Frog Pond could be discussed in lot sizes, rather than in net or gross acres.
 - One did not just say "5 to 8.5 dwelling units per net acre", because there was a conversion of those numbers as well.
 - Five dwellings units per gross acre came to about 6 dwellings units per net acre on approximately 7,000 sq. ft lots on average.

- Per the ORS, a net acre is 43,560 sq. ft of buildable land. A gross acre is the amount that remains after the street area is added. Therefore, a net acre would always have a higher overall average density than a gross acre because the streets are not included in the calculation. Lot sizes in gross acres would be about 9,000 sq. ft, and for about 7,000 sq. ft in net acres.
 - Gross acre is actually a smaller sized delineation, which is counterintuitive.
- The Commission discussed how Wilsonville might achieve a better balance between multi-family and single-family housing and whether certain densities might encourage more single-family detached housing. Comments included:
 - Having single-family in all of the Frog Pond area and the rest of the land in the city would not drastically change the ratio because it was already so lopsided.
 - The original Comprehensive Plan was designed with higher density in the middle of town, closer to Town Center and the commercial core, and lower densities moving closer to the edge. There had been concern that with the density requirements from Metro, the City would push higher density to the edge; however Metro clarified that as long as Wilsonville provided the required gross numbers, the densities could be arranged within the city boundaries as desired.
 - Additional density requirements by Metro did apply for the urban reserves and Advance Road in order to bring them into the urban growth boundary (UGB). However, there was no set number in Frog Pond, a fair amount of flexibility existed.
 - Higher density should not be at the edge of the city. Revising and rearranging densities within the city should be considered in future planning.
 - Frog Pond residents would be affiliated with the new school at Advance Road, so further consideration might be needed with regard to adding a variety of housing types and affordability.
 - To give Wilsonville more balance, the consultants recommended anywhere within the 5 to 8.5 dwelling units per gross acre. If more single-family detached homes were desired, density closer to 5 dwelling units per gross acre would provide for a range of different types of single-family detached housing with the possibility for a smidgen of single-family attached homes, if that was chosen in the master planning process.
 - Neither of the density scenarios was extreme. From a market point of view, it was unlikely that Wilsonville would have development at a lot less than 5 dwelling units per gross acre. Generally, developers want to develop at the highest density possible to make more money from building more houses.
 - The amenities and infrastructure that the City and community would want to require should also be considered. The density range should not be limited too narrowly before going into the concept planning process, when more would be learned about the infrastructure expenses that the development would have to contribute. A range was better than a single number because more information would be coming. Frog Pond was 181 gross acres.
 - A range of capacity could be presented in the Goal 10 Study because Wilsonville's capacity was greater than the forecast from Metro. ECONorthwest wanted to be sure they were not hitting something wrong or missing the range with which the Commission would be comfortable.
- The Commission consented to use the lower density assumption for Frog Pond. Additional comments included:
 - Many people have said that Wilsonville does not have a lot of housing choices compared to other parts of country and that there was little land available for housing.
 - A lower dwelling unit would provide Wilsonville a more balanced mix. At 5 dwelling units, the City still fell within Metro's very tight, high-density requirements.
 - People keep saying that Wilsonville needs to find a way to get closer to a better housing balance, including City Council, and this requires looking at lower density numbers.
 - Both the low and high ratios were still close to 50 percent and would not significantly change the City's percentage, but it would change what Wilsonville could offer.
 - Using the lower density would ultimately only be a small piece of what would happen in the master plan concept, which would change and provide opportunities for a mix of houses.

- Concern was expressed about building on the city's periphery, which would increase traffic in town. Villebois and Charbonneau did it, and Frog Pond and Advance Road would too. Even if density were built up downtown, the peripheral areas would still generate a huge amount of traffic.
- The number of dwelling units planned for Villebois was 2,645 and 909 had been built. The presentation did not reflect any units built in 2013. Auxiliary dwelling units were not included in any of the forecasts or in what was reported to Metro; however, some could be built.
 - The multi-family units to be built included single-family attached homes, and four multi-family buildings.
 - Staff was uncertain how many apartment type or attached future units would fit within the multi-family definition, but those figures were in the Villebois Master Plan.
 - The 656 single-family detached homes to be built did not include the proposal that would be presented later tonight.
 - The original minimum number from the 2003 Master Plan was 2,300 units with total capacity for 2,645 units. Page 9 of the memorandum clarified the number of units in the Villebois Master Plan as follows: 2,300 were in the Master Plan, 232 units were added through the refinement process and 113 lots were in the process of refinement. The 113 lots were only assumed in order to get the estimate for the study.
- Villebois and about eight of the larger planned development residential were reviewed and Villebois had a much higher average conversion from net to gross, at close to 30 percent, even after eliminating the alleys. The planned development residential was much lower, in the 3 percent to 5 percent range. There was a wide range, but it had not actually been averaged.
 - The 18.5 percent presumed in the average conversion included yards, green spaces in the common areas, and the required 25 percent open space, but not Significant Resource Overlay Zone (SROZ) areas, although there could be overlap.
 - Whether or not the net to gross conversion always assumed open space or never did was difficult to answer because some places assume open space and some do not.
 - The 18.5 percent only took public and private rights-of-way out of the gross acreage. Metro defined it as only removing rights-of-way.
- Metro forecasted approximately 2,800 dwelling units that Wilsonville would need over the next 20 years to satisfy presumed growth, which was considerably lower than the City's capacity.
- If the assumptions were taken for all housing in Wilsonville, the percentage for single-family homes would remain at about 47 percent, it would not move a lot. About 48 percent of the city's new housing would be single-family detached.
 - The requirement under the Administrative Rule was to plan for the density mix, or eight units per net acre, 50/50, but planning for it did not guarantee that result. Market forces would control what actually gets built.
 - The City's obligation was to meet that "plan for" requirement, but that did not necessarily mean the City would attain that percentage in 2034. It was important to carefully monitor what was happening in the community and make adjustments as appropriate during the planning period.
- Significantly changing the percentage in the overall housing mix with density changes for only new dwelling units would be difficult because the new dwelling units were substantially smaller, about 20 percent of the overall dwelling units. Even if all of Frog Pond was planned for single-family detached, the percentage would not change very much. A 5 to 7 percent difference had been seen over the historic period so it would slowly move in that direction, but no substantial difference would be seen over a 20 year period.
 - If a lot of apartments were built, the number would be skewed higher on multi-family homes, but if as many single-family detached homes were built as possible, that number could never be reached at the same rate. A substantially different mix would be needed than what was implied in the assumptions being presented.
- There were several reasons to monitor. One was to monitor the types of housing and where houses were built. How fast population growth occurred would be important to monitor because Metro's growth assumptions were considerably lower than what Wilsonville had experienced in the past. If the community grew faster than the growth assumptions, the land would be used up faster, which should be paid attention to, unless the City's policy would be to restrict land supply and have someone else take the growth.

- Metro assumed Wilsonville would have 2,700 more housing units, which was based on Metro's current forecast of 1.4 percent per year. At that rate, Wilsonville would not reach build out at low capacity until 2037. If Wilsonville grew at a rate more consistent with how it had grown historically, 3.5 percent to 5 percent per year, it would reach build out of the existing UGB in the mid-2020s, which tied back to monitoring carefully.
 - Metro reviews the forecast on a five-year basis. If Wilsonville continued to grow at rates higher than the forecast, The City might be in a position to have a different conversation in the next round of discussions about forecasts and allocation of population to Wilsonville.
 - In the short term, these forecast numbers would work against expanding the UGB. The entire UGB was a 20-year land supply and involved long-term planning.
- There was some recognition that Wilsonville was growing at faster rate, being that the City had received a grant to concept plan both the Frog Pond and Advance Rd areas. The model might not show that the growth would be sustained. Advance Rd being designated as an urban reserve acknowledged that was a growth area, but when and how long it would take for the forecasts to be met was uncertain.

The consultants agreed they had received enough feedback to move forward and would talk with Staff about having range estimates in terms of density for Frog Pond. Based on the Metro forecasts, there was enough capacity, under any set of assumptions, to accommodate Metro's forecasted growth, although the reality could be somewhat different in the near future. It seemed the Commission's general consensus was that the lower end of the density range was preferred.

Chair Altman noted that using the higher end of the density range would force the continued imbalance of housing types. Even using the low end did not preclude the attached single-family home, which was a part of the required mix, which was an important factor.

B. 5-Parcel TIF Zone (Retherford)

Kristin Retherford, Economic Development Manager, presented the Staff report, noting that a draft plan and draft report for each of the five proposed urban renewal areas were included in the meeting packet. She provided a brief background about the Tax Increment Finance (TIF) Zones and displayed a map showing the locations of the five proposed sites. A sixth site located on the Xerox property might be added within the next week. The broker had approached the City about folding the property in the process and if that happened, there would be a sixth plan and report for the Commission to consider at the public hearing in September.

Ms. Retherford and Elaine Howard, Urban Renewal Consultant, addressed questions from the Commission as follows:

- The wage base qualification requirement was tied to the average wage in Clackamas County as a whole and would increase or decrease accordingly. The rebate period or benefit was tied to either paying 125 percent or 150 percent of the average Clackamas County wage and as that wage increased, the company wages would as well to meet either of the two thresholds for each year that they qualified for the rebate.
 - The rebate was up to 75 percent of the tax increment revenue for either three years or five years, depending on which wage threshold the company met.
- On Page 45 of 244, the table in Section 7 assumed three massive amounts of investment to give the maximum indebtedness of \$12 million.
 - A project and a maximum indebtedness were required for each plan. The project in each of the plans was the rebate. Typically, there would be infrastructure with cost estimates, but in this case, Staff used what was thought could be the maximum level of investment within the timeframe a company could make and then used that high estimate to calculate what the City's maximum indebtedness would be.
 - Stating that it was actually the maximum would be helpful. A minimum investment of \$25 million would barely exceed the administrative costs for any given project. In order to pay for itself, the TIF Zone really had to have a pretty substantial investment.

- Page 47 of 244, the tax revenue displayed in the chart was the increment; it was above and beyond the current tax base.
- All the exhibits were basically the same because the same level of maximum indebtedness was being set for each of the plans. The maximum indebtedness would not change for each plan, but the rebate would because the qualifying investment in each of the sites would be different.
- The table on Page 47 of 244 assumed a \$137 million investment but the table on Page 50 showed an assessed value of \$130 million in 2017.
 - The assessed value is adjusted by the assessor; therefore, the total amount of investment may not actually equal the total assessed value.
- The plans were predicated on a total allowance of \$12 million, but as each plan is actually implemented, the assumptions would change based on the total amount of investment that actually occurred. The City would know what the actual tables would be when doing the negotiations. These tables were given the authority of the \$12 million, but did not guarantee the \$12 million of maximum indebtedness.
- At least one of the buildings was already occupied. The basis of the findings and the reason for moving forward with the proposal was not only vacancy, but underutilization, and to convert warehousing operations to manufacturing operations and increase the assessed value through that conversion.
 - One site that was originally proposed was removed because that site had no potential conversion to manufacturing. The remaining sites still had a potential to add manufacturing components, significant tenant improvements/expansion, or to relocate existing manufacturing operations to the Wilsonville site.
 - Council's vote on the 5-Parcel TIF Zones this spring approved six sites.
- Although a 75/25 percent split had been discussed, it was likely that the 25 percent received by the City and other taxing districts would be higher than 25 percent due to the rate of equipment depreciation. Although it depended on what schedule was used, if there was a three-year rebate period and the investment depreciated over a longer period of time, the money would go back on the tax rolls faster. The City would under levy and return that money. A number of depreciation schedules would be longer than that three-year period.

VII. PUBLIC HEARING

A. LP13-0005 - Villebois Village Master Plan amendment relating to Future Study Area (Polygon NW, applicant) (Pauly)

Chair Altman explained that a legislative public hearing had a different format than a typical quasi-judicial hearing that the Development Review Board (DRB) held on a regular basis. All that would be done at the Planning Commission level was recommending to the City Council the land use classification for the Master Plan for the subject property. He read the legislative hearing procedure for the record and called on Staff for comment.

Chris Neamtzu, Planning Director, noted that the letter by Community Development Director Nancy Kraushaar was an attempt to explain the planning process in Wilsonville, and the difference between legislative and quasi-judicial land use processes, both of which would occur over time regarding the subject property.

- As a legislative body, the Planning Commission operates a higher level than the DRBs, which review the site specific, detailed information of a developmental proposal. The Planning Commission was guided by more general, higher-level policies in the form of City's Comprehensive Plan and sub element plans. The Villebois Village Master Plan is a sub element of the Comprehensive Plan and an important guiding document for the community.
- Tonight, the Planning Commission's review was somewhat narrower than a lot of the testimony that the City has received on the application. Much of the testimony submitted to City Council had been about site specific development details. However, the Commission was reviewing an assignment of a land use type to the Future Study Area property: a single-family detached land use type, a medium, standard and large category land use type consistent with the categories found in the Villebois Village Master Plan. The Commission was not

reviewing tree removal, architectural compatibility, court yards, specific traffic impacts, etc. as such detailed elements would be part of subsequent processes before the DRB.

- The testimony the Commission would be compelled by and that would be helpful and effective would be focused on Comprehensive Plan policies, legislative policies, and State and Metro requirements. The Commission was hard pressed to deal with detailed, development-related comments because the process was not yet at the point where there were enough details to answer many of those questions.

Barbara Jacobson, Assistant City Attorney, instructed those in the audience who had not received Ms. Kraushaar's letter, which was very thorough in explaining what was and was not happening tonight, to obtain copies of the letter at the side of the room.

Chair Altman opened the public hearing for LP13-0005 at 7:25 p.m.

Daniel Pauly, AICP, Associate Planner, presented the Staff report via PowerPoint with his additional comments and responses to comments and questions from the Commission as noted.

- He briefly reviewed the various levels of the Villebois specific planning process, noting that the review process gets more detailed as the process moves forward.
- He noted the changes proposed by the Villebois Village Master Plan Amendment and the items to be addressed in later land use applications. (Slides 4-6)
- He described the proposed changes to the Villebois Master Plan by comparing the Current and Proposed Figure 1 Land Use Plans, noting that Figure 1 has two main components: a land use map and table.
 - Currently, the 19.6 acres shown in violet in the southwest portion of Figure 1 represented a series of uses requested in a letter the Living Enrichment Center (LEC) in 2003. The area, identified as Future Study Area, was incorporated into the Master Plan in 2003.
 - He confirmed that the Current Figure 1 being displayed did not reflect today's existing conditions. Many of the approvals in the north and eastern part over the past couple of years were not reflected, nor were some changes to streets, parks or linear spaces. However, the nature of the Master Plan was to be conceptual and to be refined over time. The southwest portion of Figure 1 was fairly accurate.
 - The proposal requested single-family residential for the Future Study Area, which was consistent with the Residential Village designation given for the entirety of Villebois on the Comprehensive Plan Map. Property being developed and rezoned must be rezoned consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. When rezoning from residential village, the only zone option is Village, and both the current and proposed uses were listed as allowed uses in the Village Zone with single-family being the first listed allowed use.
 - The land use map on Figure 1 is color coded to identify the different land uses from apartments to single-family. Except near the Coffee Lake Wetlands, most lots on the edges of Villebois were large and standard lots.
 - The same pattern established on the northwest and southeast edges was the same pattern now shown in the southwest, the Future Study Area. A whole mixture of lot sizes were seen moving toward the center, from estates to small-attached in SAP-East, and a mixture of large, standard and medium were proposed in the Future Study Area. Conceptually, on the Master Plan level, the pattern around the entire edge of Villebois would remain consistent
 - Attachment I, Figure 1, which was distributed to the Commission, was different from what was in the packet. The Applicant had updated some of the acreage numbers in the table. However, the colors on the map were the same. A road connection that had been on a previous version had been removed, which was updated as well.
 - He confirmed that the only estate lots were in the northern section of Villebois. At one point, there were some along Grahams Ferry Rd but they had been subsequently refined and removed.
 - With regard to subsequent changes or refinements in the quasi-judicial process or development review process, the different colors on the Master Plan map were lumped into essentially two categories:

Category 1 included the small lots and all the attached products and Category 2 included the medium single-family and above.

- He confirmed that larger lots had the potential to be refined into smaller lots; however, the criteria for refinement in the Development Code have quantitative and qualitative requirements. There was flexibility, but a number of considerations are involved.
 - In terms of quantitative requirements, mixing for example, standard and large lots a little bit, especially in the second ring in, would be allowed because the formers of the Master Plan did not want to have to come back for changes like going from a row house to a detached unit, or to change a condominium to an apartment.
 - On the other hand, qualitative requirements still had to be met regarding some of the Master Plan concepts. For example, although in the same land use category, changing a condo to a small lot, single-family in the Village Center was counter to qualitative policies about having the urban design for certain addresses in the Village Center.
- Although the proposed Figure 1 displayed specific colors or land uses, the exact location of those uses was not being approved. Rather than understanding the map as acreage for each of the different lots, it should be considered as acreage for that lot-type category, or the larger single-family lot type, which was 12.4 acres.

Chair Altman noted that if the Commission recommended a designation in Category 2, which was proposed, Category 1 could not be done in the future.

- Mr. Pauly responded that as written, the Code provided the possibility for a small percentage of change, 10 percent, from one category to the other, but he did not expect that would occur, nor that Staff would support it. If there was an expressed policy that the Future Study Area be made the larger single-family, then that would be a qualitative policy that any refinements would be measured against.

Commissioner McGuire recognized it was conceptual, but believed designating different lot sizes set the threshold for future decisions and what the DRB would consider when reviewing a development application. She asked for clarification on the aggregate land use category and whether it meant that it did not matter the land use, medium, large, or standard, when going to the DRB, or would some criteria require a change from a large to a medium would have to go through, and if there was a certain margin of allowance.

- Mr. Pauly explained no quantitative criteria exist that would define if it could go to a large lot, such as 10 percent of large can go to medium. Qualitative policy criteria in the Master Plan and at the SAP level would have to be relied upon and the idea was that the overall pattern around the edges of Villebois was to be followed. That expressed policy would continue as the proposal is reviewed in subsequent processes.

Commissioner Hurley asked for the defined square footages of the standard, large and estate lots.

- Mr. Pauly replied that was an important point because the Villebois Master Plan did not define each of the lot sizes. Lot sizes were defined in the Architectural Pattern Book, which is adopted with the SAP, and shows a range of lot widths and lot depths, the standards that determine if a lot is a medium, standard or large.

Commissioner McGuire:

- Confirmed than an adopted measure within the SAP had the lot sizes in it.
 - Mr. Pauly added the assumption was that an existing Architectural Pattern Book would be used.
- Asked if making the Future Study Area part of SAP-5 was included the proposed amendment.
 - Mr. Pauly answered the SAP boundaries in the Master Plan were conceptual. Changing the SAP boundaries would be a subsequent quasi-judicial decision.

Commissioner Millan understood the Future Study Area would be the same as SAP South; therefore a similar architectural plan would be adopted.

- Mr. Pauly replied the Commission was conceptually setting the basis for that, but the actual decision to change the SAP boundary would be made the DRB. The Master Plan contained conceptual SAP boundaries; the actual adoption of the SAP boundaries was a part of the DRB process.

Commissioner McGuire:

- Asked if approving the amendment would conceptually make the Future Study Area part of SAP-S.
 - Mr. Pauly answered it would be conceptually part of SAP South, so the same lot sizes as SAP South would be used.
- Asked if the 113 lots included in the amendment would be included in the Master Plan.
 - Mr. Pauly replied Staff had not actually looked at the lot sizes to ensure medium lots would fit into the blocks shown as medium based on the standards in SAP South. No documents had been received from Polygon to make that determination. He assumed the Applicant's consultant had figured that out, but the Commission was not reviewing that at this time. He would next review the table in Figure 1, which addressed whether the 113 lots would be included in the Master Plan.

Commissioner Hurley asked about the lot sizes in SAP-5.

- Mr. Pauly answered his calculations did not include alleys, etc., and were only assumptions because making every single house the minimum size would not work with block sizes. According to the SAP South Pattern Book and using the minimum width and depth for each designation, a medium lot was 2,900 sq. ft; a standard lot was 4,500 sq. ft, and a large lot was 5,400 sq. ft. These were not the actual lot sizes Polygon was proposing, but assumed that the SAP South Pattern Book, which was being shown conceptually, was used.
 - He noted the discussion was probably getting too much into the quasi-judicial, but in short, the Master Plan did not mention the size of lots.

Chair Altman understood it was possible that a new SAP could be created moving forward.

- Mr. Pauly replied it was possible and would result in separate pattern books; however Staff did not recommend creating a new SAP for a few reasons. He assumed Staff would recommend that the lot sizes be similar to the other SAPs during the quasi-judicial process.

Commissioner Postma reiterated that the lot sizes were only contextual. The Commission would not be making that decision tonight, but could reasonably expect that the lot sizes would land in that neighborhood.

- Mr. Pauly replied that was correct, adding those lot sizes would be the minimum for the different categories using the SAP South Pattern Book.

Mr. Pauly continued with the Staff report by reviewing the tables of the Current and Proposed Figure 1 Land Use Plans, noting the difference between residential unit totals was 145 units.

- The unit count incorporated what would be in the Future Study Area as well as changes through refinements over the last few years. The total number of standards had been reduced in the Master Plan even though additional standards were being proposed in the Future Study Area.
- The acreage had not been updated, except for moving the 19.6 acres shown in the Master Plan as the developable portion of the Future Study Area. The additional 12.4 acres for medium, standard and large lots combined with the additional 7.2 acres for right-of-way equaled the 19.6 acres of the Future Study Area shown in purple on Figure 1 of the current Master Plan.
 - The Current chart on Slide 14 was a part of Figure 1 currently in the Master Plan and displayed the total count from the map. He clarified what had been adopted in 2010 was under Current and the proposal was reflected under Proposed.
 - He confirmed there was substantially more small lot single-family and small-attached, which was probably due to the row houses being converted to single-family detached.
- Slide 14 showed a decrease from 194 to 138 standard, single-family and an increase in acreage. He clarified that the acreage was not updated for the refinements, but only for what was being moved from the Future Study Area into residential development. The colors on the Land Use Maps had not been updated; the acreage still reflected the colors on the map, rather than the location of the actual units approved through the PDPs.

Commissioner McGuire:

- Understood it was conceptual, but noted it did have a count of land use type and was setting a pattern.
- Asked how the 113 lots put in this specific area would be used in future decision-making. She believed the Commission was setting a threshold for future decisions and wanted to be thoughtful about what that would mean and how it would be used.
 - Mr. Pauly explained that in those future decisions, there was opportunity to refine the 113 number; however, the Master Plan Land Use Map did not necessarily define the location of the 113 lots that correlation could not be drawn from Figure 1.
- Stated part of the way it was being cast was that it was not relevant, like the number could be zero and it did not matter because it would be sited in the future. She believed it was relevant because the Planning Commission was setting a standard or threshold, if she understood the process correctly.
 - Barbara Jacobson, Assistant City Attorney, explained the Applicant had proposed 113 lots. However, Staff had not reviewed that to see whether that would actually be feasible. When making the decision, Commission could specifically say they were approving the Master Plan change to reflect larger size lots, or Category 2, but were not recommending 113 or any other number of lots which the Commission expected would be determined based on further analysis at a later time.
 - Tonight, the Planning Commission was only recommending a designation for land in the Master Plan. When an actual development application came in, then the zone would actually be changed, the layout approved, and Staff would have to review what was presented and make a recommendation regarding the number of lots proposed.
 - The 113 was a number because the Applicant had to put in something. If the 113 lots made the Commission uncomfortable, they could specifically state in their decision that they were not recommending or approving that number of lots and expected Staff to come up with the right proposal to the DRB. If City Council was not pleased with the DRB decision, there was the call-up procedure as well. Many steps would occur after tonight. She reiterated the Commission could make it very clear that they were not recommending any set number of lots, but were recommending the largest designation of lots, or Category 2, as opposed to the smalls.
- Asked if the numbers in the undeveloped portions of the land that were included, like near Tooze Rd, had been done within the master planning process between Staff and the developers.
 - Mr. Pauly responded some SAP work had been done in that area. He had not been involved in the SAP, but knew some specific SAPs were not that specific.

Chair Altman asked if, not counting the numbers but focusing on the acres, it was appropriate that 12.5 acres were being designated for Category 2.

- Mr. Pauly answered yes, but clarified it was approximately 12.5 acres because the acreage could change during the quasi-judicial process when the SROZ refinements were actually done; slight right-of-way changes or adjustments to the SAP or SROZ boundaries could take more acreage.

Commissioner Levit stated it seemed that Staff had spread the 12.4 acres over the three lot sizes, medium, standard and large, because it equaled the difference in the current and proposed acreage and explained why the proposed acreage was larger. If the 12.4 acres was changed by evaluation of the SROZ, the numbers should change and any mix would change the ratios of the actual specific areas.

Mr. Pauly continued with the Staff report via PowerPoint with responses to Commissioners questions as noted:

- The Current and Proposed Figure 2 Neighborhood Concept Diagram showed the removal of the Future Study Area label and replacing the now-demolished building footprints with the Master Plan conceptual level street layout. The Future Study Area label would also be removed from Figure 4.
- Staff supported changing the SAP boundary to be part of SAP-South because the numbers made sense. No SAP had 100 or so units; most had 500 units and SAP-Central had more than 1,000 units. If the subject area had been included as housing in the original Master Plan, it probably would have been a part of SAP South. Subsequently, the same pattern and community elements books would be used in order to have the same design standards of the adjacent development. (Figure 3) The Pattern Book did not show specific

architectural designs, but different massing and elements that must be incorporated, and then based on those standards, the City's contract architect would review the designs to ensure that the specific home designs met the standards in the pattern book.

- The developer would use the same Pattern Book, but would develop the designs for the architecture of the individual homes, which would be reviewed by the third-party architect. It would not be a public process review. In the subsequent development review process, the Applicant would be required to show conceptual elevations as part of the public process with the DRB.
- Several maps, tables and figures in the Master Plan addressed parks and open space.
 - Proposed Figure 5 removed the Future Study Area label and better delineated the wetlands, which were part of the open space. Subsequent figures indicated the alignment of conceptual trails, a new pocket park, and linear greens for other play areas and meeting spaces in the neighborhood.
 - He confirmed the drawings would be corrected to show the entrance to Graham Oaks Rd off Normandy Ln.
 - He clarified that a creative play feature already exists at the corner of Grenoble St and Lausanne St, addressing a concern about a symbol for a play area in the upper area of the SROZ that was not shown in some of the other maps.
 - He explained that a good way to view the parks would be as the minimum. Many developers put in additional linear greens. Even when looking at what had been approved and not built by Polygon, there were a number of additional linear greens and pocket parks.
 - A table in the Master Plan identified the park and open space amenities proposed for the development, which included the child play structures for range of ages as well as seating areas and a small gathering area.
 - The conceptual drawings of park designs, located in the Master Plan in the Technical Appendix, were intended to show that essentially what was in the table could be designed and put into the space on the ground. No sheets exist to show these conceptual drawings, so an additional sheet was developed to show that the child play areas and seating areas could fit in the proposed park areas.
 - One pocket park and two linear greens were proposed, but no neighborhood parks. The proposed development was not considered a neighborhood in the Villebois Master Plan. Many of the amenities seen in the three neighborhood parks were more scaled to the hundreds of units within walking distance or in close proximity to the other neighborhood parks.

Chair Altman said there seemed to be a difference in this specific property, in terms of the amount of SROZ, compared to the other areas of Villebois.

- Mr. Pauly agreed, adding there were many trails and some proposed amenities in the open space that were not necessarily reflected in the displayed map. (Slide 29)

Commissioner McGuire:

- Believed open space was different than a neighborhood park. Open space was a backdrop and an amenity that was provided within the neighborhood. Parks were commonplace for gathering and for sharing, which was a different experience than the open spaces. The Master Plan spoke a lot in regards to experiential parks and having different opportunities.
- Understood the proposed development was not considered a neighborhood because it was designated a Future Study Area, but it was proposed to be zoned residential.
 - Mr. Pauly responded that was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, adding was a neighborhood with a lowercase 'n', not a neighborhood with an uppercase 'N'.
- Asked if the development could have a medium neighborhood park or a light green neighborhood park.
 - He reiterated the proposal did have meeting spaces, picnic tables, a gathering area, etc. He noted they were probably getting too much into the specifics.
- Stated that what the Commission allocated to parks and to residential development was part of setting the land use pattern.

- Mr. Pauly replied that was correct, but in terms of exactly what the amenities were and where the amenities were located in the Master Plan was something the Parks Board and DRB reviewed in great detail.
 - There were gathering spaces in the pocket park towards the center if considered as a whole, which was a reasonable location. Having the amenities next to the trees was a nice location for a park versus in the middle of what was now concrete.
 - The location of pocket parks could be refined later during the subsequent development review if it was found that an amenity needed to be more centrally located. The Development Code states that as long as the amenities were still available in the SAP, the location was adjustable through the development review process.
- Mr. Pauly continued with the Staff report with responses to Commissioner questions as noted:
 - He reviewed proposed changes to utilities in Figure 6. The existing pump station would be replaced with a public sanitary sewer lift station. An additional technical appendix had information from the Engineering Staff about the preliminary requirements for design.
 - The architecture for the lift station building would likely be a part of the Community Elements Book and then the specific designs would come later.
 - Planning had been done to the point that water and sewer would be available for the entire Master Plan area, including the Future Study Area. During planning, the Applicant had used the maximum development of approximately 300 apartment units to ensure the utilities were sized sufficient for whatever ended up being built there.
 - Onsite Stormwater and Rainwater Facilities were consistent with other areas of Villebois.
 - The Current Street Plan (Figure 7) in the Master Plan, showed the street leading to the Future Study Area as “Residential Standard-Future Study Area Access”, meaning it was built slightly wider than other residential standard streets in anticipation of serving as an access.
 - In the Proposed Street Plan, that street would also serve as an access, which supported a number of existing policies in the Master Plan and Transportation Systems Plan, as well as Development Code standards. The connection was also strongly supported and required by Engineering Staff and strongly recommended in the memorandum from DKS Associates.
 - The brighter green colored streets next to parks and open space in the both Street Plans reflected a Master Plan principle that parking is not allowed adjacent to parks and open space, in order to preserve the view into them, and that would be consistent in the Future Study Area as well.
 - An additional street standard section, called Residential Median, would apply at the main entrance from Grahams Ferry Rd. Having a central median tended to be the design choice when one entrance existed to maintain spacing standards and avoid having to put accesses into important natural or treed areas.
 - He clarified that a Woonerf was essentially a shared street design that originated in Holland. One “address” in Villebois just north and east of the Piazza that had not yet been constructed contained that street section as part of the urban design.
 - He noted the memorandum from DKS & Associates, an engineering firm contracted with the City to do all of the City’s transportation analyses including traffic impact studies. He clarified that no traffic analysis had been done because the number of units had not yet been determined and this analysis was part of the quasi-judicial process. He noted the topics addressed in the memorandum. (Slide 39)

Steve Adams, Development Engineering Manager, stated the DKS study basically supported what had previously been done in Villebois regarding connectivity with enhanced crossings to allow better pedestrian movement through the Village area. The study strengthened how Villebois had been designed over the last ten years and how it had developed over the last several years.

Mr. Pauly noted the DKS study specifically called out how Villebois Dr is an important north-south connection. The study also recommended an additional nature trail connection on to Normandy Ln, not shown in the initial proposal, and supported the new street section.

Commissioner Levit noted two trail connections were shown to Coyote Way and Graham Oaks, and that dogs and bikes were not allowed on that trail. He believed it would be good to ensure that the trail connections were designed to discourage dogs and bikes.

- Mr. Pauly responded that would be addressed with subsequent conversations with Metro, who may or may not want to allow dogs and bikes on a portion of the trail.

Commissioner McGuire recalled that in work session, the consultant had mentioned they had considered two entrances off Grahams Ferry Rd, instead of only one street. She asked if that would possibly be refined later or was it the designation for the public right-of-way.

- Mr. Adams replied in previous applications prior to Polygon's, three or four years ago, there had been discussion of two connecting roads to Grahams Ferry Rd. With Polygon's application, he was only aware of the one connecting road being proposed.
- Mr. Pauly added that had some impact on trees and spacing standards.
- Mr. Adams added Grahams Ferry Rd was considered an arterial street. Ideally, the spacings should be 600 ft apart to minimize the traffic impact coming in for the north-south flow. The speed limit was currently at 40 mph and flowed better having fewer street connections.

Mr. Pauly concluded the Staff report by noting corrections to the Staff report listed on Slide 40 and entering additional attachments into the record as follows:

The following exhibits were entered into the record:

- Attachment F1: Email from Andrew James dated August 6, 2013, left out of initial published version of Attachment F. This email was included in online packet a few days later and emailed out to the Commission.
- Attachment I: Revised Figure 1. Land Use Plan dated July 26, 2013.
- Attachment J: Letter dated August 9, 2013 from Nancy Kraushaar sent to Wilsonville residents clarifying the scope of the proposed Villebois Master Plan Amendment in response to citizen comments to City Council.
- Attachment K: Online Petition submitted by Jeff Williams with 207 signatures and 7 comments received August 9, 2013.
- Attachment L: Comments received between 12:00 p.m., August 7, the deadline for the meeting packet, and 2:00 p.m., August 14, the deadline for tonight.
- Attachment M: Staff's PowerPoint presentation dated July 10, 2013.

Chair Altman asked if the various attachments, particularly the letters received that may or may not have applicable testimony for tonight's decision, were generally included in the record, or if there was anything done to limit the attachments.

- Ms. Jacobson replied no, the attachments were submitted, and similar to public testimony, the Commission would not consider anything that was irrelevant. Although submitted in good faith, distinguishing between what the Commission, City Council, and DRB would do later was a difficult process for the public to understand when there were so many steps. Including the attachments into the record would not mean it would be considered, but did acknowledge that they had been received and reviewed.

Commissioner Postma:

- Added that the attachments were not necessarily included in any future application that might involve future refinements of this plan. The public would be well informed to resubmit and/or find a way to put the information back before Staff and the appropriate review body at that time.
 - Ms. Jacobson agreed, adding that anything regarding, especially those items listed by Staff that would come before the DRB, such as tree removal, exact number of lots, road location, architecture, etc. should be resubmitted. The DRB is where these specific concerns are addressed. She noted that the same letters and emails could be resubmitted during that process. City Council would review what the

Planning Commission was reviewing, and City Council would make the final decision on tonight's recommendation.

- Confirmed that any recommendation made by the Planning Commission is passed up to City Council and everything in the Planning Commission record, which included the current exhibits submitted thus far would be available for City Council to review so no resubmissions would be necessary.

Chair Altman asked if there were any questions for Staff.

Commissioner McGuire:

- Understood the Commission had the opportunity with regard to the subject proposal to consider the number of acres dedicated to residential and open space in the Future Study Area.
 - Mr. Pauly answered yes, but clarified that what was dedicated to open space was not changing from Master Plan to Master Plan. It would be additional open space because what was currently in the Future Study Area designated as open space is currently designated in the Master Plan, so that would not change. The Commission would be splitting up and designating the 19.6 acres.
- Asked if whatever was allocated to parks would be a part of that.
 - Mr. Pauly replied that parks might also be a part of the residential as well, so it was adjustable.

Chair Altman asked whether the Planning Commission might do anything in their recommendation that would direct consideration of a neighborhood park.

- Mr. Neamtzu recommended speaking to the Applicant, adding that he had a number of items the Commission had highlighted that should be discussed further. He was eager to get to the public testimony given the late hour. He noted Commissioner McGuire was concerned about neighborhood parks, which was an area to be revisited, particularly with the Applicant.

Commissioner Postma understood that a recommendation could possibly be made that would not include a specific recommendation regarding the number of lots. He noticed the resolution did adopt the Staff report as it currently stood, adding it might be a worthwhile exercise to see if the Staff report had a notation that indicated specific lot numbers so that exclusion could be made if desired by the Commission.

Chair Altman called for the Applicant's presentation.

Fred Gast, Polygon Northwest, 109 E 13th Street, Vancouver, WA 98660, believed Staff's analysis followed a track similar to what Polygon was trying to find, which was to find a metric to show how they were hitting their objectives in their proposal. He thanked the Commission for their time in volunteering to assist the City in planning its future and the Staff for their diligent work. He especially thanked the Villebois residents for their passion for and involvement in the community, adding their passion was one reason Polygon enjoyed being part of the community.

- His presentation was to make a case for why their proposal was a good approach to the property. They needed to identify an appropriate intensity of development, or density, for the site; propose various and appropriate product mixes for the site, as far as lot size and lot arrangement; and consider the arrangement of uses on the site, which was what was being considered specifically tonight. The details would come in future applications, but Polygon believed their approach was appropriate based on some of the analysis Staff put into place that would be shown this evening.
- The proposal was based on input received throughout the process, through the work session at the Planning Commission; other DRB hearings and City Council sessions, as well as the two neighborhood meetings held specifically for this proposal. Therefore, the proposal reflects a large-lot spectrum, as opposed to the broadband or small lot, as well as the townhomes and cottages. Input stated that larger lots were needed in the marketplace and community, about which Polygon agreed.
 - The proposal had to be done within the context of the Compact Urban Development, which Villebois has been since the late 1990s, when discussions between the State and City occurred, and when the Master Plan was adopted in 2003. Large lots had to be in a context.

- Certainly, everyone agreed this is a unique site, but as he told Villebois residents, everyone would not agree on everything. There were many things Polygon could and would want to do and the Applicant had made movement since the last work session with the Commission.
- He presented several slides with the following key comments:
 - Displaying the previously proposed layout, he indicated the small lots and/or townhomes in the outer extremities of the community, adding that these were excluded from Polygon's proposal because of the input received.
 - The newer layout showed a movement toward larger lots. The first proposal had more standard and medium lots. Large lots had now been added, as well as a reduction in the target number, which was yet to be determined through subsequent proposals.
 - Community feedback stated that development in the northeast corner was more intense than desired, so Polygon not only changed the area impacted through development, but also the actual product type itself, proposing more large lots instead of standard lots. This limited the area of impact compared to what was currently impacted on the site today.
- Displaying the proposed Master Plan, he noted the changes made to the lot sizes and their locations, noting that the entire proposal was based on the condition that Polygon would work on a graduated density. In moving further from the center of Villebois, one would get into lower densities. As a correlation, the proposed intensity was similar to that through the community, but Polygon also moved away from what occurred, or was planned to occur, at the extremities.
 - Polygon also considered the immediate adjacent area, and unlike previous proposals with a more defined mix, the proposal had a higher echelon for the lower density, single-family detached product.
 - More than half of the site was designated as open space. It was a unique feature of the site.
- In summary, he stated that Polygon believed the intensity was right within the development impact area as Polygon was developing at a lower density than the other extremities of Villebois. The proposal was compatible with adjacent development and had significant setbacks on adjacency. The notion of compact urban development was balanced with a desire by the city collectively to build on a larger lot horizon. Regarding neighborhood parks, He noted the three stars indicated on the Master Plan was where the neighborhood parks and/or meeting areas should be; in some cases, they were in a regional park location.
 - Half of the subject site being designated SROZ under open space provided Polygon a lot of opportunity to do something different than the more manicured or traditional park arrangement found in the rest of the community. Polygon was trying to provide some of those elements, but to create something different and new. Park districts in the Metro area are looking for opportunities for nature play, which was Polygon's intent. There were historic trails and such, but other environments could be created that kids are not used to in a more urban scale, such as playing in the woods. More native and natural features could be done on this site, which provides a great opportunity not found in most cities.

Commissioner McGuire:

- Had hoped to have a work session before the request came to public hearing because the confusion regarding what people could and could not testify about could have been resolved, which would have resulted in a much better public process.
- Appreciated that neighborhood meetings were held and the revisions to the proposal. She was interested in seeing the area developed and happy plans were being made for it within the Master Plan, but her biggest concern was that there was no neighborhood park in the area.
- Did not believe the Land Use Pattern was the correct map to consider. The Parks and Open Space Map should be used to show the number of neighborhood parks versus pocket parks versus linear greens. She recognized the site was surrounded by open spaces, but that was a different type of amenity than a neighborhood park would serve within this neighborhood.
- Would be interested in seeing a neighborhood park somewhere within the center of the development, rather than off to the side; perhaps an additional one or two pocket parks or a neighborhood park, otherwise it would not be consistent with the rest of the Master Plan in that there were many common areas and opportunities for residents to gather. Although they could gather in the woods, they might not have the

same opportunity given there were potentially 100 homes, which was a lot of people. It would be a trek to get to the regional parks, and one of the best things about Villebois was being able to come out of the house and hang out with the neighbors.

- Noted having the additional park space would then reduce the number of houses perhaps, which directly relates to some of the other concerns heard in terms of numbers, traffic impacts, and etc.
- Asked if Polygon was willing to revise the application.
 - Mr. Gast reiterated that the site provided a unique opportunity and the neighborhood park locations did not provide much of a natural environment to take advantage of. He agreed it was a nature park environment, but believed that did serve as a neighborhood park. He had been fairly consistent on the point, as more than half the site was already dedicating to open space.
- Stated that was because it was already zoned SROZ.
 - Mr. Gast responded Polygon was proposing to add additional real estate to the SROZ, which was part of the arrangement to the SROZ, in that they could have more active and traditional gathering spaces adjacent to the SROZ. It was getting the best of both and not carving out a pocket for a play structure. There still would be opportunities for structures, for picnics and so forth, which would be part of the natural area, becoming a big community park and/or neighborhood park. He assured Commissioner McGuire that he wanted the same thing: places to connect, a key feature of Villebois. He believed he could do it in a more dynamic way than what had been done before, albeit different from the traditional grass-only park. It would have the features of community parks, but being adjacent to the SROZ would make it bigger.
- Responded that tonight the preliminary areas for the linear greens and two parks with the play structures were being set. The amendment would decide the blueprints for the future, regardless of the application. The right choices should be made so that the land would be serviced the way it should be and that the community would be served as well.
 - Mr. Gast stated he was not foreclosing Commissioner McGuire's recommendation forever and believed providing that flexibility was fine. However, he did not want to create two neighborhood parks in 113 homes, or whatever the number was ultimately.
 - Polygon needed to at least support the infrastructure provided. He understood the objective, not foreclosing the opportunity to have that dialogue and subsequent process. Polygon was identifying a lot of open space and park space, and how it moved might be part of the conversation.
 - He emphasized that his vision was to create something that was even better than what had been done previously, because it would be coupled with an SROZ and have something more than a traditional park. He believed something could be done that was more special.

Chair Altman called for public testimony regarding the proposed application.

Gary Templer, 11667 SW Grenoble St, Wilsonville, OR, stated the City has spent extensive time in designing the Villebois Master Plan in 2003. His comments regarded the Background History, on Page 2 of the amendment; Connectivity, on Page 5, which is Subsection 4.177(2)A; and the 2003 Master Street Plan, which he did not believe had changed.

- In 2003, the LEC mega church had grandiose commercial plans as stated in various letters from Mary Morrissey and other executives. Throughout Attachment G, History, there was great detail about the LEC. Their intention was not to build 300 apartments. Villebois Dr South was only widened by two feet in the 2003 Master Street Plan. He asked why the Planning Department and the City allowed all of the South Arbor area streets to be standard residential, despite many LEC letters and much discussion about the LEC future plans. There was a street stub at Villebois Dr South at Normandy that was for the LEC.
- He asked if the City normally allowed a commercial development to have an entrance and exit on to standard residential streets, and if not, why it was done in Villebois.
 - Mr. Pauly clarified that Attachment G was available only electronically and included the entire record of the various Planning Commission meetings through the years that referenced the Future Study Area and LEC over the last decade or so.

- Mr. Neamtzu stated he did not recall some of the specifics of Attachment G, but was glad to prepare a response, based on Mr. Templer's testimony, to both Mr. Templer and the Planning Commission.

Mr. Templer noted that the previous Assistant City Attorney, Paul Lee, referenced the fact that Villebois inherited the transportation connection from the State for the LEC property, which he was not able to verify. He found nothing in the public record and no one had really questioned him about it in any of the meetings he analyzed. He asked if the City Attorney could research and address that, or perhaps the Planning Director.

- Ms. Jacobson replied that Staff would look for that information.

Janelle Beals, 11964 SW Lausanne St, Wilsonville, OR 97070, urged the Commission to consider reducing the number of lots permitted to be built on the LEC land as doing so would have a very large positive impact regarding many of the issues raised regarding the development and how it would impact the entire neighborhood.

- Currently, Villebois was built on a grid pattern which was intended to maximize the amount of homes placed on the buildable land. A reduction of the homes built could open an opportunity to change the land use pattern in the streets to allow for more pocket parks, open spaces, and green spaces to be placed within the homes.
- The entire development was surrounded by green space, but no pocket homes, open spaces, or gathering spaces were actually set within the homes themselves. This is the key element in fostering the connectivity that was a hallmark of the Villebois Master Plan.

Chair Altman asked if Ms. Beals generally agreed with the Category 3 approach as far as single-family homes and the lower density, which was the focus of tonight's discussion.

- Ms. Beals replied she was happy to see the lot size increase and the move away from some of the smaller homes, which was more in keeping with the Master Plan, however the amount of land available to be developed had been maximized by the number of homes built, leaving very little room for any street pattern beyond a grid pattern, and allowing no parks to be placed among the homes. The displayed land use map did not reflect the amount of small and pocket parks that were placed throughout the community, which had a significant impact on how residents live in the community. It was important that those be included within the actual grid of developed land.

Andy James, 11976 SW Lausanne St, Wilsonville, OR 97070, state he had three points to make.

- He stressed that a disconnect exists between the Planning Commission and DRB processes. He believed the refinement process constrained the DRB process as it went through. Even if this action was not approving lot sizes, it was not approving lot layouts, etc.
 - During the refinement process, when an application is reviewed by the DRB, the only thing presented at that time was the refinements that the Applicant brought forward to make small changes. It was not clear, especially to the public, that what was being approved at the Planning Commission was actually a concept that could be substantially refined.
 - The public should know that during the DRB process, the designations could be changed within the Category 2, so changes regarding medium, large and estate lot size standards could change within the refinement process. What was presented was a summary of the Master Plan approved at the Planning Commission and the small proposed changes. The City should stress that the development of 113 homes, the street layout, the specific lots, arrangements and sizes were not locked in, which would be really appreciated for the further processes.
- The second point regarded the concept of the Villebois Master Plan. The Future Study Area would be included in the SAP-South. A lot of effort was needed to connect the subject area and make it part of one SAP-South. Having one street connection where people had to walk along the street to get into the neighborhood was not going to provide the connectivity perceived within a single SAP area.
 - The existing SAP area for SAP-South had a lot of linear greenways connecting various streets, which he used on a daily basis to get to Palermo Park and various pocket parks. A lot of off-street walking and parks could be done throughout the neighborhood.

- Having the area connected by only one street without any linear greenways connecting it, or anything else to that effect, would limit the connectivity between the two areas. It was essential to bring the area into the fold of SAP-South and have the linear greens pathways connected beyond just the trails. He did not want to have to go through a forest to get to the other part of a neighborhood.
- His final comment regarded the street layouts. The streets in a lot of the areas, especially in the southwest and southeast of the subject proposal, were reversed from the rest of the neighborhood when bordering a SROZ. For example, Normandy Ln bordered the SROZ, providing easy community access to trails into the Graham Oaks area.
 - As presented, the areas along the south and southwest of the Future Study Area were all residential lots that backed up against the SROZ and Graham Oaks area and that plan would not significantly change through the refinement process. When walking along those areas, people would be looking at houses rather than at the environment.

Robert Walliker, 29164 SW San Remo Ct, Wilsonville, OR 97070, shared the history of the land around his home. Previously a potato field, the City had the developer, Arbor Homes, turn the field into a stormwater retention area. A 30-inch pipe delivers all the water from north of his property into that area. There are cattails, retention ponds, and an overflow facility that flows down under San Remo Court and into a second water retention area that eventually goes downhill to the south.

- He had heard about an area that would be wetlands. Although unsure where the wetland originates, he knew that some stormwater flows through the trees as surface water. If there were wetlands there, or a wetland area would be created, he asked for a guarantee that the water would flow south rather than north and back into that retention area. Many homeowners have extra insurance in the event of an overflow, though the engineers might say that would never happen.
- He asked where the water came from and how it would reach a wetland in the new development area.

Chair Altman responded that he was involved in some of the LEC planning and explained that groundwater was feeding the wetlands. Three categories are used to create a wetland: soil condition, vegetation and water source. A stream ran through there at one time that had been cut off, but there was still a groundwater source that fed the area in the north that extends up into the existing portion of Villebois. He confirmed there was some groundwater there already that flowed south. Before there had been some field sheet flows that also fed the area.

Mr. Walliker stated the water did stay on top of the surface. The bark dust trail there becomes muddy during the winter. He asked who owned the area that was created to retain the stormwater that eventually flowed south into the LEC area. The pond was east of San Remo and south of Grenoble.

- Mr. Adams believed the pond being discussed was Pond N of the Villebois Master Plan. It was the headwaters of a forested wetland that Kerry Rappold could talk more about.
 - The pond did collect stormwater from a small group of homes north of Grenoble and emptied there. It was not connected to the larger detention Pond M, which was on San Remo. They were two completely different water basins and flowed to two different areas independently. There were no connections between the two.
- Kerry Rappold, Natural Resources Program Manager, noted that Chair Altman did well in describing that groundwater was a major contributor to the onsite wetlands. He recently reviewed the wetland delineation report, which stated that the water table came within 12 inches of the surface. Thus, the forested wetlands were primarily dependent on the groundwater resource. However, there was a connection between the surface water, Pond N, and the forest preserve area south of it. When Pond "N" was designed, a channel went around the edge of it with a little weir structure that allowed water to back up into the wetland. They could see if the weir was functioning properly, which it should. He confirmed there were a number of different sources as far as the actual hydrology.

Mr. Walliker asked that if the weir would be looked at because it was part of the City's property.

- Mr. Rappold replied no, he understood that the homeowners association (HOA) was responsible for it.

- Mr. Adams confirmed that both Pond M and N and the surrounding land were owned and managed by the Arbor HOA.

Nathan Knight, 11973 SW Lausanne St, Wilsonville, OR 97070, stated he had reviewed some of the previous issues that had come before DRB. In the past, it appears that the DRB just measured proposals against the Master Plan or proposals already proposed, and had a fairly limited ability, or did not understand their full ability to make revisions to proposals. It appeared like they stayed with what the applicant has proposed with only minor tweaks. He was concerned that if a certain number of acreage was adopted for residential homes that it would set the standard for the number of homes, despite statements to the contrary. The Commission had a plan that already determined the density and lot sizes, so essentially the number of homes being built was being set if the proposal was adopted tonight.

- If that was the case, there should be more public involvement at this stage, rather than later on. Or be willing to accept some real robust community involvement and changes when it does come. He was a bit disappointed. A letter from the City had stated that this was not the time to comment; the time would come later. He believed the letter had repressed a lot of feedback that would have been received tonight and there would have been much more involvement from the neighborhood. He was concerned that the proposal was going to get kicked down the road and DRB would be stuck with what was approved tonight.
- He had some very specific concerns, but apparently this was not the time to address them. However, one major concern was traffic. The two primary streets in the neighborhood that would be impacted were Villebois Dr South and Normandy Ln. He invited the Commissioners to stand on one of those roads at 7:50 am on a school day and try to imagine school-age children from another 113 homes trying to get to Lowrie School.
 - When the Master Plan was initially proposed, the school was at the corner of Tooze Rd and Grahams Ferry Rd. He expected the assumptions were that traffic would go out Grahams Ferry Rd and up to the school, and not routed through the existing homes.
 - He was aware the report stated that the Master Plan's traffic study was based on the possibility of 300 apartments, and since this proposal was less than 300 units, analyzing traffic studies was not necessary. He would have liked to have seen the details of the study and have the Commission review the study before making a decision. He noted if now was not the proper time, then he would push for that during the DRB process.
- Admittedly, this was a confusing process for the public. His sense from previous issues that had come before DRB was that there was a very limited review to "soften the edges" before pushing an application through.

Commissioner Levit responded that community members were doing research and becoming experts. He commented that a number of Planning Commissioners had been on the DRB. He reassured that, from personal experience, that citizen involvement could have a huge effect on the outcome, so he encouraged participation.

Commissioner Postma shared the same sentiments. Citizens needed to remember that they were a part of the DRB process of holding the DRB to task to ensure that Board implemented a community that looked like what was being planned now. If something was approved now, the DRB needed the citizens' assistance in ensuring that it got implemented down the road. He encouraged those with concerns to stay engaged in the DRB process. Several of the Commissioners had been through that and it was invaluable to hear such input.

- It was difficult for a DRB member to not just go along with what an applicant may put out there, unless there was some community involvement that said they had envisioned something different based upon the plan that they understood to be in place. He repeated that DRB needed their assistance in that process if they wanted to ensure that it occurred.
- He reassured them not to be discouraged by the fact that it was a difficult process, adding that Chair Altman had been a former Planning Director and had decades of experience, and yet, he still asked questions. Staff was available to answer questions and the Commission relished the opportunity to receive community input. It was important to understand the community's desires, but to also have the community

hold the boards accountable and that the finished product was actually what had been planned and what the community had intended from the outset. He repeated that community members needed to stay engaged because they were needed in the process.

Commissioner Levit added it did not always come across in the records of the meetings but, public involvement was rare. He agreed that having the community's feedback was important.

Chair Altman agreed. The Commission was accustomed to meeting in an empty room, so it was encouraging to see the people present, concerned, and giving direction. It was unfortunate that the process was complicated enough that it was hard for everybody to understand, but he encouraged those present not to give up, adding that it was just the beginning of this process. They were making an initial refinement to the Land Use Plan that would set things in motion where the community really would get to be involved. He expected the developer would continue to coordinate with the community as they moved forward to those refinements.

Commissioner McGuire agreed with Mr. Knight's comment in that a better job could have been done in terms of public process. The Commission does always have an empty room.

- Another role of the Planning Commission was being the Committee for Citizen Involvement (CCI). A petition was received from 214 people inquiring to conduct additional public process. Putting it in a public hearing format added more pressure for the Commission to make a decision and was not fair for those who attended because they could not hear the Commission have more of a conversation about the proposal, so that they could sort out the differences that occur within the Planning Commission and DRB.
- She believed they had made the issue even more confusing. She was even confused and it was her second term on the Planning Commission. The application said, "the development of approximately 113 detached residential units." To say that the Commission was not setting a standard for the DRB for future decisions was not accurate. If everyone had shown up tonight and was done with it because they felt frustrated and the proposal was adopted as is, that was what the DRB would see, unless there was an opportunity for the Commission to add other additional guiding language in the Master Plan.

Commissioner Postma agreed, adding it had become more problematic in instances where that was built upon because the Applicant, for obvious reasons, had a desire to have higher numbers than what may have already been approved or considered previously. It was a problem that compounded itself, which was why it was important. He hoped the Commission could discuss it and find ways to mitigate the potential concerns.

Commissioner Millan added that she was on the DRB many years ago during the original SAP Plan, and she was also a bit confused. The Staff report stated it was going to be part of the SAP-South Plan, which meant the Applicant would use the same architectural books used when the south area and street layout was conceived. However, she just heard that it could be changed, so there was confusion on the Commission's part as well. She appreciated Mr. Knight's concerns about it being more of a "done deal" when it reached the DRB. She believed the Commission would have to discuss some of the information presented.

Chair Altman stated he did not want to close the hearing yet in order to continue discussion with the Commission and receive direction from Staff. He reviewed the Proposed Amendment Section on Page 3 of 37 of the Staff report which summarized what the proposed amendment included. [1042]

- He noted the Staff report did not include the 113 number, which he considered appropriate. However, it did appear later in the process of determining the number of lots. It seemed the Commission was in the process of allocating land use and the reference in this context was by acres.
- He believed that as long as it said "preliminary" and the Commission included the word "approximately" in each of the categories on Page 3, they were not pinning it down to a specific number of lots.
- In addition, rather than referring to the "medium-size," he would reference "Category 2" as the land use that the Commission was recommending be applied, because they were making a recommendation to the City Council.

Commissioner McGuire noted the Staff report differed from the actual application; the draft amendment had revisions to the Master Plan text that allocated acreage to pocket parks and—

Chair Altman agreed, but clarified the Commission was only adopting the Staff report as a recommendation to City Council, and not the application, which was why he wanted to make that distinction.

- His concern was that there were many things in the Applicant's proposal that the Commission was not acting on. They were only acting on the limited list of things that he read and making a recommendation for the land use change to the Master Plan. He welcomed further discussion from the Commission.

Commissioner McGuire quoted the title of the resolution to emphasize the language.

Commissioner Postma clarified the Commission would be adopting the Staff report, which included exhibits and attachments, which are the application but was not specifically included in the recommendation. He noted the "NOW, THEREFORE," language of the resolution, stating the Commission would only be adopting the planning report, essentially.

Commissioner McGuire responded that the title portion was recommending adopting the ordinance to amend the Villebois Village Master Plan.

Chair Altman stated that the language did not say the Commission was adopting the Applicant's proposal.

Commissioner McGuire stated that it read, "Approve and adopt the proposed Villebois Village Master Plan as approved."

Commissioner Postma agreed that was the title, noting the adoptive language at the "NOW, THEREFORE" read, "To adopt the Planning Staff report as presented..." He added revisions could be made to be certain that any reference to the number of lots was removed.

Chair Altman said that was right, because the "as presented" was subject to revision.

Commissioner McGuire asked how that was helpful to City Council.

Commissioner Postma explained the exercise was to ensure the Commission was adopting, essentially, a zoning amendment that indicated the number of dwelling units per acre in that specific area and the maps that implement that. To the extent of excluding any indication of lot designations or numbers, he understood the Commission was not necessarily recommending that the development look like that or include that number of lots.

Ms. Jacobson confirmed Commissioner Postma was correct. She explained the Commission was recommending that the site be developed as single-family residential, as opposed to allowing for multi-family row houses or commercial. Secondly, the Commission was recommending that it be single-family residential larger lots, as designated in the medium, standard, and large category, which would exclude the smaller lots.

- As far as the 113 number reference, the Applicant was saying that using larger lots in the plan, which would require review by Staff, the outside architect, and DRB, would work. The Commission could state they were not recommending any specific number of lots, but only the Category 2 designation. The 113 was not part of the Staff report at this point.

Commissioner McGuire:

- Responded that the recommendation of the Staff report and the proposed amendment from the Applicant, which included the numbers, would go before the Council.

- Ms. Jacobson reiterated the Commission's recommendation would specify Category 2 lots, and that no recommendation was being made about any given number of residences, which would be determined later.
- Asked if more specific guiding language could be added. The Master Plan had the Future Study Area in it with whatever guidance they had to date. Was there a way to add some guiding policy to that element that directed how the area would be developed; that at a high, conceptual Master Plan level there would be common space outside the open space where people could gather. It seemed that if the Commission was removing the "Future Study Area" text, they should be able to revise the Master Plan to provide guidance. Did such direction have to come from the Applicant or could the Commission add some guiding language?
 - Mr. Neamtzu replied he could see two ways it could happen. The Commission could provide specific bulleted recommendations to be considered by the Council as part of their review or propose language in the form of an implementation measure that could possibly land in one of the various larger sections of the Master Plan. If it were a Park and Open Space standard, a sentence could be crafted specific to the Future Study Area and consideration for park development.
 - Implementation measures have been used in the past as a placeholder, so items would not be overlooked. He noted such small references could be found throughout the Master Plan.

Commissioner Postma believed the easiest method would be adding the implementation language, because the resolution was the Commission's craft as they saw fit. Additional recommendations beyond those already included in the Staff report could be included inside that language. The City Council would be receiving the resolution and the entirety of the Commission's record.

Commissioner McGuire asked if another resolution could be done that would include the implementation measures and policies to couple with the proposed package, adding she wanted to be explicit.

Commissioner Postma responded it would be the same thing because it was all a recommendation. To do a different resolution that had a recommendation on the exact same project was redundant.

- The Commission was providing some guiding principles in response to what they saw after going through the process a bit longer than Council.

Chair Altman suggested focusing on the language on Pages 2 and 3 of the Staff report under Proposed Amendment, which was being adopted as the specific recommendation under the "NOW, THEREFORE," portion of the resolution. That language could be edited to add suggestions, such as using "approximately" in the acreage references, and specifically listing Category 2 as the single-family category. Other pieces could be added on Page 3 of the Staff report as well.

- He was not committed yet on the neighborhood park. He agreed with the Applicant that there were some good opportunities to do something generally consistent with the Villebois Master Plan, but not the same, because it was not the same property. The property was significantly than the open field that the Dammasch Hospital was built on, so it was not the same. There were natural resources and wetlands, providing opportunities to do something unique.
 - If anything, the Commission may want to emphasize the gathering concept under the Park Section and how that would play out in the implementation or design of the area. He was not convinced that it needed to be a neighborhood park in the traditional sense. [1044 1:10]

Commissioner Millan agreed with making refinements to what was listed, but noted that Specific Changes, on Pages 3 and 4 of 37, stated, "Below is a list of the changes to the Villebois Village Master Plan requested by the applicant." She was unclear whether Staff had included those changes in the recommendation. She wanted to ensure the Commission was not agreeing to something that they did not agree with; that was her concern.

Chair Altman suggested that list be reviewed to determine whether it also needed editing. He clarified it would be the Proposed Amendment and Specific Changes that could carry onto Page 4 that should be reviewed for edits.

Commissioner McGuire confirmed that the public hearing could be continued so the Commission could make refinements and then provide an opportunity for people to comment on the changes.

Chair Altman understood Commissioner Millan's concern was that the Specific Changes began to reference specific figures that he was not necessarily committed to.

Commissioner Millan agreed, adding she was not sure she had cross-referenced each item to know what she was and was not agreeing to.

Commissioner Levit stated that if too much was specified about pocket parks, he was concerned about the property being isolated, and not a part of Villebois. A neighborhood park would take away incentive for people to go to the rest of Villebois. He was unsure if it was the best method, but according to the map and street layout, the number of green spaces and green areas in the proposed development were not atypical of other parts of the development. That said he did not want to preclude having a very creative thing done.

- There could not be more than one road connection to the rest of the community because it would go through the SROZ. To get around, even to get to the school, he believed traffic from the subject development would probably go up Grahams Ferry Rd and come in one of the major connectors, rather than going through all the little neighborhood streets.
- He was willing to leave it without a recommendation about the number of homes and parks. It would take a lot of creativity and thought to make it work, but the area would residential, which was the only thing that would work in that area.

Commissioner McGuire agreed, but did not see the creativity in that number of proposed houses and lots. She understood the Commission was not approving the number, but that was in the Applicant's proposed amendment that would go to City Council, so it was an important context.

Commissioner Postma responded it was not in the proposed amendments, but in the application.

Commissioner McGuire corrected that it was in the proposed amendment plan text on Page 5 of the Master Plan amendment. She agreed she would not want to stifle it either, but she did not see the opportunity for creativity. She saw that if the Applicant had playgrounds in the woods space, but that common-space element was still missing and would not be difficult to implement; it could entail a reduction of some houses.

Commissioner Levit noted the third bullet under the Specific Changes referenced Page 5 of the Staff report, which did indeed have a number of lots.

- Mr. Pauly responded that was just acknowledging what the Applicant said.

Commissioner Postma agreed it was not including a recommendation, but pointing that was the number the Applicant included. Again, if that was a concern, it could be mitigated by clearly indicating that the Commission was not providing a recommendation about the number of lots to City Council.

Commissioner McGuire agreed, adding that she preferred that the Commission be vocal, rather than silent. When making a decision, if there was nothing there that also informed the action.

Commissioner Postma noted that the remainder of the sentence specifically stated, "this number is "preliminary and should not be viewed as approval of the development of this many lots." That single reference did not include a recommendation and specifically said it was not a recommendation.

Chair Altman believed the focus should be on how to amend Pages 2 through 4, and then make clear that the Commission was responding to and not acting on the Applicant's proposal. He suggested amending the bullet points of the Proposed Amendment section on Page 3 of the Staff report as follows:

- The first bullet would read, "Preliminarily identify **approximately** 12.5 acres" or possibly **12 acres**, he was uncertain, "for development of larger single-family lots ~~(medium-sized to estate-sized)~~ **Category 2 land use.**" The remainder of the bullet was clear and was not committing to anything in terms of numbers.
- He clarified that Category 2 included estate and large lot sizes.
- Following discussion about whether to specify that it was the buildable land outside the SROZ, he stated that the reason for "approximate" was that the SROZ could still be refined; the numbers could change.

Commissioner Postma added that they would not want to preclude the opportunity for the Applicant to include estate lots.

Commissioner McGuire sought clarification why changes were being made to the Staff report, when language under the Proposed Amendment stated, "To summarize, the proposed Master Plan amendment, if approved, would do the following for the Future Study Area," She questioned why changes were being made to the bullet points despite any possible contradictions in the Proposed Amendment.

Commissioners Levit replied they had not gotten that far yet.

Chair Altman clarified they were narrowing the scope of what the Commission was acting on, regardless of what the Applicant proposed, to a certain extent.

Commissioner McGuire asked if the purpose of doing so was so the Commission could make a decision.

Chair Altman answered no, the purpose was to narrow the scope so the Commission was not approving everything that was submitted.

Commissioner McGuire asked if the Commission could just reject the proposal.

Chair Altman responded that was another option. He continued amending the bullet points of the Proposed Amendment section on Page 3 of the Staff report as follows:

- In the second bullet, "Preliminarily identify **approximately** 7.1 acres for right-of-way including streets, sidewalks, and landscape strips, medians..."
 - He believed it appropriate to add a design guide to address the concern raised about the streets not abutting open space, because that was inconsistent with the rest of the Master Plan Land Use Map.
- Third bullet, "Continue to show ~~over~~ **approximately** half the site, approximately 23 of the 43 acres as preserved open space."
 - It seemed appropriate to add two guidelines in the third bullet that would provide the gathering space locally, not just offsite, as well as a design reference regarding the refinement to emphasize and include connectivity to the existing neighborhoods as a design element

Commissioner Levit noted "Preliminary" should be corrected to "Preliminarily" in both sentences of the third bullet. He suggested removing "0.4 acres" to keep it more open.

Chair Altman agreed, adding the focus was on how the overall open space within this area was developed; some was SROZ, but not all of it. Through the refinement, the Applicant should consider how to create the best connectivity to the existing neighborhoods and provide the localized gathering space.

Commissioner Millan stated that in support of the Applicant coming up with new and creative ideas, all the studies have found that children actually spent less time playing when in an organized play area than in an unorganized play area.

Chair Altman noted no changes were necessary to the fourth and sixth bullet points on Page 3 of the Staff report. It was obvious the sewer pump needed to change and it made sense to recommend that it be part of SAP South. Onsite stormwater was generally already addressed within other parts of the process.

Commissioner Levit noted “our” should be corrected to “are” in the last sentence of the fourth bullet.

Chair Altman said was unsure what to do with the next section, Specific Changes. His concern was that the Commission did not necessarily want to adopt all the figures.

Commissioner McGuire:

- Raised a point of order, noting that the Commission was past its meeting end time and the City Council had procedures in place for what happens. She felt she was not at a point to give sufficient thought to changes that she would feel comfortable voting on. She wanted to ensure the changes were given adequate thought. It was the Commission’s responsibility to everyone that participated that it not be rushed through, given the testimony already received. She asked what procedures might be considered that the City Council followed.
 - Ms. Jacobson replied that a motion could be made to continue the hearing if the Commission felt a decision could not be made tonight, which would provide more time to work on the changes.
- Asked if revisions could be made via email, and perhaps have a special meeting.
 - Ms. Jacobson answered no, the Commission needed to do it in public, so the hearing would need to be continued. The hearing could be closed to any more public testimony, but it could be left open for the Commission; or it could be left open for additional public testimony.

Chair Altman suggested reaching a point where the specific recommended changes were made to the Staff report, and then consider whether a decision should be made tonight or the hearing continued. At that point, at least Staff would have direction and if the hearing was continued, Staff could revise the Staff report based on the tonight’s discussion.

- He suggested that the Specific Changes section not be specifically addressed, but have it edited to state, “Specific Changes Proposed by the Applicant” that the Commission was not acting upon.

Commissioner Postma agreed that was an excellent idea, adding that perhaps the bullet points could be refined with some specific revisions to leave it as is. However, he suggested a different approach; that the Commission pinpoint the items of concern in the Specific Changes so broad language could be specifically included to exclude certain things. He considered language that recommended the Staff report, excluding any recommendations with regard to lot numbers. The Commission could review the list, very preliminarily, to determine the key items the Commission wanted to ensure were addressed properly, and then provide a broad recommendation that the Commission was not recommending those specific items, or any recommendation with regard to lot numbers wherever they might be found in the remainder of the report.

Commissioner McGuire:

- Agreed with the suggestion. She asked if City Council made the decision on the lot numbers.
 - Ms. Jacobson explained that the 113 was a preliminary number proposed by Polygon that could still be modified. However, if Polygon decided to stay with that number in their application, they would have to present to Staff how the 113 lots would lay out and the proposal would have to pass scrutiny with Staff and the reviewing architect. Then, Staff would write a report, either recommending or disagreeing with the number of lots, to the DRB, where additional testimony could be heard. Then the DRB would make the ultimate decision.
- Asked how the DRB would know the number of lots to review.

Commissioner Postma explained there was some semblance of density or lots per acre based on the Master Plan, so the lots would still fit within the number of dwelling units per acre for the area.

Chair Altman added that SAP-South also had design criteria that leads to [unknown 1048 1:56]

Commissioner McGuire believed the current 113 lots fit within the proposed density.

- Mr. Pauly responded Staff had not checked to ensure the lot sizes and such fit in.

Chair Altman expressed concern about whether the specific Master Plan figures should all be acted on or flagged as a concern.

Commissioner Hurley understood most of the changes under Specific Changes regarded the removal of the "Future Study Area" labels.

- Mr. Pauly stated the list under Proposed Amendments was based on the Specific Changes list, so in his professional opinion the lists mirrored each other.
- Regarding the parks, he explained that with regard to the DRB refinement language, as long as the amenity is available within that SAP, it could be moved around essentially anywhere within the SAP.

Chair Altman:

- Stated his concern was that the Commission not adopt the figures showing specific things related to the criteria provided, such as the focus on open space in the bullets on page 3 regarding connectivity and providing gathering spaces.
 - Mr. Pauly responded that historically speaking, locations of pocket parks, especially, have moved quite a bit at the DRB level, as well as any included amenities.
- Noted as an example that the Commission did not necessarily agree with Figure 5, Parks and Open Space Plan as presented by Applicant, so there was concern about including Figure 5 in the Commission's action.

Commissioner Postma suggested the Commission recommend further refinement considerations of Figure 5 with regard to the Parks and Open Space Plan, or to meet the goals and objectives of the bullet points Staff had before.

- Mr. Pauly added if any specific amenities should be considered, a table in the Master Plan listed the different amenities.

Chair Altman reiterated that Figure 5 was not necessarily what the Commission expected, and the same with the street plan. He agreed with the two connection points and the median connection, but had a concern that lots backed up to open space rather than a street light in the rest of the neighborhood.

- Mr. Pauly responded there was a mix of that as well in the remainder of the neighborhood.

Commissioner McGuire inquired if there could be a Linear Green behind those lots to provide a buffer between those houses and Graham Oaks Nature Park.

- Mr. Pauly explained that portion of Graham Oaks was trees. Beyond Metro's little road, it was forest canopy. The trees on the Graham Oaks property would block that part of the development from the Tonquin Trail. He assured that was something Staff considered when reviewing the initial lot layout.

Chair Altman believed Staff had a feel for the Commission's position. He did not believe it was necessary to ask the Applicant's preference regarding a continuance; it was the Commission's decision whether they could make a good decision tonight.

- He called for the Commission's general consensus about how to proceed, to give Staff direction as discussed and continue the hearing, or close the hearing and continue with just the Commission's portion.

Commissioner McGuire responded she would like to give Staff direction. She would like to make the proposal work and see if the right place could be reached. Then, given the amount of comments received, she believed it was preferable to keep the hearing open to share any refinements and ensure the Commission was giving due process.

Commissioner Phelps agreed, adding the proposed amendment needed to be tweaked so that anyone reading it could understand it. The meeting should be left open to the extent that the public could comment. Even if the process was closed for public comment, it would probably be overridden next time because people would want to comment and that should be allowed by the Commission.

- He would like to see the actual words being proposed. He asked why all the specificity was in the Staff report. The Commission was making a recommendation about whether or not the area should be residential. Why were other issues included that had caused additional discussion about specific changes when the decision regarded whether to have residential or not. He had not recognized a lot of what was discussed from that point of view.
- He recommended that serious consideration be given to removing the specifics from the Staff report and reducing it to what the Commission was to decide and adopt.

Chair Altman said he had a similar concern.

Commissioner Millan responded they were actually amending the Villebois Master Plan, which did contain some specificity; it was not just about the category of housing.

Commissioner Phelps:

- Agreed, but noted the Commission was only amending the Master Plan to the extent that the Future Study Area was no longer a Future Study Area and that the site would be developed with residential. It was not an overhaul of the entire plan.
 - Commissioner McGuire added they were also looking at [inaudible 1050 :49]
 - Mr. Pauly stated Staff's intent was to reflect the same components that exist throughout the Master Plan.
- Believed that placed a burden on the process that the process could not carry. Amending the whole plan would be a whole different episode.
 - Mr. Pauly noted that at same time, all the details were preliminary and subject to change.
- Believed that was a Staff agenda, not a public policy agenda. He just could not get there from here.
 - Mr. Pauly explained that the Villebois Master Plan would be relied on by thousands of residents for many years, so having it consistent and clear across the entire map was an important consideration.
- Stated they started off with the notion that the Commission would amend the Master Plan, and not decide what would be done in the Study Area, but the Staff report was amending the entire Plan. He had not reviewed the entire Master Plan, so he did not have a context in which to measure what the Commission was attempting to do.

Chair Altman responded the bullets on Page 3 showed what the Commission was doing and that was it.

Commissioner Phelps noted that changes were being made to the bullets.

Chair Altman stated he was leaning toward everything past the bullets was what the Applicant submitted for consideration, and the Commission was acting on the specific land use decision issues.

Commissioner Phelps deferred to Chair Altman's representation because he believed Chair Altman understood it better. However, he wanted to see the language before voting.

Commissioner McGuire agreed.

Commissioner Hurley agreed with Commissioner Phelps, but added that it seemed they were removing the label "For Future Study," and effectively adding the label "For Study," meaning that because someone wanted to develop it, it would be studied now instead of in the future with the intent to make it part of Villebois along with all the other baggage that Villebois had with it. The Commission would not comment on any of that, but

only decide whether the area would be residential or not. The six bullet points the Commission was addressing spoke of it being single-family, and the Commission would add that it was Category 2 residential, that there would be streets and parks, the area would become part of the SAP and that sewer lines and the rainwater must be addressed.

- Mr. Pauly explained that the list of Specific Changes put those bullets into what existed in the Master Plan, changing the existing documents to match the bullets.

Commissioner Postma stated the issue was that there were so much testimony and input that it looked broader than it was. However, the Staff report was actually pretty compact in its recommendations. The problem was that the Commission was focusing on extraneous items, rather than the specific recommendations being made. In his opinion, Chair Altman's exercise in editing the bullet points and addressing the Specific Changes, as well as the figures, could probably be done quickly and succinctly, though he was uncertain it could occur tonight given the late hour.

- He urged everyone to realize that it was more compact than they believed; they were looking too far past Page 5, when in reality the recommendations to City Council were contained on Pages 2 through 4.
- He understood the desire to ensure there was enough clarity that the Commission did not stray from that. He agreed a concern exists regarding what would happen with DRB; a level would be set by the Commission and because of impetus, everyone would want to build upon it more and it becomes something more than how it began.

Commissioner McGuire replied the Commission was doing more than just changing it to residential. They were also looking at the associated infrastructure, lot types, parks, etc. She believed that framing it as they were only doing a residential zone change was misleading because it was more than that.

Commissioner Postma disagreed; the recommendation regarded the six bullet points on Pages 3 of 37 in the Staff report.

Commissioner McGuire stated she would like to look at what the Commission would be voting on in print.

Chair Altman stated it was clear from the discussion that the hearing would be continued. In that context, he suggested that Staff be directed to revise Page 3 of the Staff report as discussed, and that the resolution be amended under the "NOW, THEREFORE " to specifically list those same bulleted items that specifically listed what would be adopted as well as the Staff findings regarding the demonstration of compliance with the State and regional requirements.

Commissioner Postma understood the revisions were to change the six bullet points as indicated, make any reference changes needed in the Specific Changes section to mirror the changes made to the six bullet points, and revise the language to the resolution. He volunteered reading something to the record if desired.

Commission Hurley agreed with the direction of the revisions, except that the final paragraph on Page 5 of 37 under The Villebois Process and Determining Number of Lots. He understood it was not determining the number of lots, but inquired whether the paragraph should be struck because the 113 number was in the Staff report and they had discussed removing it.

Commissioner Postma replied the second sentence of that final paragraph could be revised to say, "While numbers are used in the Figure 1: Land Use Plan showing ~~113~~ **the number of** single-family lots in the Future Study Area".

Commissioner Hurley believed it would prevent having a DRB issue down the road regarding 113.

Commissioner Postma commented he was not conceding it was necessary, but it could be added.

Commissioner Millan moved to continue LP13-0005 to September 11, 2013 Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner McGuire seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Chair Altman clarified that the hearing was still open for public comment and that Staff would be provided with recommended revisions for the Staff report and resolution.

Ms. Jacobson asked that Commissioner Postma e-mail the language to her.

VIII. OTHER BUSINESS

A. 2013 Planning Commission Work Program

Chair Altman noted more work had been continued for the work program.

B. Commissioners' Comments

Commissioner Levit noted a couple of acres at the north corner of Day Rd and Boones Ferry Rd had been cleared of trees. He asked if that was part of the project to rebuild Boones Ferry Rd.

- Mr. Neamtzu confirmed that was Washington County's jurisdiction and not part of the road project. It was a private logging operation on private property in the Basalt Creek planning area.

Commissioner Levit confirmed there would be a joint meeting with City Council in October.

- Mr. Neamtzu responded that the date was to be determined. Staff would be in touch with specifics.

Ms. Jacobson requested that questions regarding LP13-0005 be directed to Staff, especially since the hearing was left open and many issues still needed to be resolved. If questions were directed to Staff and other Commissioners were copied on it, she advised the Commissioners to be careful not to reply to all inadvertently, which would constitute an outside public meeting. One way avoid the issue was to blind copy so responses would only come to one Commissioner and not the entire body.

Commissioner McGuire requested a briefing with Staff about the proposed Villebois Master Plan Amendments

- Ms. Jacobson encouraged her to call any Staff member.

Commissioner Levit noted a number of emails stated that some of the houses built by Polygon did not have porches or courtyards. He asked that was allowed to get through Staff and the DRB if it went against the Pattern Book.

- Mr. Pauly responded porches and courtyards were optional in the Pattern Book. In the most recent approval, however, a condition required there to be a number and pattern of courtyards. He studied the different phases of both Matrix and Arbor to determine the patterns used for courtyards and found they were generally located along the linear greens or streets where the houses were closer to the street.
- The project where grading had just begun in the northern of Villebois was required to have a certain percentage of courtyards. Staff would be encouraging courtyards to the extent possible as development moved into SAP-East as well.

Commissioner McGuire stated she had heard concerns in the same realm with the Pattern Book because different architecture or façade for new houses would go through an administrative review process with the contracted City Architect, so there was no public process element. Even though concepts are showed at the DRB, the final approval was made administratively. Products on the street have caused concern because people do not know how it was approved.

- Mr. Pauly understood, adding that was by design and very intentional with the Master Plan because Staff and the neighbors could debate architectural details endlessly. It made sense to have third party architect to be the arbitrator and make decisions on whether or not a specific façade met the Architectural Pattern Book.

VIII. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

- A. Basalt Creek Concept Plan update
- B. Frog Pond Grant update
- C. Advance Road UGB expansion update

Commissioner Phelps announced that the Metro Hearings Office recommended that the 40-acre Advance Road property be added, in all respects, under the UGB expansion process as requested by the West Linn-Wilsonville School District. The Wilsonville Chamber had written a letter in support of the request and was provided a copy of the Hearings Officer's report dated August 12, 2013.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Altman adjourned the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 10:16 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

By Paula Pinyerd of ABC Transcription Services, Inc. for
Linda Straessle, Planning Administrative Assistant