

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
WEDNESDAY, JULY 10, 2013  
6:00 P.M.**

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

**Approved  
August 14, 2013**

---

**Minutes**

---

**I. CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL**

Vice Chair Postma called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m. Those present:

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

City Staff: Katie Mangle, Barbara Jacobson 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

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

**V. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES**

The June 12, 2013 Planning Commission minutes were unanimously approved as presented.

**VI. WORK SESSIONS**

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

**Daniel Pauly, Associate Planner**, briefly presented the Staff report via PowerPoint, noting the location of the Future Study Area, reviewing the Villebois planning process and overviewing the proposed Master Plan amendments. A public hearing was scheduled for the August Planning Commission meeting.

Jim Lange, Pacific Community Design, 12564 SW Main St, Tigard, OR thanked the Planning Commission for taking the time to have the work session. The Applicant had done a substantial amount of work and believed sharing that work with the Commission in an informal setting might make for a more productive public session. He presented the proposed Villebois Village Master Plan amendments with these key comments:

- He briefly presented the background on the Villebois site as a whole, noting its framework, overall layout, features and general densities. Based on the framework, the Future Study Area was expected to be less dense than the rest of the Villebois project

- He displayed an aerial photograph, noting the key features of the existing site, including parking lots, the main facility, temporary housing, etc. Tunnels also connected various site features.
- Figure 1, dated July 3, 2013, was the proposed update to the Master Plan, which included a combination of medium alley-loaded product and standard, front-loaded product for 122 units.
  - He indicated the Significant Resource Overlay Zone (SROZ) and explained how the footprint and density of the site were chosen. Referencing the aerial photograph, he noted that the site plan essentially laid over the existing parking lot, hospital site, parking, maintenance facilities and housing. The density corresponded to what the Applicant believed was consistent with the Master Plan goals. The Applicant was involved with a prior attempt on the same site by a different developer that desired front-loaded lots. That proposal never reached formal application as it was considered inconsistent with the pedestrian-oriented theme of the rest of the development.
- The site was complicated and had lots of resources, so the Applicant had engaged in a process with Staff to walk the site, flagging wetlands and the SROZ, which had been established on a very rough level. A detailed audit with an arborist was also completed of all the trees in close proximity to the development footprint, which influenced the layout. The layout evolved after various visits to the site and discussions with Staff
  - Staff had provided input about a drainage condition and preferred consolidating the drainage facilities as much as possible into one facility, which the Applicant had been updated in the plan.
  - As encouraged by Staff, the Applicant was able to preserve a grove of trees located outside the SROZ, which they had not anticipated.
- After submitting the Master Plan, Staff also suggested eliminating the small lots in the development, so the Master Plan amendment application was resubmitted with all the small lots removed and only alley-loaded medium and front-loaded standard lots proposed.
- Half of the approximately 43-acre site would remain as parks and open space. The overall density was 2.8 dwelling units per acre, which was not very dense. He compared the proposed lot types to those in applications adjacent to this development and to prior Polygon applications (Slide 5: Type Distribution Comparison Table) as follows:
  - The proposed application had 38% large or standard lots, 62% were medium lots and no small lots.
  - Arbor Phase 4, which wraps around the site, had 35% large or standard lots, 9% medium and 56% small lots, so it was more skewed to small lots and row homes as opposed to medium lots.
  - The Tonquin applications, which he indicated on the Figure 1 (Slide 3), were closer to the Village core and had a much higher concentration of smaller lots. Phase 6, the first piece with which Polygon was involved, was a bit more toward the east side, but still had a predominance of the smaller product.
  - The Zion piece involved little parts of the Village Center, included row homes, and was denser. He corrected that the last column in the table reflected the Fasano/Lund piece, not Tonquin, which captured a denser part of the Master Plan.
    - Mr. Pauly stated it was Tonquin Meadows, the first column was Tonquin Woods.
- After calculating actual lot area sizes and the number of lots, the average lot size of the proposed application for the subject site exceeded any other within the functional classification. The proposed lots would be the largest lots of any other application, including PDP4 South, the Arbor project that this proposal abutted.

Commissioner Hurley arrived at 6:26 p.m.

Commissioner McGuire:

- Believed the two tables were a bit misleading, as there were seven PDP areas. Mr. Pauly had a table with the actual numbers by housing size as well as estates lots that should be entered into the exhibit. She

believed his table was a better representation than percentages and combining the two lot sizes in the second graph to indicate the distribution of standard lot sizes.

- Mr. Lange said Mr. Pauly's table came from the Applicant and was used to create the tables he presented, so the tables should be consistent with his table. Percentages were used because the Applicant believed it might be simpler to understand.
- Believed that as a Villebois resident, she had a better understanding of the sense of the plan and space. The Applicant had done a good job describing how the Master Plan was set up with the Village Center as the densest portion of the development and that development would become less dense moving away from the center. The Master Plan noted that larger lot sizes would be on the perimeter of the development along Grahams Ferry Rd, including the Future Study Area, so she was surprised to see medium/standard lots continuing along the edge into the Future Study Area. The comparisons should be made from the big picture of the Master Plan.
  - Mr. Lange noted another relevant issue was that a fundamental conflict in use types existed.
    - Alleys did not make a lot of sense when there are big yards. As envisioned in the Master Plan, the lots themselves were smaller and each individual had a little less space on their lot, but the tradeoff was having an extremely heavy network of parks around them. It was a tradeoff in uses.
    - Part of the land-use goal that was established was to make a pedestrian-friendly environment, and one way to do that was to eliminate driveways. So, there was a meshing of goals with removing driveways, making lots smaller and alley-loading them, and having a parks framework around them. This was difficult to do around the edge, so front-loaded lots were developed, and there were fewer people walking, so it seemed like a good balance.
    - In the proposed area, all the lots could be front-loaded, but that would not make it consistent with the rest of the project by not having driveways. During the pre-application meeting, the Applicant also received feedback from Staff that approach would not be consistent with the Master Plan.
  - While beyond the detail of the Master Plan, he explained the Applicant tried to have an entry road with a 10-ft wide, planted median in the middle and houses fronting on it, creating an eyes-on, pleasing entryway without a cluster of driveways, parked cars and garage doors.
    - The Applicant also tried to maintain consistency with the Parks pattern, namely, the connectivity of the open space with the lots. He described how a normal front-loaded development pattern would move the road over, back a series of lots up to the open space. However, that did not feel consistent with the rest of development nor the goals for the Master Plan.
- Agreed shared open spaces were one guiding principle of the Master Plan. However, another tenet was diversity of housing, which meant diversity of sizes and types. While she was a proponent of small houses, the people who had bought into the Villebois Master Plan had done so because it was a planned community with certain expectations, including a range of housing sizes and types. The land-use table showed that Villebois was heavy on small houses, primarily built by Polygon, and not many estate large and standard lots exist.
  - Although the area had been designated as a Future Study Area in the Master Plan, it was identified as a unique area that would not be the status quo of development. The area presented an opportunity to do something different, especially because of the wooded wetlands.
- Agreed the front-loaded houses should not go in, but asked about other alternatives, such as having fewer houses and larger lots with the ability to preserve additional trees in that area that could still have the alley in back.
  - Mr. Pauly reminded that when the Master Plan was developed, the owners of the Living Enrichment Center had not anticipated losing the property the following year, which was part of the reason it was a Future Study Area. The owners wanted to keep their options open and therefore become involved in the Master Planning process.

- Stacey Connery, Pacific Community Design, stated that Page 10 of the Master Plan under the Future Study Area outlined the uses anticipated by the Living Enrichment Center. They had not anticipated residential uses at that time, so this was in addition to what was done previously.

Mr. Lange continued with his presentation as follows:

- He displayed early draft elevations of some medium homes. Like everything else in Villebois, the Pattern Book served as the baseline that had to met, so there would be a variety of types and elevations, and control on adjacency rules. That pattern was ingrained into everything and the Applicant did not propose any change to it.
- Polygon had worked hard to overcome some big unresolved issues in this project and was very pleased to get some of those issues resolved. The Applicant was also happy with their ability to have the marketplace accept what they had done. The amount of development being proposed reflected how strongly they believed in the vision of this project.
  - Polygon had pressure from the City to innovate, however, Polygon's own success also created pressure. They were working hard to diversify the product lines they could bring to the marketplace, which was reflected in the series of other proposals that have been presented, with varying lot sizes and new product lines that were introduced.
  - The Pattern Book lumped lot sizes into different lot sizes, but there were ranges, so the changes taking place on Tonquin North, for example were lost. In the Zion project, where the area was more dense, there was a row home product and small cottages. The one-story grade relief between the street and alley was also resulting in an entirely different product line.
  - This property was part of the Applicant's solution of bringing new products to the marketplace. Subsequent applications would include and detail Polygon's larger lots and higher end product.
  - The goal was for the mediums to be 2,200 to 2,600 sq ft houses that would sell from the upper \$300,000s to the lower \$400,000s. Standard homes would range from 2500 to at least 3200 sq ft and would sell from the mid \$400,000s up to over \$500,000. (Slide 17)
  - The products themselves were still under development so no architecture was available to show, but he wanted to share the Applicant's intent.
- He noted that making a large lot alley-loaded would be a bit strange. As far as providing an opportunity to save additional trees on the property, he explained that the project needed to pencil out, so if many lots were lost, there would have to be a new deal.

Vice Chair Postma asked the Applicant to provide a context regarding their current plans and an estimate on how many trees were expected to be lost, but noted the Commission would save their questions until the end.

- He clarified the Commission might be able to receive citizen comments or encourage people to provide information or questions via email.

Mr. Lange continued his presentation with these comments:

- Part of the Specific Area Plan (SAP) process was to do an on-the-ground SROZ refinement, which had been done and was included in the SAP application being submitted. Due to the block depth, the development encroached on 5%, or slightly less than one acre, of the 19 acres of SROZ on the site, which required 2.5 acres of mitigation. However, the Applicant proposed 4.5 acres of mitigation. (Slide 12)
  - The reason the Applicant almost doubled their mitigation was because the project site had oaks, which were part of what Grahams Oak Park was trying to reestablish. The Applicant wanted to expand what the park was doing into their site and provide a healthy habitat for the park to abut, although that required a larger area than the Applicant was required to mitigate.

- Mitigation involved dealing with some invasive species, such as ivy and conifers that were shading the oak trees and causing them to grow unhealthily. Natural Resource Staff advised that it would be best to girdle the conifer trees, cut a line around them to kill them and leave them standing as habitat.
- Approximately 1,800 trees had been counted, although not every tree within some of the massive groves were not included. About 600 trees would be removed, leaving two-thirds of the 1800 trees remaining. (Slide 13) Many trees in the hospital area were ornamentals. The Applicant's tree mitigation would add more trees than were being removed.

The Applicant sought feedback from the Commission on several items. Mr. Lange posed the following questions and addressed questions while the Commissioners provided comments and feedback as noted:

- Grahams Ferry Rd was originally planned as a minor arterial in the Transportation System Plan (TSP). City Council had asked that an interim road section be built with the phases developed north of the subject site. The Applicant presumed that matching that section would be appropriate for the road section adjacent to the subject site, but asked if something different was preferred.
  - Katie Mangle, Manager of Long-Range Planning, said she was unsure, but noted the new TSP allowed for a more flexible design, so some of the specific actions that had to be taken by Council would not be required any longer. At this point, the type of roadway or urban design was a matter of opinion.
  - Mr. Lange understood from the traffic input regarding the singular access to Grahams Ferry Rd so far that not even a turn lane would be necessary, therefore it would not rise to the warrants of a roundabout.
  - The same improvements done on Grahams Ferry Rd to the north, adjacent to the development in Tonquin North, should extend down because it was all part of the back of the neighborhood; otherwise the proposed project would be a wholly independent development as only one tie in existed to the rest of Villebois.
    - Mr. Pauly noted that a prior Master Plan, when uses were unknown, Villebois Drive was shown as access to this property in Figure 7 of the Master Plan.
    - Mr. Lange did not believe the functional classification changed in the TSP update, so it seemed the Applicant would do that same interim section.
    - He clarified that any improvements would begin at the south end of the existing improvements down to the south end of the proposed lots. The next section of road got twisty and would be difficult to upgrade. The Applicant believed this section of road should match the section to the north.
- The next question regarded the Parks Plan. Mr. Lange displayed a Villebois SAP South - Plan Area 2 map (Slide 7) which featured key Villebois park components, as well as major and minor trail routes. He noted the proposed trails for the project, which totaled more than a mile in length, and key connections to existing Villebois and Grahams Oak trails. The Applicant worked with Staff to figure out where and what type of park elements to include. He asked for feedback about the locations of two proposed play area which he described as follows (Slide 8):
  - An older child play area in a clearing amongst the trees that was visible from the street and close to one of the most active trails, which would connect to the Grahams Ferry Road Multi-Modal Path.
  - A tot play area centrally located outside the woods.
  - He clarified that the sidewalk along Grahams Ferry Rd would be on the lots side and an attempt would also be made to get pedestrians onto the trails. The width of the blocks was approximately 200 ft long and the long streets would be 450 to 500 ft, so the development was easily walkable.
  - Too often, the City placed young children's play areas too close to roads without good barriers. The older child and tot play areas should be switched to get them farther away from the roads. Sidewalks help provide a bit of a barrier between play areas and roads.

- The Applicant believed they could deal with the proximity to the road given the proposed location of the older child play area, and liked the idea of eyes-on, though they had debated it themselves.
- Barriers could address the issue. Bushes were planted between the water park and Wilsonville Rd at Murase Plaza after the project was completed to deter children from darting over to Wilsonville Rd, which had a lot of high-speed traffic. The hope was to avoid the same situation where nice open spaces are created and then barriers installed because no one thought about toddlers playing within 25 ft of a road.
- The tot play area could be moved to the northeast, behind Lots 117 through 120, which could provide better access for homes to the north. The older child play area could move closer to the center of the development, on the other side of the trail and between the proposed trails to provide more equal access.
  - Mr. Lange responded that area had been the Applicant's second preferred spot; SROZ was nearby, so they were balancing things. The proposed area had oaks with a clearing, while the secondary spot had more deciduous tall trees and was a bit darker.
- The proposed entrance would be new. The street would have a nice landscaped median with houses fronting it without driveways and garages. The Applicant liked the clean, walkable entryway with a nice terminating vista. The Applicant considered having two entrances, but liked the very strong entry and there were technical issues regarding access spacing standards. Mr. Lange requested input about the idea of one or two entrances into the development.
  - A single access was preferred because it created a sense of community and would provide traffic dampening. Having more than one access would provide a bypass way to get to the rest of Villebois.
- Concern was expressed because shared spaces or common areas for people to gather that were found in other parts of Villebois were not included in the proposed plan.
- The line of proposed houses on the northeast corner seemed to encroach on the existing homes, which had green space in their backyards. What was the distance between the proposed and existing homes and how would the proposal impact existing properties?
  - Mr. Lange provided a sense of scale, indicating the distance between Lot 4 and the northern boundary was 50 ft, so the distance between the back of the homes was probably about 130 ft. He noted the SROZ would remain SROZ. An existing fence line and a strip of trees planted as hedges were located on the northeast boundary. The bigger trees would be retained, but others that were not as healthy would probably be removed. The area behind Lots 4 through 8 would not be touched. The road and alley connections would need to be completed. The distance between the existing and proposed houses would be approximately 170 ft apart with trees in between as well.
- During the tree audit had the arborist discussed the survival rate of trees during development?
  - Mr. Lange replied that a lot of detail would be included in subsequent applications. The trees would be functionally classified as important, good, fair and poor, and then decisions would be made about which trees would be removed or saved, depending on the health of the tree, safety, etc. If there was any question about the ability to save a tree, it was put into the questionable category and dealt with during grading.
  - Mr. Pauly added that as reviewers, they had experience with trees that were soggy underneath from irrigation in mid-August. Staff was a lot more aware of such things going into future phases and making sure irrigation systems and tree rings around the drip lines were more appropriate to have a higher survival rate, including that seen in Phase 4.
- The last question regarded Polygon opportunity to do a Street of Dreams on the property, which they were interested in doing and the Master Plan could be refined with subsequent applications. In the PDP, the Applicant would like to have an approved alternative for the southeast area, removing Lot 121 to allow for open space and appropriate entry monument, and changing Lots 101 through 104 and Lots 120 through

117 [1016 1:55] from 50 ft by 100 ft lots to 100 ft by 100 ft lots, potentially making the area the 2015 Street of Dreams.

- Mr. Pauly confirmed the size change would make them estate lots, which were larger than the large lots. Estate lots would need to be added to the SAP South Pattern Book.
- Mr. Lange added there were challenges even with the architecture. The Pattern Book could not be amended to anticipate the buildings that might be built in that scenario today, because Street of Dreams homes could be really different and that kind of creativity could be difficult to anticipate. There were many challenges, but the Applicant wanted to preserve the opportunity and see what the Planning Commission thought.
- Additional consideration would be needed; the decision could not be based on the potential that it may or may not happen.
  - Mr. Lange responded that was why it had been flagged today as opposed to in a hearing, where the Commission would have to make a decision. The concept was not necessarily wrapped up in the application; however, the Applicant was preserving flexibility to get there with each one.
  - Mr. Pauly noted in the Villebois process, land uses were defined in the Master Plan on a conceptual level. In subsequent land use applications, the refinement process allowed an adjustment of approximately 10%. The refinements allowed for two aggregate land use categories. The first category consisted of medium and larger lots, and the second consisted of small lots, the condo, Village Center, and row homes. Flexibility existed from estate to medium in that they could be discussed during a subsequent land use application.
- Hearing about it now was appreciated given the public forum and because it gave the Commission a heads up. Again, it was difficult to make a determination now on a “potential”.
- Had or would the Applicant consider increasing lot sizes of the lots preceding the 100 ft by 100 ft Street of Dreams area?
  - Mr. Lange replied that touched on the problem Polygon had in figuring out how to address this; the ripple could prevent them from doing anything. Polygon was very anxious to get this piece done as it was an important part of bringing different things to the marketplace that the Applicant believed would be successful. If Polygon had to wait on the Street of Dreams, they would likely choose to not participate. Therefore, the best the Applicant could do would be to provide the 100 ft by 100 ft lots, but the rest of the pattern needed to be locked in so it could commence.
  - Mr. Lange confirmed that if the scale was increased, the interior lots would go from medium lots to large or estate lots, and the lots at end would be extra-large estate lots. This was one reason Polygon believed this would be the right kind of entrance and that portion of the site would be entirely compatible.
  - A neighborhood meeting was scheduled for tomorrow night to communicate with the neighbors surrounding the new addition. The Applicant fully expected to engage with the neighboring community. He clarified the Applicant was not asking for a decision today but for a conversation.

Vice Chair Postma understood, but noted the difficult timeline in trying to get the project approved by August, which meant the first time some of the homeowners' concerns or comments would be heard was at the public hearing, when decisions would be made. He believed it was important for the Planning Commission to hear what neighboring residents thought and the Applicant's responses to those comments before making a decision in August.

Comments and questions from the Commission regarding the proposal were addressed by the Applicant and Staff as follows:

- Mr. Lange confirmed the existing fence line on the eastern side of the former Living Enrichment Center property would be retained. He believed the fence was erected from the home construction and assumed it was on their lot so they would not mess with it. The chain link fence along the southwest side of the site had holes in it.
- The trail connection to Graham Oaks was an obvious pathway and the area was pretty flat. The southern access trail was an existing game trail. The trail connections would require Metro's approval. The Applicant assumed the Commission wanted them to make the connections, if possible.
  - The connections would be worthwhile for the neighboring residents.
- Although the property was difficult to utilize, concern was expressed about the property being separate from the Villebois community. There was no way to connect the property to Villebois, given the SROZ and the existing homes.
- Mr. Pauly clarified that the degree of encroachment into the SROZ was considered on a SAP basis. The applications were being grouped so that the SAP amendment, which was essentially the Stage 1 Master Plan, and the SROZ amendments and redefinition of the SROZ boundary based on what Natural Resource Program Manager Kerry Rappold has observed, was one package. The PDP, FDP for the parks and Tentative Plat and Zone changes, were part of another package.
  - While no specific information was available regarding the SROZ encroachment, language specific to the SROZ stated that things may have to change if resources were found. Referencing Figure 1, he noted that in Phase 3 East, a wetland was initially thought to be insignificant, so a road was planned right through it. As part of the refinement and SAP approval, the road section was removed and the wetland was preserved.
  - Impacts upon the SROZ would be addressed in more detail at a later phase. Language in the Master Plan acknowledged there were unknowns about the SROZ now and that changes may have to be made.
- How had the density numbers shown in Figure 1 (Slide 3) with regard to small lots, medium lots and estate lots changed over time? The perception seemed to be that development was becoming denser. It was important for the Commission to know if the density had generally stayed on track with what was envisioned years ago, especially for those who purchased homes in Villebois with the mindset of what was going to look like ten years from now.
  - Mr. Pauly replied he did not have the numbers at the moment. The numbers in the table on Figure 1 included the Future Study Area. There had been a number of iterations, as this was the fourth or fifth Master Plan amendment and previous iterations of the maps had not included the area. The figures from the prior iterations could be used to do a side-by-side comparison to the density numbers in Figure 1, which he would bring to the next meeting to provide the Commission with some context.
  - Mr. Lange stated he had been involved with the Villebois project since 2001. Getting the Master Plan approved laid the foundation for the SAPs, which had now been approved for everything, except the Future Study Area. SAP South and SAP North were on the average of the anticipated densities and SAP East was a little on the higher end of the anticipated density. The Village Core was in the middle or slightly higher and further changes could occur there. So far, there had been little shifts, but the macro density was as it was anticipated.
  - More information would be provided regarding the densities.

Vice Chair Postma:

- Reiterated the Commission's dilemma of hearing public comments for the first time in August and asked how people wanting to speak at tonight's meeting could, although the City had not noticed the meeting as a public hearing.



- Ms. Mangle agreed it would be great to have a general public comment, noting that while not a public hearing, general public comments were welcome.
- Barbara Jacobson, Assistant City Attorney, added it was important for those present to know that this was not a public hearing. Although hearing from those present would be helpful, she noted that they must testify at the actual public hearing if they wanted to be on the record and preserve their legal rights.
- Noted it was informative for the Applicant and to the Commission but was not determinative for the sake of the record and those commenting tonight may need to provide something at a later date.
  - Mr. Pauly stated that in addition to providing things for the legislative record, many of the comments might be related to what the DRB would hear. People in attendance should be aware that their comments might need to be repeated later.
  - Mr. Lange added the Applicant would keep extensive notes from the neighborhood meeting and provide them to Staff early next week. He also provided his email address, [jim@pacific-community.com](mailto:jim@pacific-community.com), and office phone number, (503) 941-9484, so people could contact him directly.
- Thanked Mr. Lange and reiterated he simply wanted a mechanism so the Applicant could get their desired approval within an efficient timeframe.

Ms. Jacobson clarified that although this was a work session, the Commission could open the meeting up to public comment to help the Commission learn more about the project and any concerns. Because it was not a public hearing, no public notice was required. She reiterated that the citizens must understand they were providing comments to help the Commission tonight, but in order to have legal significance, they would need to make their comments again at the public hearing or submit their comments in writing for the public record. Nothing stated tonight would have any legal bearing.

Commissioner Phelps said he wanted to be sure he could use what he heard tonight. He did not want to be precluded from using it if he did not get it in an official record. He confirmed that he could use the information or comments provided by the individuals tonight as he wished.

**Commissioner McGuire moved to open the work session for public comment. Commissioner Levit seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.**

Ms. Jacobson reiterated the public hearing would provide another opportunity for citizens to provide public comment if anyone was not prepared to comment this evening. Written materials were also welcome.

The Commission took a brief recess. The meeting was reconvened at 7:50 p.m.

Vice Chair Postma reiterated that the meeting was not a public hearing and it was incumbent upon those speaking tonight to find a mechanism to make sure whatever they indicated tonight became part of the record via written comments to Staff and/or public comment on August 14, 2013. The Commission was opening it up for comment because it would be constructive to get additional community input.

Buu Huynh, 11968 SW Lausanne St, Wilsonville, OR, stated his house backed up to the green space facing the development. He was concerned about the proposed block of houses in the upper northeast area that appeared to be overlaying some of the green space. There were large trees he could view from his home and he wanted to know which trees could be saved and which would have to be removed.

Andy James, 11976 SW Lausanne, Wilsonville, OR, said his home also abutted the green space. He said was struggling to understand the differences between the working session and public hearing process, and believed it was important to communicate that and how to submit public comments to the neighborhood. He was also struggling to know what an SROZ is, what it means and what the process was for refinement from the Master Plan and SAP. He was also concerned about the houses that impinged on the SROZ and suggested putting a park in the upper northeast area, which might possibly draw things together.

Commissioner Millan arrived at 8:54 p.m.

Vice Chair Postma explained that work sessions were not traditionally opened for public comment, but allowed the Commission to receive and discuss information provided from Staff. The public hearing was scheduled for August 14, 2013, where there would be further presentations by Staff as well as the Applicant, public comment would be received, followed by Commission discussion, and an eventual vote.

- Ms. Mangle stated more information about the application could be found a few weeks before the hearing on the City of Wilsonville's website under Community Development, then Planning Department and then clicking "Projects around the City". All the neighbors would also receive a notification in the mail of the hearing with the time and directions. Those who could not participate could send comments in writing to Staff via email or postal mail. Staff would be glad to assist those with questions or concerns.
- Mr. Pauly added this was different than a typical Villebois process, making it understandably odd and confusing. He requested Mr. James' contact information to provide material that would explain the process, which he also hoped to provide at tomorrow night's neighborhood meeting. He believed a handout explaining the process could be really helpful for the neighbors.
  - He briefly described the process, noting there were two parts. Currently, the Commission was addressing the overall policy, and then another panel of citizens would serve as judges to determine whether or not specific criteria had been met. The Commission, with the recommendation to City Council, would establish the policy that would serve as guiding principles for development in the area. In the coming months, there would be another process where evidence would be provided to a panel of citizens who decide whether the application met the criteria and possibly recommend specific things must happen for the project to meet the criteria.

Mr. James requested timeframes on things such as when the streets would be constructed, the parks would be built, the trees would be selected, etc.

- Mr. Pauly confirmed legislative notice would be sent to all neighborhood property owners within 500 ft from any given point of the project. The quasi-judicial notice for the actual land use hearing would be sent to property owners within 250 ft. The City Council had to approve the Commission's recommendation, so there would be another opportunity for public comment before City Council.
- He explained that SROZ were natural areas, namely wetland areas, areas next to streams with a lot of vegetation, called riparian areas, and upland forests which have a dense forest habitat with many creatures.

Mr. James clarified his question about the SROZ was focused more around the process of definition. He understood the SROZ boundaries laid out right now were only done aerially and that a refinement process would follow.

- Mr. Pauly responded there was a citywide effort years ago to identify where potential resources might exist. When a project was proposed, it provided opportunity to see what was actually on the ground besides what was seen roughly from the air. In this case, Mr. Rappold, who managed the SROZ Program, visited the property numerous times with Mr. Lange, his staff and City Staff to see what was there, what

made sense and what was creating habitat and needed to be preserved versus what did not provide as much benefit to animals.

- A tree removal plan would be one of the applications presented before the panel of citizens in the upcoming DRB process, when specific criteria in the City Code would be reviewed to determine whether a tree could be removed. At that time, the review would involve consideration of each tree. There would be a total of approximately five public hearings before the actual construction drawings for the project were created.

Commissioner McGuire noted the Master Plan amendment being discussed today essentially laid the foundation for the project by determining lots sizes, what the green spaces, trails and streets and major elements would look like. The more refined details, such as trees, would go through the DRB later. She believed this was a critical point because what was decided at the Commission would define everything else.

- Mr. Pauly added that minor changes could be made to what was approved in the Master Plan at the DRB, so that if they realized something should have been done differently, there would not need to be another five public hearings. Certain limits set in the Code restricted how much the project could be changed from the Master Plan.

Janelle Beals, 11964 SW Lausanne St, Wilsonville, OR, said she was glad to see the area being developed and believed there was potential to have wonderful things that would enhance the neighborhood. Like others, her concern regarded the string of lots in the northeast section that abut the existing fence line and impact all the houses on Lausanne St.

- She hoped the development would respect the existing homes and consider how decisions would impact them. Those were some of the larger homes in Villebois and were sold at a premium with significant lot fees added due to the nature of their location and being able to face the green space and trees in the LEC area. When purchasing their lot, it had been explained that while the area had the potential to be developed, those trees would be respected in that development.
- From Lot 4 down to the entrance into the neighborhood from Villebois Dr had a significant band of large, old growth trees, which was a beautiful border for that corner of the neighborhood that she felt enhanced some of the philosophy of Villebois, which was to respect old growth trees and not cut everything down. The number of old growth trees throughout the neighborhood set Villebois apart in many regards.
- The deep and significant band of trees could be seen over the fence where the lots faced driving down Villebois Dr onto Normandy. She struggled to understand how that feature of the neighborhood could be retained in any significant way with the lots in that location, knowing they were on the smaller side and houses could not be built there without significantly removing the vast majority of the trees.
  - She noted comments that the distance between the lot and existing home was about 150 ft, which seemed significant at an angle, however, removing the trees and building houses would significantly change the nature of the existing homes; rather than looking at trees, residents would look onto a series of backyards because the development was quite close. The corner did hit some of the existing lots.
- She hoped that somehow those lots could be redistributed or eliminated to minimize the impact of the new development on the existing development. People did move there with the expectation that those trees would remain. The people on the other side of Normandy also benefited from the shade the trees provided during the late afternoon.
- She noted the T at the end of the road near Lot 4 on Slide 4 and asked if the map reflected all future development or if there was potential for future growth.

Vice Chair Postma suspected that when a road ended with a cut out like that, it provided opportunity for people to turn around or backup. The shape allowed for less hardscape while still providing the turnaround opportunity normally found in a cul-de-sac. He asked Ms. Beals if the existing building in the upper northeast corner of the property could actually be seen.

- Ms. Beals answered she could see a very tiny sliver of the building from her upper floor, but it was mostly masked by the band of trees. Without the trees, the view would be like any other development where houses backed up to one another.

Commissioner Phelps urged the citizens to get comments into the City, the developer, etc. as quickly as possible in order to have the biggest impact on the process. The longer they waited, the less influence they would have because of the practicality of achieving what they might want to accomplish. Getting comments in as early as possible would allow for them to be digested and, if clarification was needed, Mr. Pauly or the developer could contact them. Waiting too long might result in one's recommendation to be abbreviated or not accomplished.

Commissioner McGuire thanked the homeowners for attending tonight's meeting. She agreed it was a good idea to remove the five lots in the upper northeast corner and potentially make the area a park, which might address some of the issues raised by the existing homeowners. She liked the idea of having a shared common space that might connect the new development with the rest of the neighborhood, reiterating that neighborhood commons were found throughout Villebois.

- She asked Polygon to consider, if at all possible, incorporating a couple larger lots into the medium and standard setup because there were so many additional larger lots along Grahams Ferry Rd, so it would be more consistent with the Villebois land use pattern. Looking at Figure 1 and the colors indicating lot sizes, it was apparent that additional variation was necessary to be consistent with the Master Plan.
- In general, she was concerned about the public hearing in August and preferred to have an additional work session, so the Commission could discuss any changes the Applicant might decide to make after tomorrow's meeting with the homeowners. It was difficult to have a homeowner meeting and then go straight into a public hearing. The project was significant, being that it was a future designated area, a large number of houses, as well an amendment to the Master Plan that could not be redone; therefore, she did not want to rush through the process. At a minimum, it warranted two work sessions, the standard public process for public comment, and an opportunity for the Applicant to revise their proposal and talk with the Commission again.

Commissioner Levit agreed about having another work session, if possible, because it was difficult to go from this potential change into a public hearing. Knowing in advance what would be presented was preferable.

Vice Chair Postma agreed public input was useful and important for the Commission when making decisions. He echoed Commissioner Phelps' comments that the earlier citizens engage in the process the more helpful it would be. He did not have a firm opinion on having another work session, but if no second work session was held before the public hearing in August, citizens should be sure to be heard early in the process so both Staff and the Applicant could address their issues at the hearing and hopefully alleviate any new issues coming before the Commission at public hearing.

- He understood the comments made regarding the lots in the upper northeast corner of the development, but noted for the record that there was already an older building there, so they would be going from one building to potentially other buildings, not that the area was better for homes or for a park. Having that context was important and, to his recollection, the building was visible from the road and some homes.
- He asked if the Applicant wanted to address any questions of comments that were made.

Mr. Lange displayed an aerial photograph and clarified where the road came in as well as the existing building and parking lot locations. He noted he and his team came to the work session to engage and listen and would review their notes to see what could be done. The Applicant wanted to be open but there were also things that Polygon needed to accomplish. The challenge was always to mesh everyone's goals together. Although not necessary or required, this work session and the upcoming neighborhood meeting were something the Applicant desired to do. They were having a dialogue to gain feedback and do their best to address it.

Commissioner Phelps complimented Mr. Lange on the Applicant's attempt to engage and listen to the homeowners, which reiterated his suggestion of the citizens giving their feedback earlier in order for the Applicant to have an opportunity to meet their concern.

Commissioner McGuire inquired about the process for requesting another work session.

- Ms. Mangle answered the Planning Commission could make the request and Planning Director Chris Neamtzu would make the call. As a legislative application that was coming in, it was a bit more complicated. It did not include a statutory timeframe they needed to fulfill. She recommended a motion be made regarding the request and then Mr. Neamtzu would take it from there.

Vice Chair Postma asked Mr. Lange's opinion as to whether holding another work session was workable.

- Mr. Lange replied he would have to talk with his client, but he could get back to Staff, possibly tomorrow.
- Ms. Mangle noted public hearings could be continued, so a decision did not always have to be on the same night.

Mr. Lange said the Applicant had discovered through this and other projects that after receiving input from a neighborhood meeting, some things could be resolved and some things could not due to differences of opinion or approach and someone needed to make a call. Following the neighborhood meeting and tonight's meeting, the Applicant would sift through their notes and decide if they were on a good path or had strayed somehow, and what could be done about it, which would lead to the next step. Sometimes, the only option was to take the hard vote. He hoped the Applicant had demonstrated a pattern of being flexible when possible and being clear where no flexibility existed and addressed the issue openly.

Vice Chair Postma encouraged the Applicant to talk with Staff after tomorrow's neighborhood meeting about whether there should be a public hearing or a work session in August.

- Mr. Lange responded they strived not to have surprises and the only way to do so was to communicate.

## **VII. OTHER BUSINESS**

### **A. 2013 Planning Commission Work Program**

Katie Mangle, Manager of Long Range Planning reviewed the work program, noting the joint work session with Council on Monday, July 15, 2013 at 5:00 pm. Dinner would be served at 4:30 pm. The Housing Needs Analysis and Climate Smart Communities would be discussed. In August, a more in-depth work session on the Housing Needs Analysis would be held regarding the Capacity Analysis. The Tax Increment Financing (TIF) Zones and Urban Renewal Plan would also be discussed, as well as the Villebois Master Plan whether in work session or the regular session. Staff would keep the Commission updated.

**B. Commissioners' Comments**

Commissioner Phelps requested the information from the Villebois community meeting as soon as it could be made available. He did not want to make a decision at the public hearing based on information provided in a meeting packet the week before.

Vice Chair Postma believed the entire Commission felt the same.

**VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

Vice Chair Postma adjourned the regular meeting of the Wilsonville Planning Commission at 8:28 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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