



**DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD PANEL A  
MEETING MINUTES**

**June 12, 2023 at 6:30 PM**

**Wilsonville City Hall & Remote Video Conferencing**

---

**Approved**  
July 10, 2023

**CALL TO ORDER**

A regular meeting of the Development Review Board Panel A was held at City Hall beginning at 6:30 p.m. on Monday, June 12, 2023. Chair Jean Svadlenka called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

**CHAIR'S REMARKS**

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

**ROLL CALL**

Present for roll call were: Jean Svadlenka, Clark Hildum, and Yara Alatawy. Rob Candrian and Jordan Herron were absent.

Staff present: Daniel Pauly, Amanda Guile-Hinman, Kimberly Rybold, Cindy Luxhoj, and Mandi Simmons

**CITIZENS INPUT** – This is an opportunity for visitors to address the Development Review Board on items not on the agenda. There were no comments.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

1. Approval of Minutes of the May 8, 2023 DRB Panel A meeting

**Clark Hildum moved to approve the May 8, 2023 DRB Panel A meeting minutes as presented. Chair Svadlenka seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.**

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

2. **Resolution No. 416. SW Boeckman Road Building W-5.** The applicant is requesting approval of a Stage 1 Preliminary Plan Modification, Stage 2 Final Plan Modification, Site Design Review, Type C Tree Removal Plan, Standard SROZ Map Verification, and Standard SRIR Review for development of an 80,446 square foot industrial building and associated improvements on property located at 9600 SW Boeckman Road.

Case Files:

DB22-0004 SW Boeckman Road Building W-5

- Stage 1 Preliminary Plan Modification (STG122-0004)
- Stage 2 Final Plan Modification (STG222-0004)
- Site Design Review (SDR22-0004)
- Type C Tree Removal Plan (TPLN22-0003)
- Standard SROZ Map Verification (SROZ22-0003)
- Standard SRIR Review (SRIR22-0001)

**Chair Svadlenka** called the public hearing to order at 6:36 pm and read the conduct of hearing format into the record. Chair Svadlenka and Clark Hildum declared for the record that they had visited the site. No board member, however, declared a conflict of interest, ex parte contact, bias, or conclusion from a site visit. No board member participation was challenged by any member of the audience.

**Cindy Luxhoj, Associate Planner**, announced that the criteria applicable to the application were stated starting on page 2 of the Staff report, which was entered into the record. Copies of the report were made available to the side of the room and on the City's website.

**Ms. Luxhoj** presented the Staff report via PowerPoint, noting the site's location and features and highlighting the site's background with these key comments:

- When the architectural renovations occurred to consolidate DWFritz's local operations in one building for its world headquarters, the Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) prepared at that time analyzed traffic associated with the renovation of the existing W-4 building and the addition of a second future building anticipated to include 70,000 sq ft of high-tech manufacturing and 4,000 sq ft for a sit-down restaurant; however, no applications were ever submitted for a second building. (Slide 3)
  - The subject application proposed to construct the second building anticipated in the 2017 TIA; however, rather than including the mix of uses... the new building was proposed to be an 80,446 sq ft office/manufacturing building without the previously anticipated restaurant space.
- Proper noticing was followed for this application. Public hearing notice was mailed to property owners within 250 ft of the subject property, onsite postings were placed, and notice was published in the *Wilsonville Spokesman*.
  - One public comment was received from an employee of DWFritz Automation, located in Building W-4. Concerns were expressed about the location of the new building; associated parking and loading in relation to existing parking and internal circulation on the site, as well as employee safety for Building W-4. There was also concern that the number of proposed parking spaces for Building W-5 would be insufficient for its size.
  - The comment was forwarded to the Applicant for response during their presentation.
- All six requests were objective in nature as they involved verifying compliance with Code standards. No discretionary requests such as waivers were part of the application.
- Prior Stage 1 Preliminary Plan approvals showed the site of proposed new Building W-5 as undeveloped. No prior phasing or potential use of the building site had been approved. As such, the Stage 1 Preliminary Plan was being modified to identify the site of the proposed

new industrial building and associated improvements. The proposed use of the site was consistent with the Plan Development Industrial (PDI) Zone. (Slide 6)

- The Stage 2 Final Plan modification built upon the Stage 1 Preliminary Plan modification and reviewed the function and design of the proposed new industrial building and related site improvements. (Slide 7)
  - Overall, the campus would be heavily treed. For efficiency, the two buildings would share the existing driveways on SW Boeckman Rd, vehicle circulation drives, and some of the centrally located parking area. The building lobbies would have a pedestrian and visual connection but separate service areas.
  - The Stage 2 Final Plan would layout the function and design of the previously undeveloped portions of the site and reconfigure a portion of the Building W-4 parking area to accommodate one of the parking areas serving the new building, and the Stage 2 Final Plan review would assure the proposal met all standards of the PDI Zone.
- Traffic & Parking. Prior Stage 2 Final Plan approvals did not approve any trips for the western portion of the subject site where Building W-5 was proposed; however, the 2017 TIA prepared as part of the DW Fritz site modifications had analyzed traffic associated with the addition of a potential future 74,000 sq ft building on the subject site.
  - Because that potential future building was never applied for or approved, discussion of the building and the trip generation memo submitted for the current application was only for the purpose of connecting back to the previous TIA. All trips connected with the current proposal were new trips and did not represent any reduction in traffic from prior land use approvals.
    - The current proposal was estimated to generate 54 PM Peak Hour trips and 414 weekday trips, less trips than the 2017 TIA assumed. All impacted intersections were expected to operate above Level of Service (LOS) D.
  - Building W-5 required a minimum of 151 vehicle parking spaces and 297 spaces were proposed. Because the building contained a manufacturing component, no maximum limit existing on the number of spaces.
    - Required bicycle parking was calculated as the sum of the requirements for the individual primary uses, resulting in a minimum of 10 required spaces, and the Applicant had proposed 11 bicycle parking spaces.
- Site Design Review. The Applicant utilized appropriate professional services and quality materials, such as cast concrete, metal, and glass in neutral colors of silver, bronze, and semi-transparent stain, to design Building W-5 and associated improvements. A tilt-up concrete building was proposed, and the materials and colors chosen were appropriate for an industrial setting.
  - The landscaping plans complied with or exceeded the General Landscape or Low Screen Landscape standard. The 15% landscaping requirement was exceeded with 72.1% of the site either in Significant Resource Overlay Zone (SROZ) or formal landscaped area and plantings proposed along the entire frontage of SW Boeckman Rd to soften the appearance of the new building.
  - Standards for parking lots with more than 200 spaces were met or exceeded with respect to required trees, internal pedestrian walkways, and landscaping.

- The configuration of the development allowed for the enhancement and preservation of existing natural features, including the SROZ west and south of the proposed building and of numerous valuable trees. The site had existing trees in the SROZ west and south of the proposed building and in the new parking areas to the southeast.
  - Of 173 trees inventoried for the current application, 72 were proposed for removal and 101 preserved and protected, including 21 situational trees, which might need to be removed in the future if their health declined due to fill placement despite installation of a proposed aeration system over their roots.
  - The Applicant had taken tree preservation into consideration and limited tree removal to what was necessary for development. Existing mature trees were retained and incorporated into the new parking areas as much as possible.
  - As mitigation, 65 trees were proposed for planting in parking areas and on the building perimeter and 328 trees in the SROZ, which far exceeded the replacement requirement, including for the situational trees.
- The Applicant conducted a detailed site analysis consistent with the requirements of the SROZ ordinance. The City's Natural Resources Manager had reviewed the analysis and recommended approval by the DRB. (Slide 11)
- The Applicant's Standard Significant Resource Impact Report (SRIR) delineated specific resource boundaries, analyzed the impacts of development within the SROZ, and contained the required information, which included an analysis and development recommendations for mitigating impacts.

**Chair Svadlenka** asked if the 54 generated trips were a current number and not from 2017 TIA.

**Staff** confirmed the 54 PM Peak Hour trips were from the 2021 traffic study.

**Chair Svadlenka** asked why the 2017 study was referenced when a more recent study was available.

**Amy Pepper, Development Engineering Manager**, replied the original 2017 concept plan for the lot included a restaurant and a manufacturing use. Rather than redo the entire study in 2021, they evaluated from what the concept plan was in 2017, and the Traffic Memo identified that the current proposal was a less intense use than proposed in 2017.

**Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager**, added that since there was a study from 2017, it was not necessary to pay for a whole new study as the 2017 study contained much of the needed data even though it had never been approved. The Traffic Memo supplied by DKS was sufficient. Additionally, traffic patterns had changed since COVID, and Staff had conducted multiple updates and determined traffic had not increased at those study intersections since then. Despite never being approved, the 2017 study provided the intersection data, and Staff knew it was less traffic than what the study stated and therefore, the intersection would continue to meet the LOS.

**Ms. Pepper** confirmed that TIAs did have an expiration date, but the subject application had been in process for some time, and the 2021 Traffic Study was still valid considering when the development proposal first came online.

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

**Robert Wells, Architect, Lance Mueller & Associates, 130 Lakeside Ave., Suite 250, Seattle, WA, 98122** stated he was the architect on both the W-4 and W-5 building shells. He presented the Applicant's proposal via PowerPoint with these comments:

- Exhibit 2 showed the lot at present and a rendering of what it would look like upon completion. The building itself was a soft industrial building in a park-like setting.
  - The building had to be located on the lawn area; however, the owner wanted a building larger than that area, so a 15,000 sq ft second story was added to the 65,000 sq ft on the first story.
- On Exhibit 3, the yellow area was SROZ, dark green was wetlands, and light green was wetlands buffer. A retaining wall and fill were proposed on the west side to preserve most of the tree stand shown on the upper left of the exhibit.
  - Understanding SROZ/wetland requirements and producing a design that was workable had been a challenge. Learning that fire lanes and rain gardens could be located within the SROZ or wetlands buffer was helpful.
- The parking problem was solved with two lots at the southeast corner next to W-4, which required removing a number of trees, although a lot of trees overall would be saved. The tree count did not include all trees on the site, only the trees in the interstitial area between the SROZ and the building site.
  - The parking areas could not be seen from any right-of-way, and no parking within the site could be seen from the east, west, or south due to the existing vegetation. Only the frontage was visible to the public.
- Exhibit 3b highlighted various buildings occupied by DW Fritz. The buildings featured stained precast concrete and were on exceptionally well landscaped lots when first installed. [29:15 occupied?] The owner himself accompanied the landscape contractor to the plant suppliers to help pick the foliage.
  - The middle photo on the left showed the existing Building W-4, which had to be painted so it was not stained concrete. The photo on the bottom right featured the lobby of W-4, designed by Hacker, who had done the entry and interior. Most of the big budget for W-4 was for the interior, which was typical of high-tech buildings. He noted the developer had worked in Wilsonville on various projects for 34 years.
  - Page 2 of Exhibit 3b featured examples of one of the first stained buildings Lance Mueller & Associates had put vines on, which worked very well. The building was up against the SROZ.
  - The lower right photos featured a building from 1998 in Bellevue, Washington, the first time vines had been used with that particular owner and the first time they had stained precast concrete. It was very successful.

- The photo to the lower left featured a high-tech, three building spec development in Tualatin where one building was occupied by a precision machinist, one by a general contractor, and one had been recently sold.
- Exhibit 4 featured a rendering of the proposed Building W-5 in morning light. It was wrapped in stained concrete with vines on it to soften its appearance. The vines would grow naturally on the concrete and were not separated by any apparatus. They grew particularly well on a north elevation and would likely reach the top of the 40-ft building in four to five years.
- The southeast corner of the office featured two vertical rows of 10-ft sq windows with one row of 8-ft sq windows for the industrial area with the sills raised 8 ft from the floor to allow equipment to be placed against the wall. The proposed windows and a lot of skylights would provide a lot of natural light, which the owner liked. (Exhibit 5)
- As far as color and materials, the owner had not chosen the final stain, so several examples were shown. He noted the stains looked better and more natural on flat concrete, and although sunlight would cause fading over time, it kept a softer patina than blue, cold concrete. Bike racks in the form of geometric loops would also be featured onsite. (Exhibit 6, Slide 8)
- He highlighted key features shown on the building elevations, noting the location of the office and industrial/manufacturing areas and that a lot of vines would be present. (Exhibit 6, Slide 11)
- The lighting fixtures for Building W-5 were the same as those currently on Building W-4. (Exhibit 7-9)
- The lobby for Building W-5 was L-shaped and would face Boeckman Rd and Building W-4 to promote a connection between the two buildings. Originally, Building W-5 was intended for DW Fritz, but the process was too slow, so DW Fritz had rented elsewhere. (Exhibit 10-16, Slide 14)
- He noted an issue regarding the frontage, and they could not go more than 2.5 ft deep into that frontage.
- due to
- The utility easement located in the frontage on Boeckman Rd created an issue because the Applicant could not go more than 2.5 ft deep for about a 30 ft setback from the right-of-way on Boeckman Rd, so the pole lamps were removed and mounted to the building; though he preferred to have light bounce on the pavement and subtly light the facade. He noted sconces had been added on the façade to provide interest. [37:03]
- The high number of parking spaces was proposed for occasions when big contracts required employees to work multiple shifts but they were not normally needed. Previously, DW Fritz had to lease space offsite for parking and shuttle employees to Building W-4, which was not
- A big tree analysis had been done in an attempt to save the trees. The x's indicated trees deemed not worth keeping. (Exhibit 10-16, Slide 19)
- He concluded that he liked the project, adding it was appropriate for the use and site.

**Clark Hildum** asked how many semi- truck trips would be generated per day.

**Mr. Wells** replied there were only two truck docks, so such trips would be minimal. There were a lot more smaller trucks.

**Mr. Hildum** noted there were a lot of parking spaces for a lot of employees and asked if one driveway would be adequate.

**Mr. Wells** replied that two drive entries looped around and under Building W-4.

**Ms. Pepper** clarified that due to the classification of the streets, another driveway approach was not allowed.

**Mr. Wells** added the Applicant had tried repeatedly to add another driveway on the street to the west, but the requests were denied.

- He addressed concerns noted in Exhibit D1, the letter submitted from Karen Bryant dated June 2, 2023, with these comments:
  - She believed the building was too close to the main access road that ran north-south from Boeckman Rd. He clarified the sidewalk had been set back from a landscape buffer at the entrance, and along the east side of the building, the sidewalk was set back from the parking spaces so pedestrians would not have to walk on the edge of the street as they did on the Building W-4 site.
  - Ms. Bryant was also concerned with the entrance to the parking lot, believing that Building W-5 was too close to Boeckman Rd. He noted the turn radius met the requirement for fire truck access. The driveway had a right-in/right-out only separated by a subtle island with painted directional arrows. A large truck might have to drive over the island but could still functionally do that. These mitigations adequately addressed the tight spacing.
  - Additionally, Ms. Bryant was concerned that trucks would be in the drive aisle when maneuvering to the loading dock, which was correct as they would be briefly. However, the truck docks were located behind the building, along with a small number of employee parking stalls and garbage dumpsters, and the public had no need to go back there. The area was also screened from the right-of-way. Any vehicles that needed to pass could wait a moment and then proceed, so there was no problem.
  - The omission of the 11 parking stalls on the looped drive off the rain garden was another concern; however, the stalls had simply been moved closer to the building, making it much more convenient for W-4. Building W-5 did not take away any sidewalk space or parking stalls from W-4. In fact, the subject proposal included two additional stalls for Building W-4. The Applicant was a good neighbor in that regard. He believed Ms. Bryant was simply confused as to the location of the parking spaces when counting them on the plans.

**Mr. Hildum** asked what the sidewalk area on Boeckman Rd would look like.

**Mr. Wells** replied it was an existing sidewalk. There was existing vegetation to the sidewalk, and the Applicant had continued that same vegetation with the berm which tapered as the road

went up and down. He noted the roof equipment, such as the HVAC unit, was set back 15 ft to 20 ft and could not be seen from across the street. Screening mechanical equipment with the building façade was the preferred method. That was part of the standard and had been considered and noted on the plans for review.

**Ms. Luxhoj** advised that the sections of sidewalk Mr. Wells referenced, as well as the elevations and landscaping, could be found in the Staff report, Page 30, under Finding B49. Additionally, the angle from the public right-of-way to the roof that demonstrated the line of sight for the rooftop mechanical was included under Finding B67 on Page 34.

**Chair Svadlenka** understood the Applicant would take 49 eligible tree credits for the mature trees that were preserved. She asked if any of those credits came from the 21 situational trees.

**Mr. Pauly** replied if any did, the tree credits would be adjusted, and the standard would still be met.

**Ms. Luxhoj** confirmed that there was a group of situational trees at the southeast corner of the southern parking area along the edge where there were some grade changes; however, Staff did not look to see if there was correspondence between the tree credits and the situational trees.

**Chair Svadlenka** understood that to get tree credits, specific trees had to be identified by their diameter.

**Ms. Luxhoj** replied that was correct and explained that tree credit could only be taken for trees that were substituting for trees primarily in parking areas and that would provide shade comparable to what would have been provided with newly planted trees. The Applicant had proposed planting 65 trees, as well as over 300 in the SROZ, to mitigate for the 72 being removed.

**Chair Svadlenka** believed the SROZ looked dense to begin with and asked where 300 trees would go.

**Ms. Luxhoj** explained the primary mitigation area was in the northwest corner where several trees, primarily the Douglas firs, were really struggling. Kerry Rappold, Natural Resource Manager, was of the opinion the new trees could fit just fine.

**Chair Svadlenka** asked if Mr. Rappold provided any guidance as to what kind of trees would be planted.

**Ms. Luxhoj** confirmed Mr. Rappold would propose various appropriate and native species.

**Mr. Pauly** added that Mr. Rappold had been working on that part of the project with the Applicant in detail for quite some time. He noted that tree credits were not intended for



mitigation of removed trees. They were for situations in which a certain number of trees were required per number of parking spaces. Per Finding B44, the Applicant was at 37 of 50 required trees even without the tree credits. Therefore, if some of the situational trees were removed, the Applicant would still meet the required number of trees for the parking lot.

**Chair Svadlenka** called for public testimony regarding the application and confirmed with Staff that no one was present at City Hall to testify and no one on Zoom indicated they wanted to testify.

**Chair Svadlenka** confirmed there were no further questions or discussion and closed the public hearing at 7:23 pm.

**Mr. Pauly** entered the email Staff received of the Applicant's written responses to Exhibit D1, the letter from K. Bryant noting concerns about Building W-5, into the record as Exhibit B9.

**Cliff Hildum moved to approve the Staff report as presented with the addition of Exhibit B9. Yara Alatawy seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

**Clark Hildum moved to adopt Resolution No. 416 including the amended Staff report. The motion was seconded by Yara Alatawy and passed unanimously.**

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

**BOARD MEMBER COMMUNICATIONS:**

3. Recent City Council Action Minutes  
There were no comments.

**STAFF COMMUNICATIONS**

57:06

**Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager**, stated a DRB A meeting would be held in July.

**ADJOURN**

The meeting adjourned at 7:27 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paula Pinyerd, ABC Transcription Services, LLC. for  
Shelley White, Planning Administrative Assistant