



**Development Review Board
Panel A Meeting
October 11, 2021
6:30 pm**

This meeting is taking place with social distancing precautions in place:

- Board members are participating virtually, via Zoom videoconferencing
- Anyone experiencing fever or flu-like symptoms should not attend
- Council Chambers capacity is limited to 25 people and social distancing guidelines will be enforced

To Provide Public Comment

- 1) E-mail Shelley White at swhite@ci.wilsonville.or.us for Zoom login information
- 2) E-mail testimony regarding Resolution No. 394 (City of Wilsonville Public Works Facility) to Philip Bradford, Associate Planner at pbradford@ci.wilsonville.or.us by 2 pm on October 11, 2021.
- 3) In-person testimony is discouraged, but can be accommodated. Please contact Daniel Pauly at pauly@ci.wilsonville.or.us by phone at 503-682-4960 for information on current safety protocols.



**Wilsonville City Hall
Development Review Board Panel A**

Monday, October 11, 2021 - 6:30 P.M.

- I. Call to order:
- II. Chairman's Remarks:
- III. Roll Call:
 - Daniel McKay
 - Kathryn Neil
 - Rachelle Barrett
 - Jean Svadlenka
 - Ben Yacob
- IV. Citizens' Input:
- V. Consent Agenda:
 - A. Approval of minutes of the May 10, 2021 DRB Panel A meeting
- VI. Public Hearings:
 - A. **Resolution No. 394. City of Wilsonville Public Works Facility: Brandon Dole, Scott Edwards Architecture – Representative for Delora Kerber, City of Wilsonville – Applicant/Owner.** The applicant is requesting approval of a Stage I Master Plan, Stage II Final Plan, Site Design Review, Type C Tree Removal Plan, Class 3 Sign Permit and Lot Line Adjustment for construction of a new public works facility for the City of Wilsonville. The subject site is located on Tax Lots 1800 and 1900 of Section 14A, Township 3 South, Range 1 West, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Philip Bradford

Case Files:	DB21-0017	Stage I Master Plan
	DB21-0018	Stage II Final Plan
	DB21-0019	Site Design Review
	DB21-0020	Type C Tree Plan
	DB21-0021	Class 3 Sign Permit
	AR21-0010	Lot Line Adjustment

VII. Board Member Communications:

- A. Results of the May 24, 2021 DRB Panel B meeting
- B. Results of the September 27, 2021 DRB Panel B meeting
- C. Recent City Council Action Minutes

VIII. Staff Communications:

IX. Adjournment

Assistive Listening Devices (ALD) are available for persons with impaired hearing and can be scheduled for this meeting. The City will also endeavor to provide the following services, without cost, if requested at least 48 hours prior to the meeting.

- Qualified sign language interpreters for persons with speech or hearing impairments.
- Qualified bilingual interpreters.
- To obtain such services, please call the Planning Assistant at 503 682-4960

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING
OCTOBER 11, 2021
6:30 PM

- V. Consent Agenda:
 - A. Approval of minutes of May 10, 2021 DRB Panel A meeting

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

**Development Review Board – Panel A
Minutes– May 10, 2021 6:30 PM**

I. Call to Order

Chair Daniel McKay called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m.

II. Chair's Remarks

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

III. Roll Call

Present for roll call were: Daniel McKay, Jean Svadlenka, Kathryn Neil, Rachelle Barrett, Ben Yacob

Staff present: Daniel Pauly, Barbara Jacobson, Philip Bradford, Kerry Rappold, Miranda Bateschell, Kimberly Rybold, and Shelley White

IV. Citizens' Input This is an opportunity for visitors to address the Development Review Board on items not on the agenda. There were no comments.

V. Consent Agenda:

A. Approval of minutes of April 12, 2021 DRB Panel A meeting

Chair McKay moved to approve the April 12, 2021 DRB Panel A meeting minutes with the adjournment time corrected to state, "12:23 pm am". Jean Svadlenka seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

VI. Public Hearing

A. **Resolution No. 388 (revised). Canyon Creek ~~8-Lot~~ 5-Lot Subdivision: Scott Miller, SAMM-Miller LLC – Applicant for William Z. Spring and Fallbrook, LLC Owners.** The applicant is requesting approval of a Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment from Residential 0-1 Dwelling Units per Acre to Residential 4-5 Dwelling Units per Acre, a Zone Map Amendment from Residential Agriculture-Holding (RA-H) to Planned Development Residential 3 (PDR-3) and adopting findings and conditions approving a Stage I Master Plan, Stage II Final Plan, Site Design Review, Type C Tree Plan, Tentative Subdivision Plat, and Waiver for an ~~8-lot~~ 5-lot residential subdivision located at 28700 and 28705 SW Canyon Creek Road South. The subject site is located on Tax Lot 6400 and a portion of Tax Lot 3800 of Section 13BD, Township 3 South, Range 1 West, Willamette Meridian, City of Wilsonville, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Philip Bradford

Case Files: DB20-0039 Zone Map Amendment
DB20-0040 Comprehensive Plan Amendment

DB20-0041 Stage I Master Plan
DB20-0042 Stage II Final Plan
DB20-0043 Site Design Review
DB20-0044 Type C Tree Plan
DB20-0045 Tentative Subdivision Plat
DB20-0053 Waiver (*no longer needed in revised design*)

This item was continued to this date and time certain at the April 12, 2021 DRB Panel A meeting.

The DRB action on the Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment and Zone Map Amendment is a recommendation to the City Council.

Chair McKay called the public hearing to order at 6:37 p.m.

Chair McKay stated the resolution was a continuation of the April 12, 2021 DRB Panel A hearing, which was itself a continuation of the March 8, 2021 hearing. On behalf of the Board, he stated that he believed the Board was privileged to have listened to the testimony given last month, and he appreciated hearing some very valid arguments made using criteria applicable to the Board's review. He had noted the City's memo, which included some revisions to ensure that the Board was given adequate time to deliberate. He understood the Board was required, by rule, to provide the Applicant a review; otherwise the application was deemed to be accepted. Therefore, he wanted to ensure the Board had sufficient time to deliberate the proposed application thoughtfully, and believed it was in the public interest to follow the requirements outlined. He asked City Staff to detail those requirements to ensure the Board and members of the public were aware of them.

- He noted the significant and material changes that had been made to the application were largely a result of public testimony. The public had made an impact on the application even if all of their goals had not been met. He acknowledged City Staff and the Applicant for the revisions they made that addressed some of the concerns raised last month.
- He read the conduct of hearing format into the record. All Board members declared for the record that they had visited the site. No board member, however, declared a conflict of interest, bias, or conclusion from a site visit. No board member participation was challenged by any member of the audience.

Barbara Jacobson, City Attorney, stated she assumed everyone had seen the memo, noting her concern that the application was on its last extension of time, so the Board needed to get through it tonight and would need to be diligent about time. She suggested the Board hear the Staff and Applicant's report, and hold questions until both were finished. Any questions during citizen testimony should also be held until the end of citizen testimony and the Applicant's rebuttal.

Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager, expressed his appreciation for everyone involved who took the time to go through the Board's long meeting last month. The setback waivers were a major

issue last month. The City did not believe the setback waivers were approvable, but without the waivers, the Applicant did not believe the proposed eight homes would fit on the lots, which otherwise met the minimum lot size. The Applicant amended the application down to the current proposal for five lots and a wider street, as discussed last time. Otherwise, not much had changed, including the tree removal proposal.

Philip Bradford, Associate Planner, announced that the criteria applicable to the application were stated on page 2 of the Staff report, which was entered into the record. Copies of the report were made available to the side of the room.

Mr. Bradford presented the Staff report regarding the Applicant's revised proposal via PowerPoint with these key comments:

- The primary change to the proposed subdivision was a reduction from eight to five lots. The new proposal would relocate the Tract A open space from the west to the northeastern corner of the developable area of the property, and now only one home was proposed on the eastern side of the site where three homes had been proposed previously. Lots 1-5 were now wider, still met all the minimum lot size standards, and still fell within the density range allowed by the PDR-3 Zone as well as the Applicant's requested Comprehensive Plan Amendment. (Slide 2)
 - The relocated Tract A open space had decreased in size based on the developable area of the project now decreasing without including a portion of the property to the west. However, it still met the size requirements for an open space for a development of this size.
 - Currently, there was no detailed design for the proposed open space area because there was not enough time between hearings for the Applicant's landscape architect to design the open space tract for the new location. As such, the Staff report contained a condition of approval requiring the Applicant to return to the DRB for the final design of Tract A. He understood the landscape architect would not change; however, the condition was written such that if the landscape architect did change, a new affidavit and list of projects would be required to be submitted to City Staff to ensure that all requirements of the residential open space were met upon final design.
- The new site configuration removed the need for any waivers. The updated proposal now showed a 10-ft setback for Lot 5, which complied with the corner lot standard, and all interior lot lines now featured a setback of 7 ft, the standard for a two-story home, so waivers were no longer required and the waiver requests had been removed.
 - Lot 1 was in excess of 10,000 sq ft, which triggered different Code requirements compared to lots under 10,000 sq ft. The side yard setback for lots over 10,000 sq ft was 10 ft and Lot 1 was in compliance. Although the Applicant had shown a 7-ft setback, Staff did not condition it because the setbacks would be verified at the Building Permit stage and nothing about the shape or configuration of the lot led Staff to believe the 10-ft setback could not be met in the future as there was plenty of room to provide the correct setback. The noted the existing zoning for the site called for a 10-ft setback, and any home built there today would still require that 10-ft setback.

- The Applicant also widened the street for parking on one side. Previously, the right-of-way width, once built out, was approximately 24 ft, slightly under the threshold TVF&R allowed for parking on one side. With the changes to the application, the street width would now be 26-ft wide, which would allow for parking on one side, which hopefully addressed concerns about having additional parking.
- The amended Tree Removal Plan was mostly the same as the original. By default, fewer trees were proposed for removal because the new proposal removed part of the property from development, so five trees would remain as they were now offsite and no longer subject to the application. The trees still slated for removal were consistent with the trees slated for removal last time. Staff believed the conditions would still effectively protect the trees in the future. If the Applicant demonstrated a valid need in the future for those trees to be removed, Staff would work with the Applicant to evaluate that and approve it if necessary.
- He displayed an aerial view of the area, including the subject site, as it appeared in 1988 (Slide 7) and indicated a row of large trees on the northern boundary of the subdivision near the apartment complex on Vlahos Dr. The 1997 aerial showed the site with those trees having been removed for development, (Slide 8) as well as the younger trees currently on the site north of the property line, as Mr. Spring stated in his testimony, that were slated for removal. The slides demonstrated that the City had required the protection of significant trees within its natural resource zones in a consistent manner for years. Trees do get approved for development, and the valuable natural resource on the subject site, the Boeckman Creek Corridor, was protected or enhanced as evidenced by its unchanged state as shown between the two slides. The trees that were removed were for necessary development.
 - The new condition of the property to the south had resulted in a lot more trees as the redevelopment required new street trees along the frontage of Vlahos Dr where many homes had up to three street trees per lot. The apartment complex also featured additional tree plantings in its open space, parking lot, and along the street frontage. This showed that the City's approach to tree removal and preservation had stayed consistent throughout the years. As the area had redeveloped, trees had been approved for removal and for mitigation in their place. That was how the City kept track and maintained Wilsonville's urban tree canopy through development and other changes to the city over the years.
 - **Mr. Pauly** added it was about preserving those natural areas. Half the subject site was preserved as natural forest and riparian area and other trees on the site that fell outside the protected natural area. The Code was written in a way to balance tree removal with other considerations and site design considerations.
- Based on the available evidence and revisions to the project, Staff recommended approval to City Council on the Comprehensive Plan and Zone Map Amendments, and that the Board approve with conditions, contingent on City Council, the requested applications. Although the Applicant had not withdrawn the waiver request, Staff did not recommend approval for the waiver, because it was no longer necessary.

Chair McKay called for the Applicant's presentation.

Steve Miller, Emerio Design, 6445 SW Fallbrook Pl, Unit 100, Beaverton, OR, 97008 provided the Applicant's presentation via PowerPoint with the following key comments:

- He was happy to have the opportunity to show the Board that the Applicant had heard the neighbors' comments at the last meeting, and after a lot of thought and consideration, had amended the layout to five lots. It was important to note that the new layout did not take advantage of the SROZ density transfer, so the new plan was at the absolute bare minimum density.
- The Applicant was still working on getting all of the plan sheets updated, which was challenging to do in the short amount of time, particularly the storm sheet as it required more detail. He displayed the revised site plan showing the five lots. On the Existing Conditions Plan, the only item being removed was the old tract with everything else remaining the same. (Slide 2) The Tree Removal and Mitigation Plans would remain the same except for the five trees noted by Mr. Bradford that were in the previous tract which was no longer part of the project, so they no longer needed to be removed or mitigated for. (Slides 3 and 4)
 - The Applicant had explored what else could be done with the layout and the only other option was to shift the street to the south and put the lots to the north; that was how limited the Applicant was with options on the site. However, if the street was moved to the south, those trees would have to be removed, so the Applicant thought it best to keep the same proposal with Staff's conditions of approval, and work to mitigate preservation of some of those trees to the extent possible with the future homes.
 - The Applicant had seen some comment letters received this morning that included a conversation about moving the open tract space to the south, but the Applicant had chosen to put it to the north for two reasons. First, the north area was flatter so there would be more usable open space compared to the southeast area of the site, which had the most dramatic elevation change. Second, when the Applicant had worked on the previous layout, Staff had been very concerned about the other tract due to the line of sight into that open space area, how it interacted with the neighborhood, and how inviting it would be for people to use the space. The Applicant understood Staff liked the open space being at the end of the street instead because it accomplished the goals of it being open and visible with no places where people could hide, as well as more inviting to the neighborhood. He noted the road was currently shown extending all the way to the end, but it could be shortened. (Slide 5)
 - None of the grading had been changed, but the open space tract needed to be removed from the plan sheet.
 - The Utility Plan had been updated for the five lots with nice driveways. Some stormwater facilities were still being worked on but utilities could easily be provided to each lot. An opposition letter had shown the stormwater line running in a straight line, but it had to run in the direction shown on the Plan due to where the existing manhole it had to connect to was located. The truck turnaround met City criteria for delivery trucks and emergency vehicles, and the garbage hauler confirmed with the Applicant that the turnaround worked for their needs. (Slide 7) The only item that changed on the Public

Street Plan was the widening of the paved surface a bit; the rest of the Plan would remain as before.

- The new layout still included the required street trees, which were also in Tract A as well. The Lighting Plan was almost complete except the Applicant was still working on the location of one light which would probably shift to the east, based on the driveways. (Slide 10) Again, the original Tract A would also be relocated on the Plan.
- The Tree Plan showed which trees were necessary for removal to construct the project and which could potentially be saved in the future with the homes. Again, the Applicant supported the updated Staff report as written and the conditions of approval that addressed the trees. It was reasonable, complied with City Code, and did not remove the Applicant's ability to construct dwellings based upon a tree that could potentially conflict with a foundation in the buildable area of the lots. He was sorry the Applicant could not satisfy everybody's concerns with the reconfigured layout, but they had put a lot of time in trying to respond to those concerns. The revised project met all applicable review criteria. There were no more waiver requests and the lot sizes complied with the lot size standards.
- The setbacks also complied. He noted in an effort to get the revised Site Plan submitted in a timely manner, he overlooked the 10,000 sq ft lot requirement, which was why the Plan showed a 7-ft setback. The Applicant understood it was a 10-ft setback for lots over 10,000 sq ft and were okay with that. The Applicant did have a 10-ft setback for the side yard as it was a corner lot. Everything had been updated to address the Code. The subdivision was as simple as they could make it. It complied with all review criteria, met all Comprehensive Plan requirements, and provided needed housing for the city.
- He wished there was more they could do, but he was grateful Mr. Bradford had shared the aerial photos that showed the history of the site, the surrounding neighborhood, and how both had developed over time. He had presented a very clear picture that with development, trees were sometimes removed to accommodate homes, streets, and additional amenities that went into subdivisions. With that, however, came tree mitigation as well. Right-of-way trees were planted along streets, additional trees were planted in open spaces, and trees were mitigated on individual lots and preserved in the SROZ boundary.
- He confirmed the driveways were still wide enough to park a car in them, adding at 24 ft, they were even wider now.

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

Sharon Sala stated she wished to cede her time to Joan Carlson.

Shelley White, Planning Administrative Assistant, stated Staff had planned to call on those who were unable to testify at the last meeting first. She informed Ms. Sala that if she wished to testify, she should do so now as a decision had been made prior to the meeting that there would be no ceding of time to other neighbors who wished to speak.

Mr. Pauly replied that there should be consistency among everyone tonight on that point.

Ms. Jacobson confirmed she had nothing to add but they did have to get through the hearing tonight, as the City was out of time.

Ms. Sala stated she would not speak and would leave it to Joan or David Carlson if that could be accommodated later.

Ms. White said she believed the only other person who was unable to testify at the last meeting was Rene Sala. Although he had called in earlier, he was not in the Zoom meeting. The remaining people were those who were in attendance and either testified at the last DRB meeting or ceded their time to others. She noted about five people in Council Chambers wanted to testify, as well as another person online. She noted each speaker would have three minutes to testify.

David Carlson thanked the DRB for their hard work and the time it took to review the testimony and letters. He believed they all had the mutual goal of wanting to do what was best for the citizens of Wilsonville and the neighbors of the proposed development. He advised the Board he would be referencing Mr. Calcagno's document, adding that Mr. Calcagno was ill and could not attend. He apologized to his neighbor, Mr. Spring, for any hurt that this had caused him, as he was a good man and he certainly did not intend to disparage him in any way, and he was sorry for anything that had come across that way. He noted he would be 95 years old before those trees were back to the same height they were now. He hoped he and his wife lived long enough to see them.

- The relocation of Lot 1 made a lot of sense. He lived there, and the property was essentially flat across the back. He was concerned about having a large house 10 ft from his property line and preferred 20 ft. It seemed logical to move it back and swap the home and the open space tract locations. Then, none of the 10 trees along his property line would need to be cut down because they would be in the open space. It would not impact his large Big Leaf Maple or the dripline, and his maple tree would not be touching or encroaching on the new house 10 ft from his property line, which seemed like a good balance to him.
- Swapping the proposed home and open space tract would also eliminate the need for a private drive. He understood the City was careful about creating more impervious surfaces. Instead, there could be a nice pathway, which would be a very nice space. Having raised a lot of children, he would rather have his open space be a bit protected by neighbors rather than open to the street. It would actually create a more desirable open space, reduce the amount of severe grading necessary, and potentially, by running the storm line over the back hill similar to Phase II of the project, reduce additional impact to trees. He had a large oak tree on his property that would probably be killed by the storm drain access and he would appreciate the Applicant's consideration in relocating the open space.

Joan Carlson stated her address was on record. She noted the previous speaker was her husband and they were thankful for the DRB and how they had taken a tremendous amount of time to evaluate the proposed project as it was very important to them, their neighbors, their children, and grandchildren. She cared about the city and what was done in the city as it continued to grow and develop. Wilsonville was a great place to live, and she wanted to keep it

that way. However, at some point, the high rate of development needed to slow down. Wilsonville was a Sterling Tree city, and residents took that very seriously. She had reviewed the March and April editions of the Boones Ferry Messenger, which included multiple articles about what a great city Wilsonville was and how the City protected trees. The proposed project did not match up with that. She was very concerned that the developer wanted to remove 21 trees and believed that in reality, all of the trees would be removed. Those trees are big, beautiful, native trees that had stood there for many years and even survived the February ice storm. She asked the DRB to do the right thing and slow this down.

- In her perfect world, the zoning would not be changed and her neighbors to the north could buy the property and put a horse on it. Short of that, she was grateful the project had been reduced from eight to five homes, but she would also like to see Lot 1 moved to the north. She had chickens in that back corner on her property and they were very noisy in the morning. That would be a problem for her new neighbors if Lot 1 stayed in its current proposed location.
- She asked the DRB to protect the city's urban treescape. The tree canopy in the area was beautiful and they hated to see it go. She asked the DRB to take another look at the SROZ area as shown in the 1997 aerial photograph displayed earlier and note all the trees that used to be there. The current developer had spoken about replanting down in there, but she did not think that was a viable idea because the trees being removed were 20 to 30 ft tall. She noted the developer still wanted to remove the four trees on the City property and did not believe his Tree Plan had changed at all.

Brenda Troupe stated that her address was on record and thanked the Applicant for reducing the number of homes from eight to five. Lot 1 was the largest lot on the site at 10,000 sq ft. As proposed, the side of the home on Lot 1 would back up against her back property line and be only 10 ft from her backyard. The other four homes would have normal 20-ft setbacks. She would have part of a Lot and all of Lot 2 in her backyard. One home would be 10 ft from her backyard and the other 20 ft. At the very least, it should be 20 ft from her property line consistent with the other four homes.

- The maximum height of a home in Wilsonville was 38 ft from ground level. She asked if the DRB understood how tall that really was. To give them an idea, she presented a photo of the Cape Meares Lighthouse, which was 38 ft tall. She would have a structure as tall as a lighthouse 10 ft from her property line. Because the original Plan had called for three homes to be built along the east side of the property, and now that was reduced to one, it would seem there was sufficient room to move that house farther to the north and eliminate some of the problems she had outlined.
- She agreed with Mr. Carlson's suggestion to switch the locations of Lot 1 and Tract A. It would solve the problem of a 38-ft house 10 ft from her backyard. In addition to the ideas mentioned by Mr. Carlson, the switch would prevent car headlights from shining into their back windows, minimize fire hazards caused by the close proximity of a house on Lot 1 to her house, and improve privacy for both her family and the new homeowner. The change would make it equitable to both herself and the new homeowner. She thanked the DRB for their consideration and time and noted that now was the time to do the right thing.

Chip Halstead stated his address was on file and he wanted to focus on the new road that would access the five homes and the waivers required to build it. Current City Code stated that no dead-end road could exceed 200 ft and that any such road needed to be 28-ft to 34-ft wide. To avoid those restrictions, the developer's proposed plan indicated their access road was not a dead end, but a through street. That was not true. The proposed future through street would need to cut straight through the next door neighbor's \$1.8 million property, dividing their recently built home from the church building in back. It would strand their home on an island surrounded closely by streets on all four sides. No one he knew who would want to live in such a terrible location. He wondered who would spend \$1.8 million to buy the home and church only to tear them down to construct a through street and another subdivision. He did not believe any through street would be built during his or anyone's lifetime. That meant the Code violations for the access road would not be rectified for 50 to 100 years. It would really be a dead-end road over the 200-ft limit, not 34-ft wide, and with no turnaround at the end for cars, trucks, or emergency vehicles. For those reasons, he strongly recommended the proposed subdivision plan and access road not go forward as planned.

- Over the weekend, he and his wife had walked through the neighborhood and had spoken to many people about their feelings regarding the rezoning needed to build the proposed development. Of the 42 people they had spoken to in person, 39 signed the petition to oppose the development, which was more than 90 percent. Additionally, a Facebook poll sent to the Renaissance Canyon Creek neighborhood received 34 more responses with one person in favor and 33 opposed, many of whom were not even aware of the proposed development until they got the poll; that was more than 95 percent opposed. The majority of the neighbors he reached stated they were concerned about the trees, the parking, the safety, and firmly opposed this proposed subdivision. He hoped the DRB would listen carefully to all of their voices and thoughtfully take their concerns to heart.

Michelle Calcagno, 7563 SW Vlahos Dr, Wilsonville, OR stated she had not planned on speaking but wanted to address something Mr. Bradford had said in his presentation. She understood the considerations of development and what had occurred in the past, but just because something was done before, did not mean it was still the correct course of action in the present. In 1988, climate change was something people talked about that might happen, but that was not the reality today. She wondered why people would continue to be complacent when they should be more aggressive in their decisions about what to do with trees. Climate change was not coming—it was here. There were insane fires, ice, hurricanes—insane weather. How much rain had fallen this month? Hello—climate change was here. The trees had to be considered. While not amazing white oak or a precious species to keep, they were beautiful, native trees that offered shade and added to the urban canopy. She understood not every tree could be saved, but the earth was at an inflection point and this had to be thought about. Sometimes that meant trees had to be chosen over development. If not, what was going to happen?

- She agreed with Mrs. Carlson that the SROZ did not look the same. A lot of it was dead and covered in blackberries. She asked the DRB to just please think about it.
- She also agreed with swapping Tract A and Lot 1, and then there would be an impervious walkway. The developer had said they did not want the open space shady where people

could lurk, but it was surrounded by homes on three sides, so a lurker would be noticed. Who didn't have motion detectors at the back of their property?

Helena Lulay stated her address was on file. She wanted the DRB to understand how appreciative neighbors were of the DRB's respect for the citizens' input. It was unbelievable that this had come to this. If not for the extension and the City meeting with the developer, there would be eight homes on that lot that would not meet Code, the density transfer. She also thanked the City for meeting and having the conversation as well.

- She believed there had to be a new Tree Plan. As she understood it, the old Tree Plan included four City trees, which were part of the 26 to be removed. Those four trees had been removed, and she wanted to know if that meant another four trees were removed. On pages 22 or 23 of the previous meeting minutes, Mr. Miller had stated a home could not be built on what was Lot 8, currently Lot 5, even with a 10-ft setback. The lot was now almost 2,000 sq ft larger, so she could not understand why all of the trees could not be protected. The street could be 38-ft wide and still get what the Applicant needed, while also protecting the trees.
- She was kind of insulted by the slides of the area in 1988 and 1997 that showed how the area compared to how it was now. The SROZ was a forest; now, it was just little sticks. There were questions that needed to be answered. She wanted to know about a real Tree Plan and what it looked like. She did not believe that neighbors would have the opportunity to see one or speak to it because tonight a decision would be made. It needed to move forward for all the right reasons and she appreciated that, but there other questions. She asked if that easement was ever researched and if anyone had an answer on the easement that was discussed at the last meeting. There were still unanswered questions that needed to be addressed. She believed the DRB had done a great job, and she appreciated it, but there were also questions about the property line. She asked if the arborvitae that ran down the center of the property line would be protected. No one knew.
- As a homeowner, she was afraid to wake up one morning to the sound of a chainsaw and those trees coming down in in her backyard. She asked the Board to do the due diligence it had already done; the neighbors really appreciated it. This process worked. The citizens' voices needed to be heard, and the citizens needed to understand who was accountable and where to follow through. She appreciated the DRB's time tonight and looked forward to some answers.

Greg Pelsner stated his address was on file and he was concerned about the new street. He understood the new street had gone from 24-ft to 26-ft. He was unable to find any Code requirements for street width and parking. Although he was happy that the revised Plan included street parking, he did not believe 6-ft was wide enough for parking. It was his understanding that public streets needed a minimum of 20-ft of clearance for emergency vehicles, which would only leave 6-ft here for parking. His own vehicle was more than 6-ft wide. The Code requirement for minimum parking width for compact cars was 8.5 ft, 2.5 ft more than the proposed street width. He requested that both the developer and Staff look at that again. He wanted to ensure there was 20-ft clear for emergency vehicles, as well as adequate street parking. Although he had seen no elevations, he was fairly certain that the curb on the north side of the street was too high to allow a parked car to open its door.

- His main purpose in testifying tonight was to thank everyone. He thanked Staff for their efforts and re-review of everything. He had been involved in local, state, and national code interpretations and wanted to remind everyone that codes were minimum standards for development and construction and asked that the DRB keep that in mind when allowing multiple variances. He thanked the DRB for listening to all of the testimony, especially late into the evening on April 12, 2021. They all very much appreciated what the DRB did. He thanked Shelley White and advised that she had been great to work with, and he thanked Bill Spring for his patience through this process.

Ms. White stated there were no more citizens who wished to testify.

Chair McKay stated that he and the DRB appreciated everyone's kind words, but the DRB could not take credit; it was truly citizen involvement that made the difference. He noted the citizens' involvement was unprecedented, at least during his time on the Board. He thanked everyone for their testimony last month as well as tonight. He called for any questions from the Board of the Staff, the Applicant, or any member of the public that had provided testimony.

Rachelle Barrett asked Staff for guidance or clarity regarding the placement of Lot 1.

Mr. Pauly replied Staff did not dictate every aspect of a project's design. Ultimately, the Applicant might be able to meet the Code even if not ideal. If putting Lot 1 to the north was the design preference and it met Code that might be acceptable. He noted the area was not an open wildlife area, but meant for active recreational use. It was called usable open space in the Code because of a requirement program usable open space. Access and topography were important. From an urban design standpoint, Staff loved to see open spaces as the focal point at the terminus of the street. It was commonly accepted and desirable to turn the vista at the end of the street into an open space. Visibility from the street was in the Code and was important from a public safety standpoint to allow patrol officers to see into the open area as well as residents from their homes. These things were supportable from a Staff standpoint regarding the proposed location of the open space.

Jean Svadlenka asked if the SROZ transfer was waived now, would it not be able to be utilized by the builders in the future.

Mr. Pauly replied that was not something that could be changed administratively. It was subject to the Board's review as part of the subdivision review tonight. Any change would have to return to the Board as it was the same process as used tonight.

Ms. Svadlenka asked if the new road design had been shown to Republic Services and Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue (TVF&R) for them to assess the dimensions and accessibility. She understood the prior design had been shown to both services previously.

Khoi Le, Development Engineering Manager, replied Staff did not usually show public street designs to public services or delivery companies, but Staff did confirm the 26-ft-wide street was

wide enough for parking on one side according to the cross street section for a local street as interpreted from the Transportation System Plan (TSP). That also answered the earlier question during testimony about how wide the street would be and whether it would accommodate on-street parking on one side.

Mr. Bradford responded that Staff did not show the revised road design to Republic Services or TVF&R because it had become 2-ft wider and that fell within the standards and conditions the City already had from TVF&R for street width and parking on one side.

Ms. Svadlenka asked how a 2-ft increase in street width would be able to accommodate parked cars on one side and still allow emergency vehicle access.

Mr. Le replied that local streets with parking on one side were not expected to accommodate travel in both directions at the same time. Even with a car parked on one side, the 18-ft wide street could accommodate two cars traveling in opposite directions, but when a garbage truck or emergency vehicle came through, it was expected that other drivers would share the road.

Mr. Miller stated that if there was any concern with the on-street parking, the Applicant was more than willing to remove it. They had widened the street and added on-street parking in a good faith effort to respond to neighbor concerns raised at the last meeting. The current design met all City requirements, which TVF&R operated from as well. The Applicant was agreeable to either the original 24-ft-wide street with no on-street parking or the current design and would leave it up to the DRB to decide.

Mr. Pauly replied that there was a two-step approval process. TVF&R was involved in the development of the standards in the TSP, and signed off on an acceptable road width for parking on one side. For a subdivision application review, the primary concern of TVF&R was turn radius, the ability to get a hose to all homes, and if alternatives, such as sprinklers were present in the homes. They would not review the width of a particular street at this point in the process as those standards had already been agreed upon.

Ms. Svadlenka confirmed with the Applicant that the home on Lot 1 would still have fire sprinklers installed. She asked if Trees 6245, 6246, 6247, and 6248 would only be removed if absolutely necessary and Staff deemed it as such.

Mr. Miller stated those trees were along the common property line of the existing right-of-way and Lot 5. The trees were not on any one property, but right in the middle of the property line. The Applicant stood behind the Tree Removal, Grading & Mitigation Plan and anticipated those trees would need to be removed to accommodate the development. That was why the Applicant supported the conditions of approval. They were showing the trees they believed needed to be removed to develop the property.

Ms. Svadlenka noted the Staff report stated, "The Applicant shall submit a revised Tree Preservation & Removal Plan that shows the retention of those trees, including proper tree

protection fencing.” The Staff report also said that should those trees require removal in the future, then City approval would be required.

Mr. Miller responded then the Applicant would operate under that condition of approval. He confirmed they would be removed only if necessary and supported by an arborist.

Mr. Pauly clarified that at that point, if all evidence pointed to removal being necessary, the Applicant would have to obtain signatures from the proper City officials to remove them, just like any other neighbor.

Ms. Svadlenka asked if the trees were currently in the official Tree Removal Plan.

Mr. Bradford replied per that condition.

Mr. Pauly asked if the condition needed modified a bit. The intent was that those trees would operate similarly to the trees along the back property line which were intended for retention if at all possible, while recognizing the feasibility of retention was currently unknown until the exact location of the foundations were identified as well as the roots in those locations. If the Applicant showed the trees could not be retained, the City would sign off on those removals, similar to those along the south property line.

Chair McKay asked if the question was whether the 21 trees that had been identified included the trees that were not intended to be removed.

Ms. Svadlenka responded that as of now, the 21 trees to be removed did include those four. She wanted to get the numbers clear in terms of how many trees were definitely or might possibly be removed

Chair McKay confirmed it should state 17 trees.

Mr. Bradford stated Condition of Approval PDF8 was revised with additional language to clarify that if the trees should be removed in the future, City approval would be required and the Applicant would have to follow the steps outlined in Condition of Approval PDF9 to demonstrate the removal was necessary. Condition of Approval PDF9 discussed the arborist report and whether those trees needed to be removed, based on the house plans. If so, it would be verified with a second arborist. Although the preference was for the trees to remain on the site, he believed those trees should stay slated for removal because then the mitigation would remain consistent if they were indeed removed in the future.

Ms. Svadlenka stated that as she recalled from the last meeting, the eight trees on the southern border across Lots 2, 3, and 4 would be preserved if possible, but it was not likely based on where the house would have to go on those lots. She asked if it made sense to add those trees to the Tree Removal Plan to allow mitigation for them, since they would likely be removed.

Mr. Bradford replied the overall mitigation was such that no matter what happened, the 36 trees being planted would cover those eight trees if they were removed.

Mr. Pauly added that prior to any tree removal, Staff issued an administrative permit that confirmed the mitigation. He believed that would be the case if the trees in question had to be removed. However, if mitigation was not called for, Staff would require it. There was no window for the Applicant to get out of mitigation.

Ms. Svadlenka stated approximately ten trees were slated for removal across the new design of Tract B and Lot 1. She asked if the trees could remain if Tract A and Lot 1 were reversed.

Mr. Miller responded that not all of the trees to the south would be able to remain. He reminded that currently, a storm line needed to come down through the southeast corner of Lot 1 to connect to the existing storm line in the subdivision to the south, and there were trees in that corner where the storm line would have to exit. It was preferable that storm lines maintained no more than a 45-degree angle, and to maintain that angle and connect the new storm line to the existing storm line, the pipe had to come out at a certain point on that property. Therefore, the trees in that corner would have to be removed to accommodate the storm line.

Ms. Svadlenka understood that according to the plan she had, only five trees had to be removed to accommodate the storm line, but the other five trees could potentially remain if Tract A and Lot 1 were reversed.

Mr. Miller confirmed Ms. Svadlenka was correct.

Chair McKay read from page 12 of the Staff report, "Removal of 21 trees outside the SROZ due to grading and site improvement, and one tree due to poor conditions," and asked if they were talking about 21 trees or 22 trees.

Mr. Bradford replied that one of the 21 trees was being removed due to poor condition.

Ben Yacob asked if there were other options for the storm line other than connecting to the existing storm line in the subdivision to the south, such as the creation of a dry well to allow the stormwater to permeate into the groundwater aquifer or redirecting stormwater into the creek.

Mr. Le replied that the City required the new stormwater line to connect to the existing manhole to convey the stormwater runoff generated by the development. City Code did not allow dry wells. Directly to the creek could be an option, but was not preferable. The requirement stated that it had to connect to an already established stormwater system. The City did not like to discharge into the creek because they did not want to disturb the natural area of the creek or cause erosion of the creekside into the creek.

Mr. Yacob stated that if the stormwater was fed into the creek, it could potentially provide more habitat and water for more trees and life, as opposed to having it directed into the stormwater pipe and erosion could be monitored on an annual basis.

Mr. Le agreed that it could be, but the Code requirement stated it had to be connected to an existing stormwater system. The City tried to minimize outflow to the creek and allow only natural flowing water, as opposed to water generated from developments.

Mr. Yacob thanked Mr. Le, adding he had lived in Wilsonville since 1984 and remembered when the creek was just a trickle. Now, when he walked along the Boeckman Creek Trail, he saw culverts that added water to Boeckman Creek. He understood directing stormwater into the creek was not preferred, but there were precedents where it had been done in the past.

Mr. Le stated he believed it had been done in the past when there was no restriction. As far as he understood, the requirement was to minimize outflow to a natural creek or river. Maintaining the outflow that pre-dated the regulation was very expensive and required a lot of manpower from Public Works. Staff was looking to update the Stormwater Master Plan to improve the outflow to ensure that it continued to function, as well as eliminate erosion to the creek bank. That work disturbed a lot of the natural area due to construction equipment going down there. Therefore, the City preferred not to have any additional outflow going into the river or creek.

Mr. Yacob noted that as part of the Master Plan, a bike lane would be added to the Boeckman Creek corridor that would connect Canyon Creek to Memorial Park, which would cause disturbance to the area.

Ms. Jacobson advised continuing the discussion after the City's Natural Resource Manager had joined the meeting.

Chair McKay stated that both Mr. Miller and Staff agreed there was an error in the plans where the setback on Lot 1 was listed at 7-ft as opposed to 10-ft. He asked if Staff would consider adding a condition that the Site Plan be updated to fully comply with the setback requirements to ensure that it was codified.

Ms. Jacobson replied she had heard the Applicant state he was agreeable to that, so it could be added as a condition and included in the resolution, if the DRB decided to approve the project.

Mr. Miller agreed with Ms. Jacobson and added that it could be as simple as stating that lots over 10,000 sq ft must meet the applicable setback requirements.

Mr. Bradford confirmed he would write up and read a condition into the record that the Board could add. Otherwise, it would be reviewed at the Building Permit process when setbacks were checked on the actual home site. Adding a condition would provide additional assurances.

Chair McKay believed adding a condition made sense. He asked if the arborvitae were on the property line and if they would be maintained.

Mr. Miller replied the arborvitae were either on the property line or south of the property line, which was why they were not shown for any type of removal.

Mr. Yacob stated that a new stormwater line would be ran through one of the proposed lots and connect to a manhole on the Vlahos Dr side. To achieve that, some trees had to be removed. He asked Mr. Rappold why that stormwater could not be funneled to the Boeckman Creek waterway along the corridor because he had seen culverts into the creek at the Boeckman Creek Trail and other locations along the corridor.

Kerry Rappold, Natural Resources Manager, responded that he did not have the drainage report with him, but there was a chance that there was a topographical break there. Some of the stormwater from the Renaissance subdivision ran off to the west, and the City did not like to see out-of-basin transfers as far as stormwater runoff, but preferred to see historic drainage patterns maintained. That was possibly the issue, but without the report in front of him, he did not know for sure. There were outfalls in the Boeckman Creek corridor that took runoff from other developments along Canyon Creek.

Mr. Yacob noted the City was going to build a bridge on Boeckman Rd, as well as a proposed bike path from Canyon Creek down to Memorial Park. He did not believe adding some stormwater would be significant, whereas building a stormwater pipe that went through backyards and took out trees could have some impact.

Mr. Rappold replied it was City policy to not redirect historic flows or drainage patterns. It could potentially be looked at, however, if the City had that direction.

Mr. Miller stated the Applicant was agreeable to either solution, but the City would have to decide that because the Applicant had designed to City Code. As he understood it, the DRB would need to direct the Applicant to do anything outside the Code.

Chair McKay recommended a condition be added whereby the City reviewed the potential to direct stormwater runoff directly into Boeckman Creek. If that was deemed not possible, then it would go as is. He understood the Applicant was amenable to changing where the stormwater runoff went, but the City had to indicate they wanted to do it that way.

Mr. Yacob replied that he would like to make that motion. He understood the City had defaults, but if this deviation from that default saved some trees and allowed the Applicant to move Lot 1 from the south to the north side of the site, it would alleviate a lot of concerns people had, including digging up their backyards to connect to a manhole on Vlahos Dr.

Mr. Pauly stated he did not know that they could make a decision but he did know that it was an alternative.

Mr. Jacob stated he wanted to make a motion to request City Staff to research the issue.

Chair McKay responded he had made note of that and would make sure it was raised during deliberations and worded in an acceptable way.

Mr. Miller noted that when the subdivision was designed originally, the pipe was daylighted because they were unaware of the existing manhole. When they daylighted the pipe down into the SROZ, it disturbed more trees, and those trees would have to come out to get that pipe to daylight. It was a tradeoff between removing the trees at the southeast corner of the site or the trees in the SROZ.

Mr. Jacob said he appreciated that, but there was also the issue of disturbing people's property.

Mr. Miller replied that he understood and was leaving the decision to the DRB. He simply wanted to make sure it was understood that either solution meant the loss of some trees.

Kathy Neil stated she understood the Applicant did not want to switch Lot 1 and Tract A because the elevation gain was not amenable to the community space. However, it looked to her like the elevation gain on Lot 1 and Tract A were similar. She asked if the storm drainage was corrected, would the elevation gain be an issue in switching the two lots.

Mr. Miller responded the Applicant was more than happy to swap Tract A with Lot 1 and confirmed they would do so in such a manner that all of the requirements were still met. Tract A would remain at its current proposed square footage and the remainder would go to Lot 1. He was also agreeable to either including or not including street parking, running the storm sewer line to the SROZ or down to the existing manhole, and to all the conditions of approval.

Chair McKay stated that Page 12 and Page 67 of the Staff report showed the original design with eight lots. He asked if that was intended to be deleted.

Mr. Bradford replied that was intentional. Although the Tree Plan had not changed, the lots did, but he had not provided a new one because it was unlikely the condition would change so it was not necessary to redo the overlay because it would not result in a very different site condition.

Ms. Jacobson added that when the resolution was made, Chair McKay could clarify that it was based on a 5-lot design.

Chair McKay stated that a concern had been raised by a neighbor that a prior builder had not followed through on their obligation for items such as setbacks and preservation. He noted that the report stated the City would conduct a review for the plat and/or sub-plat and the setbacks. He asked Mr. Miller if that was an actual City obligation or just something the City planned to

do. A question for the attorney would be, "Could the DRB obligate the City to do a review to enforce all the conditions for the builder."

Mr. Pauly replied that it was built into the process. Tonight was one step in the process. Then a plat review would be conducted, at which time any conditions were double-checked to ensure they were met. During the Building Permit phase, setbacks were tracked. Conditioning a review by the City would be moot. A better approach was to call out City Staff to the site during plat review or Building Permit review if any conditions were unclear or needed to be further highlighted. Reviewing the conditions of approval was a kind of checklist at both of those checkpoints. He confirmed City Code stated that permits could only be issued consistent with DRB approval.

Chair McKay appreciated that parking on one side of the proposed street had been added. He noted that on the drawing there was a bit of a road expansion where the public road met the private road and asked if that was large enough to allow a vehicle to turn around. He asked if in the alternative, a waiver to the open space requirement could be provided so there could be a cul-de-sac that would allow turnaround.

Mr. Miller stated it was not possible to have a cul-de-sac and an open space due to the size of a cul-de-sac. It was a stump street, but he was confident that eventually it would be a through street. Even if the open space was shifted to the south, a hard surface would still be needed, especially if they connected the storm line to the manhole to facilitate access to the manhole. A hard path would also be necessary for pedestrian access into the open space area. One option would be installing a bollard for vehicles to pull into and back out of to turn around, but a cul-de-sac was not an option.

Chair McKay asked Mr. Miller if he was amenable to adding something that allowed for some kind of vehicle turnaround.

Mr. Miller replied they could work with Staff to come up with different ideas but cautioned against a hard surface that was open to the open space if Lot 1 were located on the north side. A bollard was an option because vehicles would only be allowed to go approximately 20-ft in and then turn around.

Chair McKay stated he assumed that if Lot 1 and Tract A were swapped, the plans would be drawn up a little bit differently. He believed there would be less hard surface and the 16-ft-wide private drive that went all the way through would be turned into a path or something else.

Mr. Miller replied that was correct. Ultimately, the final design would depend on whether the stormwater was discharged through the existing manhole or into Boeckman Creek. Other manholes would have to be added to the storm line route that would also need to be accessible for cleaning. He could not answer the question specifically, but advised some hard surfaces would be needed. The width might be 20-ft where it met the public street to accommodate the turnaround pocket and then taper down to 5- or 6-ft for a sidewalk into the open space.

Chair McKay asked Staff how a motion would be made to make an amendment to the conditions. It was obvious there would be a modification of Tract B, so he asked Staff how a modification that was consistent with their intent would be made if the DRB did not want to hear that.

Mr. Pauly replied the intent of the motion should be very clear so the design team and Staff had clear direction. He asked Mr. Bradford if any other Code considerations should be considered, such as regarding public safety and line of sight for the open space.

Mr. Bradford replied that a few things just discussed had raised a few Code concerns that he wanted to address. First, regarding comments about possibly waiving the open space requirements, he cited Section 4.118.B, "The following shall not be waived by the Board unless there is substantial evidence in the record to support a finding that the intent and purposes of the standards will be met in alternative ways" and noted first item that shall not be waived was the open space requirements in residential areas.

- Swapping the lots would also result in difficulty meeting the Site Design Review standards. Tucking the open space behind houses would limit line of sight and make it difficult to meet the public safety and crime prevention standards. Open spaces were designed to be usable, and by nature. Tucking it back in an area where it could not be seen would defeat the purpose of the open space. Residents had to know it was there in order to use it.
- Including a turnaround could be detrimental to designing the open space and be problematic when the open space criteria were considered during the Site Design Review. A turnaround feature would take up space from a beneficial feature for the community that was listed as an amenity that should be provided within open spaces.
- Currently, the open space was shown in a very visible location, seen immediately upon turning the corner. It would have fewer shadows cast upon it because it would not be blocked by any houses. The current layout was the most Code compliant arrangement, so he encouraged the DRB to consider what sort of design swapping those lots would result in and how that would benefit the community when it returned before the DRB fleshed out by a landscape architect.

Mr. Le stated the DRB could ask the Applicant to demonstrate how the private drive could be used as a vehicle turnaround, as he believed it would be sufficient for a turnaround as opposed to tacking more room on the open space for a turnaround.

Ms. Svadlenka understood that although the open space would be accessible to the general public, it was intended for use by the five homeowners as they would be responsible for its maintenance through an HOA.

Mr. Bradford confirmed the open space was not a public park. It would not be fenced and be open to anyone. Even though the open space would be controlled by the HOA and meant for those residents, there would not be a barrier, so anyone could use the open space.

Ms. Svadlenka stated that the previous plan that had Tract A across the road featured a fence around Tract A. She believed having it behind Lot 1 would remove the need for a fence because it would be semi-protected for use by the residents of the five homes. She noted Ms. Lulay had mentioned an easement during her public testimony and asked what that was about.

Chair McKay recalled there being an easement on the street on a past map, but the current site design omitted it, and the Board had sought clarification on it.

Mr. Pauly stated if it existed, it could stop the development but the City was not party to that easement, so the DRB should operate under the assumption that it had been resolved. It was a private easement of some sort, potentially. The owner of the easement would have to be the one to enforce it. No agency existed that owned or took responsibility for the easement at this point. It was beyond the DRB's scope tonight to resolve that private item.

Ms. Svadlenka asked who the public would contact to report illegal parking.

Mr. Pauly replied the police or the Traffic & Parking Concern Team. The City had a Code compliance specialist. Citizens could use the City's website to file a complaint and it would get assigned to the right place for resolution.

Mr. Yacob stated that in the previous plan, Tract A was next to a house behind the Sundial Apartments, which resulted in some shadowing. He asked why shadowing was not a concern then, but was a concern now that Tract A was being moved to the east of the property.

Mr. Bradford responded the context was very different. In the previous plan, the parking lot of the apartment complex was adjacent to Tract A, and no structure would have cast shadows or blocked it. The unimproved right-of-way provided sight lines into the open space. The adjacent house was one-story, and the public sidewalk would go right along the access point to the open space, providing a visual cue that there was something there. Whereas on the new site plan, the open space could be walked passed and completely missed or assumed to be private property rather than a residential open space. Staff had concerns about the original Tract A, so an herb garden was included in the design to push the active use space more within the public view shed. With that, he felt more comfortable writing Code findings that stated the open space met the site design review, public safety, and crime prevention standards. He did not know how he would write findings to support an open space where the current Tract A and Lot 1 were swapped. He confirmed that the upkeep for Tract A would be funded through HOA for the 5-lot subdivision and not the City.

Mr. Yacob noted if the homeowners were paying for the upkeep of Tract A, they would know where it was located.

Chair McKay asked if the Applicant had any rebuttal.

Mr. Miller replied no, adding that he believed a lot of ground had been covered tonight and he appreciated the conversation. The major concerns had been addressed. He reiterated that there had been concern with the original Site Design and the Tract A open space around line of sight into the area, which was why the Applicant had suggested no fence in the front and either a lower fence or a chainlike fence on the property to the north. There had been quite a bit of discussion about that as Staff had tremendous concerns about safety. The Applicant had responded by moving the usable open space to the front. He reminded that the Applicant was agreeable to swapping Tract A and Lot 1, if the DRB wanted, but Mr. Bradford had raised some good concerns about Tract A being located to the south of the site because there would be an access easement over the new Lot 1 to the north in order to access the open space. The intent of the open space was for use by residents of the subdivision. Others would likely be discouraged from using it if they had to walk down to access it.

- He noted public comments regarding the building heights and assured the Applicant was building to City Code and asked that the Applicant be afforded the same right as any other builder in the city to build to the Code standards for a structure
- He reiterated that the trees were planted by the property owner. There could be native species, but they were not native in terms of having grown from a fallen pinecone. They were actually planted as screening for his property from the neighboring subdivision to the south. He was now asking that the property be developed, and to do that, the trees needed to be removed, and new trees would be planted for mitigation. He believed this was simply the natural progression of development within the city limits; nothing too crazy. A city had to use the developable land within its city limits and make efficient use of it so the city limits did not sprawl out into the county. He did not think some chickens would be problematic because roosters were not permitted within city limits.
- The street was a designed stub street. Regardless of how people believed it would function, that was the intent. The Code required streets be stubbed out to developable property to provide that opportunity. He understood the street exceeded 200 ft, but the Applicant had demonstrated that there was space for fire trucks to back out, and delivery and garbage trucks could turn around.
- Everything was to City standards and the Code requirements were met. He understood people said the Code was a minimum, but that was where their designs started. If there was the ability to add something to a project or provide a unique feature, developers were not opposed to doing that, but developers had to start somewhere, and that was with the Code. That was the Wilsonville standard, what people expected projects to be built to, and the Applicant had presented a project that complied with all applicable criteria. The street design, tree mitigation plan, tree removal plan, future home sites, and lot sizes all satisfied the criteria, and no waivers were being requested.
- During the Building Permit Review process setbacks would be checked to make sure they were being met. All the checks and balances were in place to approve the project as proposed with the conditions of approval recommended by Staff. The Applicant was happy to change the open space or eliminate the on-street parking if the DRB so desired. He believed the Applicant had gone above and beyond. Not many developers would reduce an already small project by three lots, and he believed it was commendable that the developer had done that, realizing he needed to play along with everybody and did so. They now had

a project that not only met the criteria, but was more suitable for the neighbors that lived in the immediate area, specifically the four along the southern boundary and the one to the north, who were the most impacted. He believed this project responded to their concerns. He thanked everyone for their time.

Mr. Pauly asked what location Mr. Miller preferred for the Tract A open space and why.

Mr. Miller replied that based on neighborhood comments, the Applicant was agreeable to swap the Lot 1 and Tract A open space. They had proposed the Tract A open space in its current location to meet Staff's comments and the City's concerns and preferences for neighborhood safety concerns and line of sight. He reiterated they were happy to move it if that made the neighbors happy, but the current location met City Code.

Chair McKay understood that although Tract A was meant to be an open space maintained by the HOA, it would be open to the public in that anyone could walk into the property.

Mr. Pauly replied open spaces typically had public access. Nothing in the Code required that it have public access. Currently, it was designed to be open, and typically, it made sense to provide public access even though nearby residents would be the primary users of the space. Over the years of allowing public access to neighborhood parks such as this one, he had not heard of any concerns from HOAs about public usage of parks.

Ms. Barrett stated she was curious what the Codes were for open spaces.

Mr. Pauly understood there was one more comment to clarify the road access or road as a lot of numbers were discussed about the width of the road.

Mr. Le stated he had been asked why the Applicant was not required to provide the minimum 28-ft wide street curb-to-curb. He explained the developer was required to provide half-street improvements, enough to be 12-ft of the street, but in order for the street to function correctly, it needed to accommodate two-way traffic. Initially, a 24-ft wide street was proposed and with the parking issues, another 2-ft was provided, making the street 26-ft-wide, which was beyond what the developer was required to provide. Therefore, the developer had met the street improvement requirements for the subdivision.

Mr. Pauly understood there were still some questions regarding open space requirements.

Mr. Jacob stated when he accessed the Boones Ferry Trail, he had to go through a shared driveway between two homes that had a wall and no line of sight until he arrived at the water treatment park. He noted there were open spaces in Wilsonville that were out of the line of sight.

Mr. Pauly stated that was correct, but that was not the preferred design.

Mr. Bradford understood that trails did not go through the same Code criteria.

Mr. Pauly confirmed that was correct because they were on a right-of-way.

Chair McKay called for Board members to discuss any proposal to add, remove, or modify conditions of approval after which the Applicant would have the opportunity to respond.

Chair McKay stated that quite a few exhibits recommended swapping Lot 1 with Tract A and he wondered if that was a condition the Board should add. Last month, the Board had also received a couple pieces of written testimony that mentioned the Canyon Creek neighborhood was also lacking usable open space. As currently designed, the proposed development's usable open space could also be utilized by neighbors from Canyon Creek. He added that now was the time for the Board to add that condition if so desired.

Ms. Barrett stated she was having a difficult time weighing the open space. She lived near an open space in Hazelwood that was behind houses, and the only people who knew it was there were those that lived near it. All of the nearby children played back there and it was safe, although it was different than the proposed setup as there was a path with lighting and an easement for the school.

Ms. Svadlenka said taking into consideration Staff's recommendations as well as the Tree Removal Plan, the proposed community would be small enough that the neighbors on the southern border, as opposed to the northern border, would know the open space was there. She was in favor of swapping Tract A and Lot 1.

Mr. Yacob agreed, noting the added benefit of swapping Tract A and Lot 1 was mitigating encroachment on neighbors' properties as well for added privacy for existing neighbors and the eventual new homeowners.

Kathy Neil disagreed and believed the homeowners on that street would prefer a visual green space. It would make the street look nicer and be more inviting instead of just all homes. The developer had accommodated the current neighbors' requests with the addition of street parking and the reduction in the number of new homes. The needs and desires of the future residents had to be considered as well. Personally, she would feel awkward going by someone's home to access a green space. Additionally, there were areas in the back where the safety was questionable, and any children playing back there would not be visible.

Chair McKay summarized the conditions and amendments that the Board had discussed so far as follows:

- Add a condition to update the Site Plan to fully comply with the City setback requirements to address the one noted as 7-ft that should be 10-ft.
- Add a condition that the City review with the Applicant the feasibility, environmental impact, and impact to adjacent properties of having the stormwater exit to the creek. If

feasible, the Applicant would modify their plans to divert stormwater to the creek and minimize disruption to adjacent properties.

- Add a condition to swap Tract A with Lot 1 while maintaining open space requirements.
- Add a condition that the Applicant demonstrate the private drive could be used for vehicle turnaround to provide for vehicle safety.

Ms. Barrett asked if an updated Tree plan would be needed.

Mr. Pauly said he believed the Tree Plan was where it needed to be for Staff to execute it; substantially compliant with the DRB approval. The correct amount of lots did not need to be shown. If certain trees were in question, any conditions needed to be fairly specific with clear directions to Staff in the conditions.

- He noted the record was clear that the 7-ft setback was a typo and should read 10-ft. Adding a Code requirement in as a condition was a moot point since the Code requirement was already there and no waiver was requested.

Ms. Svadlenka asked if Tract A and Lot 1 were swapped should the five trees that would no longer need to be removed be specified in the conditions.

Mr. Miller responded those five trees could only be saved if the stormwater sewer was relocated to the creek. If the storm line had to connect to the existing manhole, those five trees in the southeast corner would still have to be removed.

Ms. Svadlenka stated she understood the five trees in the southeast were still slated for removal and were not the same five trees.

Chair McKay suggested adding a separate condition to update the Tree Plan's number of trees to be removed following the final decision regarding the two new proposed conditions.

Mr. Pauly recommended the phrase "preserve any additional trees possible in the new open space tract pending the feasibility from a health standpoint."

Ms. Svadlenka clarified that the five trees she was referring to were all in good condition.

Ms. Barrett suggested the Board make a decision and then that language would not have to be added.

Chair McKay replied it would be up to the decision made at the end. He mentioned it in case it was required after the Board deliberated, and if it was not mentioned, he would ask to amend any motion made.

Mr. Pauly advised making a motion on the bigger item and then making any amendments or adding conditions, if necessary, that related to that item.

Chair McKay confirmed there was no additional discussion. He closed the public hearing at 9:08 pm.

Chair McKay thanked Staff, the Applicant and the members of the public for their work on the proposed development that resulted in changes that were positive for everybody.

Ms. Jacobson advised that if the DRB wanted to approve the resolution, but swap the locations of Tract A and Lot 1, which would be the first motion to make. If the DRB wanted to approve the resolution without swapping those tracts, the motion should be made as is with smaller items addressed after the motion was made and discussed. She confirmed the motions could be made one by one.

Chair McKay moved to add a new condition of approval to update the plans to swap Tract A with Lot 1, maintaining the open space requirements. Jean Svadlenka seconded the motion.

Chair McKay acknowledged this was a tough one; everyone had valid points. He invited Ms. Neil to restate her position if she wanted, noting that Ms. Barrett and Ms. Svadlenka had also commented.

Mr. Yacob stated he believed it was beneficial for neighbors to not have to look into each other's' yards through their windows. It was also beneficial not to have an green space directly at the end of a street due to many different scenarios regarding vehicles.

Ms. Barrett stated that as a homeowner, she was more in favor of the swap because she would prefer her house on the street, rather than down the flag lot and extra road that would need to be built.

Chair McKay stated he was on the fence. He appreciated all the comments surrounding this potential condition. He believed a line of sight to the open space would be nice for the other neighbors, but he also understood the homeowners would all know it was there.

The motion carried 3 to 2 with Kathy Neil and Chair McKay opposed.

Chair McKay confirmed he was fine with the City's justification as to why a condition for the setbacks was not needed.

Mr. Yacob confirmed he was satisfied with Chair McKay's earlier wording regarding the stormwater line. The intent was to connect the storm line to Boeckman Creek, not the existing manhole in Vlahos Dr, thereby avoiding the disturbance of private property and removing the requirement to cut down the trees from the southeast portion of the subdivision.

Mr. Pauly suggested making daylighting to Boeckman Creek the preferred alternative. He suggested the following language for the new condition, "City Staff will assess the Applicant's proposal of designing and installing a new outfall on Boeckman Creek in an effort to reduce site

and slope disturbance and tree removal. However, the preferred approach is to minimize the number of new outfalls to avoid impacts to Boeckman Creek. City Staff shall ensure any changes that revise lot layout or stormwater facilities for the proposed subdivision meet all adopted City standards and Code criteria.”

Chair McKay moved to add a condition of approval regarding the storm line proposed on the southeast side of the development as read into the record by Mr. Pauly.

- **The new condition stated, “City Staff will assess the Applicant’s proposal of designing and installing a new outfall on Boeckman Creek in an effort to reduce site and slope disturbance and tree removal. However, the preferred approach is to minimize the number of new outfalls to avoid impacts to Boeckman Creek. City Staff shall ensure that any changes that revise lot layout or stormwater facilities for the proposed subdivision meet all adopted City standards and Code criteria.”**

Ben Jacob seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Chair McKay moved to add a new condition of approval requiring the preservation of any additional trees possible in the open space as a result of the two newly added conditions of approval. The motion was seconded by Rachelle Barrett and passed unanimously.

Chair McKay moved to add a new condition of approval requiring the Applicant to demonstrate that the private drive could be used as a vehicle turnaround to provide for vehicular safety. Rachelle Barrett seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Pauly said Staff also suggested a condition that mandated a deadline for the delivery of the revised plans to Staff and recommended May 21st. He was not sure if that date was feasible but he did not want to leave it indefinite. Three to four weeks should be sufficient to write up a new report for Staff with all the changes. No construction permits would be issued until that was done. He suggested a date be set and it could be extended into the future as agreed upon in writing between the City and the Applicant, as the stormwater changes could take longer to design.

Mr. Miller stated he questioned the legality of such a condition, adding it was odd to require something to be delivered.

Mr. Pauly responded he understood Mr. Miller's viewpoint. There was a concern but nothing would be approved to be built until Staff had building plans to review.

Chair McKay asked if Staff was requesting a deadline be added as a condition.

Mr. Pauly stated it was not necessary. Staff had discussed it and the City Attorney concurred it was not necessary at this point. The Applicant also did not have time to challenge that condition.

Chair McKay confirmed the Board had no further motions or modifications to conditions to discuss.

Chair McKay moved to add all of the exhibits to the record, which included any presentations as well as testimony received and not included in the Staff report. **Rachelle Barrett** seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Staff advised calling out the specific exhibits by number that were being added to the record.

Chair McKay moved to adopt the Staff report as amended, which included the four (4) new conditions of approval and adding Exhibit A3, Staff's PowerPoint; Exhibits D33 through D40, additional written testimony submitted; and Exhibit B11, all emails received from the Applicant after 4 pm, including the Applicant's plan set presented during the hearing. **Kathy Neil** seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Chair McKay moved to adopt Resolution No. 388 along with the amended Staff report. **Ben Yacob** seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Chair McKay read the rules of appeal into the record.

VII. Board Member Communications

A. Recent City Council Action Minutes

Dan Pauly, Planning Manager, noted the Boeckman Creek Bridge and the Diversity, Equity & Inclusion Committee were big actions.

Chair McKay thanked everyone still present. This had been quite the experience for him with very thoughtful questions and a lot of citizen involvement. He understood some Board members were new and advised them that while the last meeting was difficult, it was not the norm and they should not expect that going forward. He thanked them for volunteering. He thanked Staff for their work with the Applicant, adding he was pleasantly surprised to see the revised application.

VIII. Staff Communications

There were none.

IX. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 9:38 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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

**DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING
OCTOBER 11, 2021
6:30 PM**

VI. Public Hearing:

A. Resolution No. 394. City of Wilsonville Public Works Facility: Brandon Dole, Scott Edwards Architecture – Representative for Delora Kerber, City of Wilsonville – Applicant/Owner. The applicant is requesting approval of a Stage I Master Plan, Stage II Final Plan, Site Design Review, Type C Tree Removal Plan, Class 3 Sign Permit and Lot Line Adjustment for construction of a new public works facility for the City of Wilsonville. The subject site is located on Tax Lots 1800 and 1900 of Section 14A, Township 3 South, Range 1 West, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Philip Bradford

Case Files:

DB21-0017	Stage I Master Plan
DB21-0018	Stage II Final Plan
DB21-0019	Site Design Review
DB21-0020	Type C Tree Plan
DB21-0021	Class 3 Sign Permit
AR21-0010	Lot Line Adjustment

**DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
RESOLUTION NO. 394**

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING FINDINGS AND CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL, APPROVING A STAGE I MASTER PLAN, STAGE II FINAL PLAN, SITE DESIGN REVIEW, TYPE C TREE REMOVAL PLAN, CLASS 3 SIGN PERMIT AND LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT FOR CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW PUBLIC WORKS FACILITY FOR THE CITY OF WILSONVILLE. THE SUBJECT SITE IS LOCATED ON TAX LOTS 1800 AND 1900 OF SECTION 14A, TOWNSHIP 3 SOUTH, RANGE 1 WEST, CLACKAMAS COUNTY, OREGON. BRANDON DOLE, SCOTT EDWARDS ARCHITECTURE – REPRESENTATIVE FOR DELORA KERBER, CITY OF WILSONVILLE – APPLICANT/OWNER.

WHEREAS, an application, together with planning exhibits for the above-captioned development, has been submitted in accordance with the procedures set forth in Section 4.008 of the Wilsonville Code, and

WHEREAS, the Planning Staff has prepared the staff report on the above-captioned subject dated October 4, 2021, and

WHEREAS, said planning exhibits and staff report were duly considered by the Development Review Board Panel A at a scheduled meeting conducted on October 11, 2021, at which time exhibits, together with findings and public testimony were entered into the public record, and

WHEREAS, the Development Review Board considered the subject and the recommendations contained in the staff report, and

WHEREAS, interested parties, if any, have had an opportunity to be heard on the subject.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Development Review Board of the City of Wilsonville does hereby adopt the staff report dated October 4, 2021, attached hereto as Exhibit A1, with findings and recommendations contained therein, and authorizes the Planning Director to issue permits consistent with said recommendations for:

DB21-00017 through DB21-0021, and AR21-0010; Stage I Master Plan, Stage II Final Plan, Site Design Review, Type C Tree Plan, Class 3 Sign Permit, and Lot Line Adjustment.

ADOPTED by the Development Review Board of the City of Wilsonville this 11th day of October 2021, and filed with the Planning Administrative Assistant on _____. This resolution is final on the 15th calendar day after the postmarked date of the written notice of decision per *WC Sec 4.022(.09)* unless appealed per *WC Sec 4.022(.02)* or called up for review by the council in accordance with *WC Sec 4.022(.03)*.

Daniel McKay, Chair - Panel A
Wilsonville Development Review Board

Attest:

Shelley White, Planning Administrative Assistant
RESOLUTION NO. 388



Exhibit A1
Staff Report
Wilsonville Planning Division
City of Wilsonville Public Works Complex

Development Review Board Panel 'A'
Quasi-Judicial Public Hearing

Hearing Date:	October 11, 2021
Date of Report:	October 4, 2021

Application Nos.:	DB21-0017 Stage I Master Plan DB21-0018 Stage II Final Plan DB21-0019 Site Design Review DB21-0020 Type C Tree Plan DB21-0021 Class 3 Sign Permit AR21-0010 Lot Line Adjustment
--------------------------	--

Request/Summary: The review before the Development Review Board is a Class 3 Stage I Master Plan, Stage II Final Plan, Site Design Review, Type C Tree Plan, Class 3 Sign Permit, and Lot Line Adjustment for the new City of Wilsonville Public Works Complex.

Location: The property is specifically known as Tax Lots 1800 and 1900, Section 14A, Township 3 South, Range 1 West, Willamette Meridian, City of Wilsonville, Clackamas County, Oregon

Owner / Applicant: City of Wilsonville (Contact: Delora Kerber)

Comprehensive Plan Designation: Industrial

Applicant's

Representative: Scott Edwards Architecture (Contact: Brandon Dole)
AKS Engineering & Forestry (Contact: Nick White)

Zone Map Classification: PDI (Planned Development Industrial)

Staff Reviewers: Philip Bradford, Associate Planner
Matt Palmer, Associate Engineer; Matt Huxley, PE Tetra Tech

Staff Recommendation: Approve with conditions the requested Stage I Master Plan, Stage II Final Plan, Site Design Review, Type C Tree Plan, Class 3 Sign Permit, and Lot Line Adjustment.

Applicable Review Criteria:

<u>Development Code:</u>	
Section 4.001	Definitions
Section 4.008	Application Procedures-In General
Section 4.009	Who May Initiate Application
Section 4.010	How to Apply
Section 4.011	How Applications are Processed
Section 4.014	Burden of Proof
Section 4.031	Authority of the Development Review Board
Subsection 4.035 (.04)	Site Development Permit Application
Subsection 4.035 (.05)	Complete Submittal Requirement
Section 4.110	Zones
Section 4.116	Standards Applying to Commercial Development in All Zones
Section 4.117	Standards Applying to Industrial Development in All Zones
Section 4.118	Standards Applying to Planned Development Zones
Section 4.131	Planned Development Commercial (PDC) Zone (as referenced by PDI Zone)
Section 4.135	Planned Development Industrial (PDI) Zone
Section 4.137	Screening and Buffering (SB) Overlay Zone
Section 4.140	Planned Development Regulations
Section 4.154	On-site Pedestrian Access and Circulation
Section 4.155	Parking, Loading, and Bicycle Parking
Section 4.156.01 through 4.156.11	Signs
Section 4.167	Access, Ingress, and Egress
Section 4.171	Protection of Natural Features and Other Resources
Section 4.175	Public Safety and Crime Prevention
Section 4.176	Landscaping, Screening, and Buffering
Section 4.177	Street Improvement Standards
Section 4.179	Mixed Solid Waste and Recycling
Sections 4.199.20 through 4.199.60	Outdoor Lighting
Sections 4.200 through 4.290	Land Divisions
Sections 4.300 through 4.320	Underground Utilities
Sections 4.400 through 4.440 as applicable	Site Design Review
Sections 4.600 through 4.640.20	Tree Preservation and Protection
<u>Other Planning Documents:</u>	
Wilsonville Comprehensive Plan	
Previous Land Use Approvals	

Vicinity Map



Background:

The City of Wilsonville has been one of the fastest growing cities in Oregon for many years. The Public Works Department currently operates out of the old City Hall building, which was developed in the early 1980's. The current Public Works site is space constrained and as a result Public Works stores materials and fleet vehicles in locations spread throughout the City. The new structure will allow the Public Works department to be more efficient by consolidating their needs into one site, and ensures operational continuity with a modern structure designed to meet current seismic building codes as well as building and yard space for equipment and material storage.

Summary:

Stage I Preliminary Plan (DB21-0017)

The Stage I Preliminary Plan proposes a new Public Works office building and warehouse and service yard for the City of Wilsonville Public Works Department. The overall development, and layout are consistent with the Planned Development Industrial Zone (PDI).

Stage II Final Plan Revision (DB21-0018)

The Stage II Final includes an approximately 25,000 square foot office building and 17,000 square foot warehouse building. The proposed uses of the development are consistent with the Planned Development Industrial (PDI) Zone. All services are available for the site. The site includes parking, circulation areas, pedestrian connection, and landscaping meeting or exceeding City standards.

Site Design Review (DB21-0019)

The applicant used appropriate professional services to design the Public Works office building and warehouse and other accessory structures using quality materials and design. The goal of the consolidation is to provide Public Works with a modern, efficient, and easy to maintain facility that is designed for their current and future operational needs. The office building, which is the most prominent of all the structures on site as it faces SW Boberg Road, provides an attractive mix of durable materials suitable for an industrial office development. The configuration of the new Public Works complex also allows for the preservation and enhancement of existing natural features such as the SROZ area along the southern portion of the site, and the preservation of valuable trees.

Type C Tree Removal Plan (DB21-0020)

The applicant proposes the removal of 89 trees. The majority of the trees on site are Black Cottonwood *Populus trichocarpa*. One Oregon White Oak *Quercus garrana* is planned for preservation and is the only native valuable species on site. 30 other existing trees will be preserved as part of the development of the site. The applicant proposes replanting 117 new trees on the subject property, which is in excess of the 1:1 mitigation ratio as required by the development code.

Class 3 Sign Permit (DB21-0021)

The subject property has frontage on SW Boberg Road No building signs are proposed at this time, however the building is eligible for building signs in the future. One freestanding ground mounted monument style sign is proposed along SW Boberg Road near the private access drive. A condition of approval ensures appropriate location of the monument sign

Lot Line Adjustment (AR21-0002)

The subject property contains Tax Lots 1800 (2.92 AC) and 1900 (4.72 AC). As part of this application the applicant is requesting the approval of a lot line adjustment that combines Tax Lot 1800 and 1900 into one consolidated lot to enable development of the site.

Traffic and Parking:

The Traffic Impact Study in Exhibit B1 contains the Traffic Impact Study completed by DKS for the City of Wilsonville Public Works Facility. The subject property is currently undeveloped with the study analyzing the impact of a proposed development that contained a 15,800 square foot office building and a 17,900 square foot warehouse at the time of submittal.

The tables below are from the Traffic Impact Study and show the general range of PM Peak Trips and total daily trips for the development, along with the Level of Service (LOS) for each of the three intersections studied as part of the study.

For the purpose of parking standards, the proposed development falls into the use category of office or flex space (except medical and dental) and storage warehouse listed in Table 5 of Section 4.155. The parking minimum is 2.7 spaces per 1,000 square feet for the office component and .3 spaces per 1,000 square feet for the warehouse portion. The parking maximum is 4.1 spaces per 1,000 square feet for the office component and .5 per 1,000 square feet for the warehouse. The proposed building contains a 15,800 square foot office building and 17,900 square foot warehouse. The minimum number of parking spaces is 51. The maximum number of parking spaces permitted is 80. The applicant proposes 50 parking spaces for visitors and staff and another 37 parking spaces located in the service yard.

TABLE 4: VEHICLE TRIP GENERATION

LAND USE (ITE CODE)	SIZE ^a	PM PEAK TRIP RATE ^b	PM PEAK TRIPS			DAILY TRIPS
			IN	OUT	TOTAL	
GENERAL OFFICE (710)	15.8 KSF	1.27 trips per KSF	3	17	20	177
WAREHOUSE (150)	17.9 KSF	1.68 trips per KSF	8	22	30	74
TOTAL TRIP GENERATION			11	39	50	251

TABLE 5: FUTURE INTERSECTION OPERATIONS

INTERSECTION	OPERATING STANDARD	EXISTING + PROJECT			EXISTING + STAGE II			EXISTING + STAGE II + PROJECT		
		V/C	DELAY	LOS	V/C	DELAY	LOS	V/C	DELAY	LOS
UNSIGNALIZED										
SW BOECKMAN RD/ SW BOBERG RD*	LOS D	0.74	19.0	C	0.82	23.4	C	0.84	25.1	D
SW BOBERG RD/ SW BARBER ST	LOS D	0.48	16.0	A/C	0.52	17.3	A/C	0.54	18.0	A/C
SW BOONES FERRY RD/ SW BARBER ST	LOS D	0.43	16.4	A/C	0.46	17.2	A/C	0.47	17.4	A/C

Public Comments and Responses:

None Received

Discussion Points:

Screening and Buffering Overlay Zone

The SB Overlay Zone, defined in Subsection 4.137.5 of the Wilsonville Code (WC), requires appropriate screening and buffering for areas where residential and nonresidential land uses abut. For industrial properties, the SB Overlay Zone requires a 10-foot buffer with landscaping to the High Wall standard or a 20-foot-deep buffer with landscaping to the High Screen standard. Further, there are restrictions on motor vehicle access, exterior operations, and signs, and the DRB may impose additional landscape requirements to minimize visual impacts of any approved vehicle access points. The proposed development meets the standards of the SB Overlay Zone as the site is located across SW Boberg Road (60-70 right-of-way width) and provides 30 feet of landscaped area with numerous trees and ground cover, additionally the non-industrial office building provides significant screening meeting the high wall standard. This configuration conceals the industrial uses from off-site view from adjacent residential uses in the mobile home park.

On Site Facilities

The Public Works Facility contains a variety of warehouse, storage, and accessory structures. The service yard is 201,200 square feet, enclosed within an opaque security fence. All access points are secure with controlled access gates. This fenced yard area includes the following: material bin storage, dewater / decant facility, warehouse building, vehicle wash bays, magnesium chloride storage tank, nursery storage area, power generator, trash and recycling area, and parking for fleet vehicles and equipment. The warehouse structure contains six vehicle bay stations, small

part and equipment storage, a wood shop, sign shop, paint storage, lock shop, and staging area along with office space and a water quality lab. The warehouse is designed with future growth in mind and can be expanded if future needs deem it necessary. The dewater / decant facility located at the northwestern corner of the site allows for the proper disposal of waste retrieved from catch basins and drywells within the city. This facility enables the City to safely dispose of materials collected in the storm water drainage system. The locations of all the facilities described above are shown on the site plan below.



120-Day Extension

The applicant submitted Request A-E on February 22, 2021, the application was deemed complete on August 11, 2021. Request F was submitted separately on March 8, 2021. This request was deemed complete on April 7, 2021. All requests subject to Development Review Board (DRB) review are typically processed concurrently. Due to the large gap between these applications being deemed complete, the applicant has provided a 120-day extension consistent with the provisions of ORS 227.178 to allow for concurrent review.

Parking Calculation Errors

The applicant's narrative in exhibit B1 contains several errors in the response to the off-street parking requirements. The size of the warehouse component is incorrectly listed as 1,551 square feet. The structure is approximately 18,000 square feet as noted elsewhere in the plans and narrative. Staff has measured the structure and recalculated parking accordingly which results in new minimum and maximum parking requirements. The site contains 57 code compliant off-street parking spaces within the range of the minimum and maximum requirements for the property.

Conclusion and Conditions of Approval:

Staff reviewed the Applicant's analysis of compliance with the applicable criteria. The Staff report adopts the applicant's responses as Findings of Fact except as noted in the Findings. Based on the Findings of Fact and information included in this Staff Report, and information received from a duly advertised public hearing, Staff recommends that the Development Review Board approve the proposed application (DB21-0017 through DB21-00321; AR21-0010 with the following conditions:

Planning Division Conditions:

Request A: DB21-0017 Stage I Preliminary Plan

No conditions for this request

Request B: DB21-0018 Stage II Final Plan

PDB 1.	General: The approved modified final plan shall control the issuance of all building permits and shall restrict the nature, location and design of all uses. Minor changes in an approved preliminary or final development plan may be approved by the Planning Director through the Class I Administrative Review Process if such changes are consistent with the purposes and general character of the development plan. All other modifications shall be processed in the same manner as the original application and shall be subject to the same procedural requirements. See Finding A13.
PDB 2.	Prior to Non-Grading Building Permit Issuance: All bicycle parking spaces will comply with the 2' width and 6' length requirement and include 5 feet of maneuvering space behind each space.
PDB 3.	Prior to Final Occupancy: All exterior, roof and ground mounted, mechanical and utility equipment shall be screened from ground level off-site view from adjacent streets or properties.

Request C: DB21-0019 Site Design Review

PDC 1.	General: Construction, site development, and landscaping shall be carried out in substantial accord with the Development Review Board approved plans, drawings, sketches, and other documents. Minor revisions may be approved by the Planning Director through administrative review pursuant to Section 4.030. See Finding C15.
PDC 2.	Prior to Temporary Occupancy: All landscaping required and approved by the Board shall be installed prior to issuance of any occupancy permits, unless security equal to one hundred and ten percent (110%) of the cost of the landscaping as determined by the Planning Director is filed with the City assuring such installation within six (6) months of occupancy. "Security" is cash, certified check, time certificates of deposit, assignment of a savings account or such other assurance of completion as shall meet with the approval of the City Attorney. In such cases the

	<p>developer shall also provide written authorization, to the satisfaction of the City Attorney, for the City or its designees to enter the property and complete the landscaping as approved. If the installation of the landscaping is not completed within the six-month period, or within an extension of time authorized by the Board, the security may be used by the City to complete the installation. Upon completion of the installation, any portion of the remaining security deposited with the City will be returned to the applicant. See Finding C38.</p>
PDC 3.	<p>Ongoing: The approved landscape plan is binding upon the applicant/owner. Substitution of plant materials, irrigation systems, or other aspects of an approved landscape plan shall not be made without official action of the Planning Director or Development Review Board, pursuant to the applicable sections of Wilsonville’s Development Code. See Finding C39.</p>
PDC 4.	<p>Ongoing: All landscaping shall be continually maintained, including necessary watering, weeding, pruning, and replacing, in a substantially similar manner as originally approved by the Board, unless altered as allowed by Wilsonville’s Development Code. See Findings C40 and C41.</p>
PDC 5.	<p>Prior to Temporary Occupancy: The following requirements for planting of shrubs and ground cover shall be met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-horticultural plastic sheeting or other impermeable surface shall not be placed under landscaping mulch. • Native topsoil shall be preserved and reused to the extent feasible. • Surface mulch or bark dust shall be fully raked into soil of appropriate depth, sufficient to control erosion, and shall be confined to areas around plantings. • All shrubs shall be well branched and typical of their type as described in current AAN Standards and shall be equal to or better than 2-gallon containers and 10” to 12” spread. • Shrubs shall reach their designed size for screening within three (3) years of planting. • Ground cover shall be equal to or better than the following depending on the type of plant materials used: gallon containers spaced at 4 feet on center minimum, 4” pot spaced 2 feet on center minimum, 2-1/4” pots spaced at 18 inch on center minimum. • No bare root planting shall be permitted. • Ground cover shall be sufficient to cover at least 80% of the bare soil in required landscape areas within three (3) years of planting. • Appropriate plant materials shall be installed beneath the canopies of trees and large shrubs to avoid the appearance of bare ground in those locations. • Compost-amended topsoil shall be integrated in all areas to be landscaped, including lawns. See Finding C42.
PDC 6.	<p>Prior to Temporary Occupancy: Plant materials shall be installed to current industry standards and be properly staked to ensure survival. Plants that die shall</p>

be replaced in kind, within one growing season, unless appropriate substitute species are approved by the City. See Finding C45.

Request D: DB21-0020 Class III Sign Permit

PDD 1. Ongoing:	The approved sign shall be installed in a manner substantially similar to the plans approved by the DRB and stamped approved by the Planning Division.
PDD 2. Prior to Sign Installation / Ongoing:	The applicant shall provide an updated site plan showing the proposed freestanding sign in a code compliant location no further than fifteen (15) feet from the property line and no closer than two (2) feet from a sidewalk or other hard surface in the public right-of-way. If an appropriate location cannot be found the sign shall not be installed.
PDD 3. Prior to Sign Installation / Ongoing:	The applicant shall provide an updated sign plan / drawings showing the future site address on the proposed freestanding monument sign.

Request E: DB21-0021 Type C Tree Plan

PDE 1. General:	This approval for removal applies only to the 89 trees identified in the applicant's submitted materials. All other trees on the property shall be maintained unless removal is approved through separate application.
PDE 2. Prior to Grading Permit Issuance:	The Applicant shall submit an application for a Type 'C' Tree Removal Permit on the Planning Division's Development Permit Application form, together with the applicable fee. In addition to the application form and fee, the applicant shall provide the City's Planning Division an accounting of trees to be removed within the project site, corresponding to the approval of the Development Review Board. The applicant shall not remove any trees from the project site until the tree removal permit, including the final tree removal plan, have been approved by the Planning Division staff.
PDE 3. Prior to Temporary Occupancy / Ongoing:	The permit grantee or the grantee's successors-in-interest shall cause the replacement trees to be staked, fertilized and mulched, and shall guarantee the trees for two (2) years after the planting date. A "guaranteed" tree that dies or becomes diseased during the two (2) years after planting shall be replaced.
PDE 4. Prior to Commencing Site Grading:	Prior to site grading or other site work that could damage trees, the applicant/owner shall install 6-foot-tall chain-link fencing around the drip line of preserved trees. Removal of the fencing around the identified trees shall only occur if it is determined the trees are not feasible to retain. The fencing shall comply with Wilsonville Public Works Standards Detail Drawing RD-1230. Protective fencing shall not be moved or access granted within the protected zone without arborist supervision and notice of the City of the purpose of proposed movement of fencing or access. See Finding D6.

Request F: AR21-0010 Lot Line Adjustment

PDF 1.	Prior to Final Plat Approval: Any necessary easements or dedications shall be identified on the Final Subdivision Plat.
PDF 2.	General: The applicant / owner shall submit an application for Final Plat review and approval on the Planning Division Site Development Application and Permit form. The applicant/owner shall also provide materials for review by the City’s Planning Division in accordance with Section 4.220 of the City’s Development Code. The final plat shall be prepared in substantial accord with the tentative partition plat as approved by this action and as amended by these conditions, except as may be subsequently altered by minor revisions approved by the Planning Director.

The following Conditions of Approval are provided by the Engineering, Natural Resources, or Building Divisions of the City’s Community Development Department or Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue, all of which have authority over development approval. A number of these Conditions of Approval are not related to land use regulations under the authority of the Development Review Board or Planning Director. Only those Conditions of Approval related to criteria in Chapter 4 of Wilsonville Code and the Comprehensive Plan, including but not limited to those related to traffic level of service, site vision clearance, recording of plats, and concurrency, are subject to the Land Use review and appeal process defined in Wilsonville Code and Oregon Revised Statutes and Administrative Rules. Other Conditions of Approval are based on City Code chapters other than Chapter 4, state law, federal law, or other agency rules and regulations. Questions or requests about the applicability, appeal, exemption or non-compliance related to these other Conditions of Approval should be directed to the City Department, Division, or non-City agency with authority over the relevant portion of the development approval.

Engineering Division Conditions:

CA= Conditional Approval NC=Non-Complying

	City of Wilsonville Public Works Section and Standard		Code	Comments
PFA 1.	Public Works Plans and Public Improvements shall conform to the “Public Works Plan Submittal Requirements and Other Engineering Requirements” in Exhibit C1.			
PFA 2.	101.9.04 c.1(b)	Erosion Control	NC	A wheel wash is required at temporary construction entrances as site is >5 acres.
PFA 3.	201.2.23	Driveways	CA	Street trees are shown close to proposed driveways. Provide sight distance triangles to verify vision clearance.
PFA 4.	201.2.25	Sidewalks	NC	Proposed sidewalk to office building and parking lot - separation from roadway

				should be increased to 5-feet per Table 2.13 of the PWS.
PFA 5.	201.2.25	Sidewalks	NC	Provide ADA ramp from accessible parking stall to proposed sidewalk
PFA 6.	301.1.100	Stormwater and Surface Water Design – General	CA	A catch basin is required at the low point next to north curb in the staff parking lot.
PFA 7.	301.1.100	Stormwater and Surface Water Design – General	CA	Suggest connecting all laterals in the courtyard to a manhole. Will make it easier to inspect and maintain.
PFA 8.	301.1.100	Stormwater and Surface Water Design – General	CA	Suggest eliminating the water quality facility in the northeast corner of maintenance area. It discharges to another water quality facility so serves no purpose.
PFA 9.	301.1.100	Stormwater and Surface Water Design – General	CA	Water quality facility in SW corner – northern portion of facility will be difficult to access behind storage bins. Suggest eliminating this piece and enlarging southern and eastern portion.
PFA 10.	301.4.11	Stormwater Pretreatment Manholes	NC	These are required for all outfalls to stormwater management facilities. Plans show multiple outfalls but a manhole on just one outfall.
PFA 11.	301.12	Source Controls	CA	Required for vehicle washing, above-ground storage of liquid materials, solid waste storage, and exterior storage of bulk materials. Sedimentation tanks are shown for two buildings. Oil/water separators are required at vehicle maintenance bays, and covered spill containment for chemical and fuel storage tanks.
PFA 12.	401.1.00	Sanitary Sewer Design - General	CA	Water and sewer line horizontal separation in front of the maintenance building is 7-feet. 5-feet to 10-feet separation is only allowed if the invert water line is higher than the crown of the sewer line.
PFA 13.	401.2.01.i	Lateral Connections	NC	Sewer laterals from buildings B and D should not connect to manholes.

PFA 14.	501.2.01	Fire Hydrants	CA	Only two fire hydrants are shown and are close to each other at the northwest corner of the site. Confirm fire hydrant spacing, locations, and coverage are adequate with TVF&R
PFA 15.	501.8.05.e.	Bollards	CA	Provide bollards around hydrants in areas exposed to vehicle traffic
PFA 16.	501.2.04	Dead-End Mains	NC	Dead end mains are not allowed. Proposed fire line should be looped instead of dead-ending at the northwest corner of the site.
PFA 17.	501.2.05	Valves	NC	Provide valves at all junctions in mainlines.
PFA 18.	501.2.07	Water Services	CA	Separate meters are required for domestic and irrigation services. Drawing C3.0 shows two water meters but one is not connected to anything. Confirm if this is for irrigation.

Building Division Conditions:

None Received

Natural Resources Division Conditions:

NR1.	Natural Resource Division Requirements and Advisories listed in Exhibit C2 apply to the proposed development.
-------------	---

Master Exhibit List:

The entry of the following exhibits into the public record by the Development Review Board confirms its consideration of the application as submitted. The exhibit list below includes exhibits for Planning Case Files DB21-0017 – DB21-0021, AR21-0010. The exhibit list below reflects the electronic record posted on the City’s website and retained as part of the City’s permanent electronic record. Any inconsistencies between printed or other electronic versions of the same Exhibits are inadvertent and the version on the City’s website and retained as part of the City’s permanent electronic record shall be controlling for all purposes.

Planning Staff Materials

- A1. Staff report and findings (this document)
- A2. Staff’s Presentation Slides for Public Hearing (to be presented at Public Hearing)

Materials from Applicant

- B1.** Land Use Narrative
 - Tree Preservation + Removal Plan
 - Stormwater Management Plan
 - Geotechnical Report
 - Exterior Material Study
 - Pre-Application Summary
 - Traffic Impact Analysis
 - Preliminary Title Report
 - Existing Conditions Survey
 - Republic Services Provider Letter
 - TVF&R Service Provider Letter
- B2. Drawing Package:**
 - G0.01 General Project Information
 - Civil**
 - C0.0 Civil General Notes
 - C0.1 Existing Conditions & Demo Plan
 - C1.0 Overall Civil Site Plan
 - C1.1 Civil Site Plan - West
 - C1.2 Civil Site Plan - East
 - C2.0 Overall Grading Plan
 - C2.1 Grading Plan - Northwest
 - C2.2 Grading Plan - Northeast
 - C2.3 Grading Plan = Southwest
 - C2.4 Grading Plan – Southeast
 - C3.0 Overall Utility Plan
 - C3.1 Utility Plan - West

- C3.2 Utility Plan - East
- C4.0 Details
- C4.1 Details
- C4.2 Details
- C4.3 Details
- C4.4 Details
- C4.5 Details
- EC0.0 ESC – Cover Sheet
- EC1.0 ESC – Clearing, Demo, & Mass Grading
- EC2.0 ESC – Utility, Street Construction, Completion of Grading & Final Stabilization
- EC3.0 ESC – Standard Details

Landscape

- L1.0 Tree Mitigation Plan
- L1.1 Landscape Layout Plan
- L1.1 Landscape Details
- L1.2 Landscape Details
- L1.3 Landscape Details
- L1.4 Landscape Details
- L1.5 Landscape Details
- L2.0 Planting Plan - West
- L2.1 Planting - East
- L2.2 Planting Details
- L3.0 Irrigation Plan – West
- L3.1 Irrigation Plan – East
- L3.2 Irrigation Details

Architectural

- A1.01 Site Plan
- A1.02 Sign Plan
- A2.11 Lower Floor Plan – Building A
- A2.12 Upper Floor Plan – Building A
- A2.13 Floor Plans – Warehouse Building B
- A2.14 Floor Plans – Out Buildings C, D, E, F
- A3.01 Exterior Elevations – Building A
- A3.03 Exterior Elevations – Warehouse – Building B
- A3.04 Exterior Elevations Buildings C, D, E
- A3.05 Exterior Elevations – Buildings E, F

Electrical

- E1.12 Site Plan – Lighting Photometrics

B3. Land Use Exhibits

- Aerial Site Plan
- Proposed Site Exhibit
- Parking Site Exhibit

- Site & Parking Lot Coverage Exhibit
- Pedestrian Circulation Exhibit
- Office Building Lower Level
- Office Building Upper Level
- Warehouse Floor Plan
- Exterior Elevations North
- Exterior Elevations East
- Exterior Elevations South & West
- B4.** Lot Line Adjustment Application Materials
 - Narrative
 - Exhibit A – Development Permit Application
 - Exhibit B- Proposed Property Line Adjustment Plan
 - Exhibit C – Counter Assessors Map with Property Ownership Information
 - Exhibit D – Proposed Partition Plat
- B5.** Luminaire Cutsheets
 - SA1 – Lithonia RSX 2
 - SB1 – Lithonia WEDGE4
 - SB2 – Lithonia WEDGE3
 - SC1 – Lithonia DSX0
 - SD1 – Invue Luxescape
 - SD2 – Invue Luxescape
 - SD3 – Invue Luexescape
 - SE1 – Selux Exelia
 - SE2 – Selux Exelia
 - SF1 – Ligman Marvik
 - SG1 – Gotham Evo4sq
 - SH1 – Metalux VT3
 - SH2 – Metalux VT3
 - SJ1 – Concord American Flagpole
 - SJ2 – BK Lighting Saratoga
- B6.** Color Material Boards
 - North Elevation
 - East Elevation
 - South & West Elevation
- B7.** Incomplete Application Response Letter – July 20, 2021
- B8.** 120-Day Extension from August 11,2021 for Preliminary Partition Plat
- B9.** Revised Landscaping Plan

Development Review Team Correspondence

- C1. Engineering Division Conditions
- C2. Natural Resources Findings & Requirements

Other Correspondence

None received

Procedural Statements and Background Information:

1. The statutory 120-day time limit applies to this application. The applicant first submitted the application for Stage I Preliminary Plan, Stage II Final Plan, Site Design Review, Class 3 Sign Permit, and Type C Tree Plan on February 22, 2021. Staff conducted a completeness review within the statutorily allowed 30-day review period and found the application to be incomplete on March 23, 2021. The applicant submitted additional material on July 22, 2021. Staff conducted a completeness review within the statutorily allowed 30-day review period and found the application to be complete on August 11, 2021.

The applicant submitted the Lot Line Adjustment Application on March 8, 2021. Staff conducted a completeness review within the statutorily allowed 30-day review period and found the application to be complete on April 7, 2021. As these applications are typically reviewed together with all requests, staff has added the application to this broader land use application for the Public Works Facility. Due to the dates Requests A-E were deemed complete, an extension of the 120-day period set forth in ORS 227.178 has been completed by the applicant and is included with the application as Exhibit B8. The City must render a final decision for all requests, including any appeals, by December 9, 2021.

2. Surrounding land uses are as follows:

Compass Direction	Zone:	Existing Use:
North:	PDI	Industrial
East:	PDI / RAH-I	Industrial / Residential
South:	PDI	SMART
West:	PDI	WES Railyard

3. Previous Planning Approvals:

None

4. The applicant has complied with Sections 4.013-4.031 of the Wilsonville Code, said sections pertaining to review procedures and submittal requirements. The required public notices have been sent and all proper notification procedures have been satisfied.

Findings:

NOTE: Pursuant to Section 4.014 the burden of proving that the necessary findings of fact can be made for approval of any land use or development application rests with the applicant in the case.

General Information

Application Procedures-In General Section 4.008

The processing of the application is in accordance with the applicable general procedures of this Section.

Initiating Application Section 4.009

The application has the signature of Delora Kerber, Public Works Director of the City of Wilsonville, an authorized signer for the property owner, the City of Wilsonville.

Pre-Application Conference Subsection 4.010 (.02)

The City held a Pre-application conference on October 29, 2020 (PA20-0014) in accordance with this subsection.

Lien Payment before Approval Subsection 4.011 (.02) B.

No applicable liens exist for the subject property. The application can thus move forward.

General Submission Requirements Subsection 4.035 (.04) A.

The applicant has provided all of the applicable general submission requirements.

Zoning-Generally Section 4.110

This proposed development is in conformity with the applicable zoning district and City review uses the general development regulations listed in Sections 4.150 through 4.199.

Request A: DB21-0017 Stage I Preliminary Plan

As described in the Findings below, the request meets the applicable criteria or will by Conditions of Approval.

Planned Development Regulations

Planned Development Purpose & Lot Qualifications
Subsections 4.140 (.01) and (.02)

A1. The property is of sufficient size to be developed in a manner consistent the purposes and objectives of Section 4.140. The subject property is greater than 2 acres, is designated for industrial development in the Comprehensive Plan. The property will be developed as a planned development in accordance with this subsection.

Ownership Requirements
Subsection 4.140 (.03)

A2. All the land subject to change under the proposal is under a single ownership.

Professional Design Team
Subsection 4.140 (.04)

A3. As can be found in the applicant’s submitted materials, appropriate professionals have been involved in the planning and permitting process. The project architect is Sid Scott with Scott Edwards Architecture, the civil engineer is Alex Simpson and the landscape architect is Daniel Chin, both with Harper Houf Peterson Righellis, Inc. Nick White with AKS Engineering & Forestry has completed the lot line adjustment component of the application.

Planned Development Permit Process
Subsection 4.140 (.05)

A4. The subject property is greater than 2 acres, is designated for industrial development in the Comprehensive Plan, and is zoned Planned Development Industrial. The property will be developed as a planned development in accordance with this subsection.

Comprehensive Plan Consistency
Subsection 4.140 (.06)

A5. The proposed project, as found elsewhere in this report, complies with the Planned Development Industrial zoning designation, which implements the Comprehensive Plan proposed designation of “Industrial” for this property.

Application Requirements
Subsection 4.140 (.07)

A6. Review of the proposed revised Stage I Preliminary Plan has been scheduled for a public hearing before the Development Review Board, in accordance with this subsection, and the applicant has met all the applicable submission requirements as follows:

Development Review Board Panel ‘A’ Staff Report October 11, 2021
City of Wilsonville Public Works Facility
DB21-0017 – DB21-0021, AR21-0010

Exhibit A1

Page 20 of 56

- The property affected by the revised Stage I Preliminary Plan is under the sole ownership of the City of Wilsonville and the application has been signed by Delora Kerber, Public Works Director, authorized to sign on behalf of the City of Wilsonville.
- The application for a Stage I Preliminary Plan has been submitted on a form prescribed by the City.
- The professional design team and coordinator have been identified. See Finding A3, B4.
- The applicant has stated the various uses involved in the Preliminary Plan and their locations.
- The boundary affected by the Stage I Preliminary Plan has been clearly identified and legally described.
- Sufficient topographic information has been submitted.
- Information on the land area to be devoted to various uses has been provided.
- Any necessary performance bonds will be required.

Planned Development Industrial (PDI) Zone

Purpose of PDI-RSIA

Subsection 4.135 (.01)

A7. The uses proposed in the portion of the Stage I Preliminary Plan area within the PDI zone are limited to industrial uses, supporting the purpose stated in this subsection.

Uses Typically Permitted

Subsection 4.135 (.03)

A8. The proposed development consists of a Public Facility building where the intended uses are office space, warehousing, equipment storage (covered and uncovered), dewatering and vehicle wash station, and outdoor vehicle storage. These uses are consistent with the uses typically permitted and are therefore allowed uses.

Prohibited Uses

Subsection 4.135 (.04)

A9. No prohibited uses are proposed by the applicant. Performance standards will be required to be met as part of the Stage II Final Plan review.

Block and Access Standards

Subsections 4.135 (.04) and 4.131 (.03)

A10. The drawings submitted by the applicant show development on the subject property providing adequate pedestrian and vehicle connectivity along SW Boberg Road. No changes to blocks or access spacing are proposed.

PDI Performance Standards

Industrial Performance Standards

Subsections 4.135 (.06) A. through N.

A11. The Stage I Preliminary Plan enables conformance with the Industrial performance standards. Final compliance will be reviewed with the Stage II Final Plans. See Finding B26.

Other Standards for PDI Zone

Lot Size

Subsections 4.135 (.07) A.

A12. Nothing in the Stage I Preliminary Plan would prevent lot size requirements from being met.

Setbacks

Subsections 4.135 (.07) C. through E.

A13. Nothing in the Stage I Preliminary Plan would prevent setback requirements from being met.

Screening and Buffering (SB) Overlay Zone

Purpose of SB Overlay Zone

Subsection 4.137.5 (.01)

A14. The SB Overlay Zone requires appropriate screening and buffering for areas where residential and nonresidential land uses abut. For industrial properties, the SB Overlay Zone requires a 10- to 20-foot-deep buffer area with landscaping to the High Wall or High Screen standard, respectively. Further, there are restrictions on motor vehicle access, exterior operations, and signs, and the DRB may impose additional landscape requirements to minimize visual impacts of any approved vehicle access points.

The subject property is proposed for a variety of nonresidential uses consistent with the PDI zone and abuts a residentially zoned (RA-H) residential use (Walnut Mobile Home Park) to the east, which meets the purpose for applying the SB Overlay Zone and requiring appropriate screening and buffering to assure adequate separation of potentially conflicting land uses.

The subject property is located across the street from the mobile home park. The right of way width varies between 60 and 70 feet along the SW Boberg Road frontage. The PDI zone requires a 30-foot front yard setback, which provides additional buffering from the residential land use. The landscaping provided along with the non-industrial use proposed at the front of the property closest to the adjacent mobile home park provides ample buffering meeting the purpose of the SB Overlay Zone.

Application of SB Overlay Zone
Subsection 4.137.5 (.02)

A15. The criteria for applying the SB Overlay Zone is met along the eastern boundary of the subject property, which abuts the Walnut Mobile Home Park property. Compliance with the SB Overlay Zone requirements is discussed in detail under Request B, Stage II Final Plan.

Landscaped Areas-Industrial Properties
Subsection 4.137.5 (.03) B.

A16. Landscaping of the site is reviewed as part of the Stage II Final Plan. As noted elsewhere in this Staff Report, special care needs to be taken related to buffering and screening from the Walnut Mobile Home Park to the east consistent with Comprehensive Plan language for Area of Special Concern E.

Ingress and Egress
Subsection 4.137.5 (.04)

A17. The proposed development includes an existing private access drive that crosses the portion of the site where the SB Overlay Zone is applied. The drive is densely landscaped and screened ensuring that any industrial uses on site will be screened from off-site view. The second access point to the south does not abut residential uses and therefore is not subject to the requirements of the SB Overlay Zone.

Exterior Work
Subsection 4.137.5 (.05)

A18. No exterior manufacturing, storage, sales, or other similar work is proposed in the SB Overlay Zone area.

Signs
Subsection 4.137.5 (.06)

A19. One monument sign is proposed within the SB Overlay Zone, as allowed by this subsection.

Performance Standards and Off-Site Impacts
Subsection 4.137.5 (.07)

A20. Review of conformance with the PDI zone Performance Standards occurs with the Stage II Final Plan (Request B).

Request B: DB21-0018 Stage II Final Plan

As described in the Findings below, the request meets the applicable criteria or will by Conditions of Approval.

Planned Development Regulations-Generally

Planned Development Purpose & Lot Qualifications
Subsection 4.140 (.01) and (.02)

- B1.** The proposed Stage II Final Plan for development of the subject property is consistent with the Planned Development Regulations purpose statement.

Ownership Requirements
Subsection 4.140 (.03)

- B2.** The subject parcels are under the ownership of the City of Wilsonville, for whom an authorized signer, Delora Kerber, Public Works Director, signed the application.

Professional Design Team
Subsection 4.140 (.04)

- B3.** The applicant has utilized a professional design team from a variety of firms in accordance with this subsection. The project architect is Sid Scott, AIA with Scott Edwards Architecture, the civil engineer is Alex Simpson, PE and the landscape architect is Daniel Chin, RLS, ASLA, both with Harper Houf Peterson Righellis, Inc. Nick White with AKS Engineering & Forestry has completed the lot line adjustment component of the application.

Stage II Final Plan Submission Requirements and Process

Stage II Submission Within 2 Years of Stage I
Subsection 4.140 (.09) A.

- B4.** The applicant is requesting approval of both Stage I and Stage II Approval, together with Site Design Review, as part of this application. The final plan provides sufficient information regarding conformance with both the preliminary development plan and Site Design Review.

Development Review Board Role
Subsection 4.140 (.09) B.

- B5.** The Development Review Board review considers all applicable permit criteria set forth in the Planning and Land Development Code and staff recommends the Development Review Board approve the application with conditions of approval.

Stage I Conformance, Submission Requirements

Subsection 4.140 (.09) C.

- B6.** The Stage II plans conforms to the proposed Stage I Master Plan. The applicant's submitted drawings and other documents show all the additional information required by this subsection.

Stage II Final Plan Detail

Subsection 4.140 (.09) D.

- B7.** The applicant's submitted materials provide sufficiently detailed information to indicate fully the ultimate operation and appearance of the development, including a detailed site plan, landscape plans, and elevation drawings.

Submission of Legal Documents

Subsection 4.140 (.09) E.

- B8.** The Development Review Board does not require any additional legal documentation for dedication or reservation of public facilities.

Expiration of Approval

Subsection 4.140 (.09) I. and Section 4.023

- B9.** The Stage II Approval, along with other associated applications, will expire two (2) years after approval, absent the granting of an extension in accordance with these subsections.

Consistency with Plans

Subsection 4.140 (.09) J. 1.

- B10.** The site's zoning, Planned Development Industrial, is consistent with the Industrial designation in the Comprehensive Plan. The Transportation Systems Plan calls for no additional frontage or road improvement.

Traffic Concurrency

Subsection 4.140 (.09) J. 2.

- B11.** The City's traffic consultant, DKS Associates, calculates that the proposed 15,800 square foot office building and 17,900 square foot storage warehouse will generate 251 new daily trips and 50 PM peak hour trips (11 in, 39 out). It will generate 8 new trips through the I-5/Wilsonville Road Interchange area, and 10 new trips through the I-5 Elligsen Road Interchange Area. Traffic operations at the three intersections studied as part of the traffic impact analysis are shown to continue meeting the LOS D standard. A traffic impact analysis is included in in Exhibit B7.

Facilities and Services Concurrency
Subsection 4.140 (.09) J. 3.

B12. Facilities and services, including utilities in SW Boberg Road, are available and sufficient to serve the proposed development.

Adherence to Approved Plans
Subsection 4.140 (.09) L.

B13. Condition of Approval PDB 1 ensures adherence to approved plans except for minor revisions by the Planning Director.

Standards Applying in All Planned Development Zones

Underground Utilities
Subsection 4.118 (.02)

B14. The applicant's plans show all utilities underground.

Waivers
Subsection 4.118 (.03)

B15. The applicant does not request any waivers.

Other Requirements or Restrictions
Subsection 4.118 (.03) E.

B16. Staff does not recommend any additional requirements or restrictions pursuant to this subsection.

Impact on Development Cost
Subsection 4.118 (.04)

B17. Implementation of standards and imposing conditions beyond minimum standards and requirements do not unnecessarily increase the cost of development. No parties have raised such concerns.

Requiring Tract Dedications or Easements for Recreation Facilities, Open Space, Public Utilities
Subsection 4.118 (.05)

B18. Staff does not recommend any additional tract dedication for recreational facilities, open space, or easements for orderly extension of public utilities consistent with this subsection.

Habitat Friendly Development Practices
Subsection 4.118 (.09)

B19. The applicant will implement habitat-friendly development practices to the extent practicable. Grading will be limited to that needed for the proposed improvements, no

significant native vegetation would be retained by an alternative site design, the City's stormwater standards will be met, thus limiting adverse hydrological impacts on water resources, and no impacts on wildlife corridors or fish passages have been identified.

Planned Development Industrial (PDI) Zone

Purpose of PDI Zone

Subsection 4.135 (.01)

B20. The stated purpose of the PDI zone is to provide opportunities for a variety of industrial operations and associated uses. The proposed development includes a Public Facility containing a variety of industrial operations and associated uses consistent with the purpose stated in this subsection.

Typically Permitted Uses

Subsection 4.135 (.03)

B21. The uses proposed in the Stage II Final Plan are consistent with the Stage I Master Plan. The proposed development consists of a Public Facility building where the intended uses are office space, warehousing, equipment storage (covered and uncovered), dewatering and vehicle wash station, and outdoor vehicle storage. These uses are consistent with the uses typically permitted and are allowed outright within the PDI zone.

Block and Access Standards

Subsections 4.131.05 (.07) and 4.131 (.03)

B22. The proposal requests no changes to blocks or access spacing.

Industrial Performance Standards

Industrial Performance Standards

Subsection 4.135 (.05)

B23. The proposed project meets the performance standards of this subsection as follows:

- Pursuant to standard A (enclosure of uses and activities), all non-parking activities and uses will be completely enclosed. The proposed dewater facility, vehicle wash bay, and storage bins will be partially enclosed due to the nature of their function. These structures are located to the rear of the office building and are screened from off-site view by landscaping.
- Pursuant to standard B (vibrations), there is no indication that the proposed development will produce vibrations detectable off site without instruments.
- Pursuant to standard C (emissions), there is no indication the proposed use would produce the odorous gas or other odorous matter.
- Pursuant to standard D (open storage), outdoor storage of mixed solid waste and recycling will be screened from off-site view.
- Pursuant to standard E (night operations and residential areas), the proposed use is will conduct night operations only as part of emergency response events. No

openings are within one hundred feet of a residential district.

- Pursuant to standard F (heat and glare), the applicant proposes no exterior operations creating heat and glare.
- Pursuant to standard G (dangerous substances), there are no prohibited dangerous substances expected on the development site.
- Pursuant to standard H (liquid and solid wastes), staff has no evidence that the operations would violated standards defined for liquid and solid waste.
- Pursuant to standard I (noise), staff has no evidence that noise generated from the proposed operations would violate the City’s Noise Ordinance and noises produced in violation of the Noise Ordinance would be subject to the enforcement procedures established in WC Chapter 6 for such violations.
- Pursuant to standard J (electrical disturbances), staff has no evidence that the proposed use would have any prohibited electrical disturbances.
- Pursuant to standard K (discharge of air pollutants), staff has no evidence that the proposed use would produce any prohibited discharge.
- Pursuant to standard L (open burning), the applicant proposes no open burning.
- Pursuant to standard M (outdoor storage), the applicant proposes outdoor storage of City fleet vehicles, partially enclosed storage bins, and mixed solid waste and recycling area all of which are screened consistent with City standards.
- Pursuant to standard N (unused area landscaping), no unused areas will be bare.

Screening and Buffering (SB) Overlay Zone

Purpose and Application of SBOZ

Subsection 4.137.5 (.01) and (.02)

B24. The subject property is proposed for a variety of nonresidential uses consistent with the PDI zone and abuts a residentially zoned (RA-H) residential use (Walnut Mobile Home Park) to the east, which meets the purpose for applying the SB Overlay Zone. Appropriate screening and buffering is required to assure adequate separation of potentially conflicting land uses.

Landscaped Areas-Industrial Properties

Subsection 4.137.5 (.03) B.

B25. For land zoned PDI, the SB Overlay Zone requires either a 20-foot-deep area landscaped to at least the High Screen Standard, or a 10-foot-deep area landscaped to at least the High Wall Standard along all property lines where the SB Overlay Zone is applied. To provide buffering and screening from the Walnut Mobile Home Park to the east the applicant includes a 30 foot wide landscaped area along the eastern portion of the property facing SW Boberg Road and the mobile home park. The non-industrial office building is 33 feet tall, which also provides screening of the industrial uses to the rear of the site fully screening those uses from off-site view. The applicant also includes a 6-foot tall privacy fence providing additional screening of the service yard area.

Ingress and Egress, Exterior Work, Signs, Performance Standards and Off-Site Impacts

Subsection 4.137.5 (.04) through (.07)

B26. The applicant has located the new access on the southern portion of the property which is outside of the SB Overlay Zone. The existing private access drive is located within the SB Overlay and will continue to provide access to the property to the west and the subject property also utilize the existing private access drive for two driveway access points. The western access point provides access to the service yard and the eastern driveway will provide access to the guest parking area for the office building.

On-site Pedestrian Access and Circulation

Continuous Pathway System

Subsection 4.154 (.01) B. 1.

B27. As shown on the applicant's site plan in Exhibit B2 Sheet C1.0, the proposed pedestrian pathway system (sidewalks) will provide pedestrian access to the existing public sidewalk along SW Boberg Road. The sidewalk continues west along the private access drive to provide a direct connection to the main entrance of the office building which is located on the rear of the building facing the public parking lot. The sidewalk continues from the courtyard around the storage yard and provides a pathway for staff throughout the site.

Safe, Direct, Convenient Pathways

Subsection 4.154 (.01) B. 2.

B28. Proposed pedestrian pathways are flat, paved sidewalks. Where crossing the parking area, the applicant proposes a 5-foot wide, striped crosswalk with contrasting paint providing safe crossing through the parking lot. The pathways provide direct access to the building from the parking area on all sides of the site. Pathways connect to all primary (and secondary) building entrances. The pathway system that encircles the rear of the site is intended only for staff use as an amenity that passes through the stormwater facility and adjacent to the SROZ area to the south of the site. All pathways terminate within the plaza between Building A (Office) and Building B (Warehouse) and provide access to all entrances for the public and staff.

Vehicle/Pathway Separation-Vertical or Horizontal

Subsection 4.154 (.01) B. 3.

B29. The proposed design of pedestrian pathways provide for vertical separation from vehicle circulation areas.

Crosswalks Clearly Marked
 Subsection 4.154 (.01) B. 4.

B30. As shown on the applicant’s site plan A1.01 in Exhibit B2, the primary circulation system is marked using crosswalk striping at the two instances pedestrian circulation areas cross with drive aisles or vehicular gate areas. A striped crosswalk is not shown or required at the location where the public sidewalk crosses the private access drive along SW Boberg Road.

Pathways Width and Surface-5 Foot Wide, Durable Surface
 Subsection 4.154 (.01) B. 5.

B31. The applicant proposes pathways at least five feet wide. The applicant proposes a combination of concrete pathways and contrasting paint pathways throughout the site.

Parking and Loading

Parking Design Standards
 Section 4.155 (.02) and (.03)

B32. The applicable parking designs standards are met as follows:

Standard	Met	Explanation
Subsection 4.155 (.02) General Standards		
B. All spaces accessible and usable for Parking	☒	The applicant proposes standard parking spaces that are at least 9’ by 18’ and compact spaces that are at least 9” by 15’, and 24’ wide drive aisles, meeting the Development Code’s standards.
I. Sturdy bumper guards of at least 6 inches to prevent parked vehicles crossing property line or interfering with screening or sidewalks.	☒	The applicant’s plans show bumper guards of at least 6 inches in width where required to prevent interference with sidewalks, especially for the ADA spaces.
J. Surfaced with asphalt, concrete or other approved material.	☒	Surfaced with asphalt.
Drainage meeting City standards	☒	Drainage is professionally designed and being reviewed to meet City standards
K. Lighting won’t shine into adjoining structures or into the eyes of passers-bys.	☒	Lighting is proposed to be fully shielded and meet the City’s Outdoor Lighting Standard
N. No more than 40% of parking compact spaces.	☒	4 of the 50 parking spaces are compact, well below the maximum of 40%.
O. Where vehicles overhang curb, planting areas at least 7 feet in depth.	☒	The narrowest planting area adjacent to parking spaces exceeds the 7 foot depth requirement.

Subsection 4.155 (.03) General Standards		
A. Access and maneuvering areas adequate.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Access drive and drive aisle are 24 feet or more, providing an adequate 12 foot travel lane each direction.
A.1. Loading and delivery areas and circulation separate from customer/employee parking and pedestrian areas.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The proposal does not include any loading or delivery areas nor does the City require any.
Circulation patterns clearly marked.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The proposed design is typical commercial parking lot design and intuitive to a driver familiar with typical commercial parking lots.
A.2. To the greatest extent possible, vehicle and pedestrian traffic separated.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The plans clearly delineate separate vehicle and pedestrian traffic areas and separate them except for crosswalks.
C. Safe and Convenient Access, meet ADA and ODOT Standards.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The proposed parking and access enable the meeting of ADA and ODOT standards.
For parking areas with more than 10 spaces, 1 ADA space for every 50 spaces.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The proposal provides 3 ADA parking spaces for 50 parking spaces, One ADA space is located in the public parking area, and the other two ADA spaces are located in the below grade parking area nearest to the doorway.
D. Where possible, parking areas connect to adjacent sites.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The parking areas connect to SW Boberg Road via an existing private access drive and a new driveway at the southern portion of the site and do not connect to any adjacent properties.
Efficient on-site parking and circulation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The careful and professional design of the parking provides for safety and efficiency and is a typical design with standard parking space and drive aisle size and orientation.

Minimum and Maximum Number of Parking Spaces

Subsections 4.155 (.03) G., Table 5, and 4.136 (.05)

B33. The City of Wilsonville Public Works Facility requires a minimum of 51 parking spaces. The applicant proposes 61 parking spaces. The maximum number of spaces for the development is 80. The applicant also provides an additional parking spaces for City of Wilsonville Public Works fleet vehicles and other equipment; however these do not count toward the minimum and maximum parking requirements as they are non-standard sized parking spaces. The applicant's narrative included several errors in calculating the required number of parking spaces primarily due to utilizing incorrect square footage totals for the various structures on site. Staff has accurately measured the structures and recalculated parking requirements based on these numbers. Based on an evaluation of the site plan

provided by the applicant the development meets the off-street parking requirements of the above subsections. The calculation of parking spaces is as follows:

Use and Parking Standard	Square Feet	Minimum Off-street Spaces Required	Maximum Off-street Spaces Allowed	Proposed Off-street Spaces	Minimum Bicycle Parking Spaces	Proposed Bicycle Parking Spaces
Office or flex space (except medical and dental)	17,200 sf	2.7 per 1,000 = 46	4.1 per 1,000 = 71	--	1.0 per 5,000 (min 2) = 5	--
Warehouse	17,900 sf	.3 per 1,000=5	.5 per 1,000 = 9			
Total	33,700 sf	51	80	61	5	6

Parking Area Landscaping

Minimizing Visual Dominance of Parking

Subsection 4.155 (.03) B.

B34. The applicant proposes landscaping throughout the parking area helping to minimize the visual dominance of the paved parking area.

10% Parking Area Landscape Requirement

Subsection 4.155 (.03) B. 1.

B35. According to the applicant’s narrative the parking area is 13,830 square feet. 5,100 square feet of the parking, area is landscaped providing 37% of landscaped area. The landscape area provided is well in excess of the 10% requirement. Additionally, a portion of the parking area is underground and screened by the structure, making it exempt from the landscape requirements.

Landscape Screening of Parking

Subsection 4.155 (.03) B. 1.

B36. The proposed design screens the parking area from adjacent properties and adjacent rights-of-way by physical distance and proposed landscaping and vegetation. The design does not warrant additional screening meeting a specific City screening standard. As a previously developed site Parkway Woods Business Park contains a high berm along SW Parkway Avenue, which screens the existing parking area from view. As no changes are proposed to this portion of the site, the berm will continue to screen the proposed parking area and does not warrant additional screening meeting a specific City screening standard.

Tree Planting Area Dimensions

Subsection 4.155 (.03) B. 2.

B37. The landscape plan shows 21 new trees planted in the parking lot areas. 12 of these trees will be planted around the perimeter of the parking area, 9 new trees are provided in landscaped peninsulas within the parking lot. The proposed trees meet the dimensional requirements of the above section.

Parking Area Tree Requirement

Subsection 4.155 (.03) B. 2. and 2. a.

B38. The proposed Public Works Facility contains 39 surface parking spaces. The site contains 11 additional parking spaces below grade do not require parking lot trees. One (1) tree is required for every eight (8) parking spaces. The tree planting requirement for the parking lot is 5 trees. The applicant proposes 21 new trees around the parking lot area, which exceeds the minimum requirement.

Parking Area Landscape Plan

Subsection 4.155 (.03) B. 2. a.

B39. The applicant's landscape plan includes the proposed parking area.

Parking Area Tree Clearance

Subsection 4.155 (.03) B. 2. b.

B40. The applicant will maintain all trees listed for planting in the parking area and expected to overhang the parking areas to provide a 7-foot vertical clearance.

Bicycle Parking

Required Bicycle Parking

Section 4.155 (.04) A. 1.

B41. Office uses require one bicycle parking space per 5,000 square feet or a minimum of two (2) bicycle parking spaces. Warehouse uses require one bicycle parking space per 20,000 square feet or a minimum of two (2) bicycle parking spaces. The requirement for the office portion of the site is four (4) bicycle parking spaces. The requirement for the warehouse portion of the site is two (2) bicycle parking spaces. The overall requirement for the site is six (6) spaces. While the applicant provides seven (7) bike racks on the property, which have the capacity for two (2) bicycle parking spaces per rack for a total of 14 bicycle parking spaces. The code requires 50% of the total parking requirement for bicycles to be developed as long term bicycle parking spaces when six (6) or more bicycle parking spaces are required. The applicant has included 3 bicycle racks for a total of six (6) short term bicycle parking spaces at the main entrance of the building shown on Sheet L1.1 in Exhibit B2. Additionally, there are six (6) bicycle parking spaces located under the building for long-term parking providing twelve (12) spaces as shown on Sheet A2.11 in Exhibit B2. The breakdown of

short and long-term bicycle parking spaces provided by the applicant meets the requirements above.

Bicycle Parking Standards

Section 4.155 (.04) B.

B42. The applicant's plans show short term bicycle parking at the main entrance of the building and under the building within 30 feet of the entrance for long bicycle parking requirements. The applicant's narrative states that the bicycle parking spaces will comply with the 2' width and 6' length requirement with 5 feet of maneuvering space behind each space. Sheet A2.11 demonstrates compliance with this standard for the long term bicycle parking spaces, however this is not shown for the short term bicycle parking spaces, therefore a condition of approval PDA 3 ensures compliance with this standard.

Minimum Off-Street Loading Requirements

Section 4.155 (.05)

B43. The subject property is not of a use that typically requires the receipt or distribution of materials or merchandise by truck or similar vehicle. Based on the square footage of the use one (1) off-street loading space would be required. The applicant provides one (1) off street loading berth in the warehouse building meeting the size requirements of the above standard.

Carpool and Vanpool Parking Requirements

Section 4.155 (.06)

B44. While the property does not contain over 75 parking spaces the applicant has provided two (2) carpool / vanpool parking spaces in the staff parking area. The spaces are clearly marked as carpool / vanpool spaces as shown on Sheet C1.0 in Exhibit B2 and are located near the main staff entrance.

Other Development Standards

Access, Ingress, and Egress

Section 4.167

B45. Site access is via an existing private access drive that connects to SW Boberg Road. An additional access point is proposed at the southern portion of the property connecting to SW Boberg Road.

Natural Features and Other Resources

Section 4.171

B46. The property is currently undeveloped and contains 119 trees located on site. The site also contains land within the SROZ along the southern portion of the site. The applicant's

narrative recognizes that the site contains natural features worthy of preservation, and minimizes disturbance and strives to protect these features to the extent practicable.

Access Drives and Travel Lanes

Subsection 4.177 (.01) E.

B47. The design of the access drives provides clear travel lanes, free from obstructions. The design shows all drive aisles as asphalt.

Outdoor Lighting

Sections 4.199.20 through 4.199.60

B48. The outdoor lighting standards apply to the proposal is required to meet the Outdoor Lighting Standards. See Request C, Findings C48 through C55.

Underground Installation of Utilities

Sections 4.300-4.320

B49. All utilities on site are existing and underground, no new utilities are proposed.

Public Safety and Crime Prevention

Design for Public Safety, Surveillance and Access

Subsections 4.175 (.01) and (.03)

B50. The proposed development is designed to a reasonable extent to deter crime and ensure public safety. The proposed development includes a perimeter fence for security around the operations yard, security cameras, electronic controlled access gates, and separated staff and visitor parking areas.

Addressing and Directional Signing

Subsection 4.175 (.02)

B51. Addressing will meet public safety standards. The building permit process will ensure conformance.

Lighting to Discourage Crime

Subsection 4.175 (.04)

B52. Lighting design is in accordance with the City's outdoor lighting standards, which will provide sufficient lighting to discourage crime.

Landscaping Standards

Landscaping Standards Purpose

Subsection 4.176 (.01)

B53. In complying with the various landscape standards in Section 4.176 the applicant has demonstrated the Stage II Final Plan is in compliance with the landscape purpose statement.

Landscape Code Compliance

Subsection 4.176 (.02) B.

B54. The applicant requests no waivers or variances to landscape standards. All landscaping and screening must comply with standards of this section.

Intent and Required Materials

Subsections 4.176 (.02) C. through I.

B55. The applicant's planting plan implements the landscaping standards and integrates general and low screen landscaping throughout the site, consistent with professional landscaping and design best practices. Plantings meeting the low screen standard will be utilized along the periphery of the parking areas. The applicant proposes meeting the fully sight obscuring fence standard around the perimeter of the operations yard.

Landscape Area and Locations

Subsection 4.176 (.03)

B56. The proposed development will exceed the 15% landscaping requirement. The subject property is 322,726 square feet and provides 101,506 square feet of landscaping which is 31% of the site. Of the 13,830 square feet of parking area, 37% or 5,100 square feet will be landscaped. Plantings are proposed along the entire frontage of SW Boberg Road to soften the appearance of the new building, as well as the parking areas of the site. The landscaping will include trees, shrubs, ground cover and grasses planted in parking areas, general landscape areas, stormwater facilities, and within the SROZ.

Buffering and Screening

Subsection 4.176 (.04)

B57. The subject property is zoned PDI and borders PDI zoning to the north, east, and south. To the east, the property also borders RAH zoned property that contains residential uses. The Screening and Buffering Overlay Zone requirements are addressed in findings B25 through B27. The site contains outdoor storage and activity areas on the western portion of the site which has been screened meeting the site obscuring fence standard. The applicant proposes a 6 foot tall chain link metal fence with HDPE privacy slats to provide a sight obscuring screen for these areas. The eastern portion of the site contains an office building and parking

areas, which are landscaped with the general landscaping standard and low screen standard.

Landscape Plan Requirements
Subsection 4.176 (.09)

B58. The applicant’s submitted landscape plans are drawn to scale and show the type, installation size, number and placement of materials. Plans include a plant material list identifying plants by both their scientific and common names. A note on the landscape plan indicates the irrigation method.

Mixed Solid Waste and Recyclables Storage

DRB Review of Adequate Storage Area, Minimum Storage Area
Subsections 4.179 (.01)

B59. The subject property currently one combined solid waste and recyclable storage area on site. The enclosure is shown on Sheets A1.01 and A3.05 in Exhibit B2. The structure is 482 square feet and provides 252 square feet of storage within. The minimum requirement for the site is 184 square feet based on the following calculations:

Building	Use	Size	Min. Storage
Administration Building	Office	17,235	68.94 square feet
Warehouse Building	Warehouse	17,390	104.34 square feet

The collection area satisfy the existing spatial demands for the site and meets the access standards of the City’s franchised waste hauler. A letter supporting the redesign and trash and recycling locations from Republic Services dated May 21, 2021 is included in Exhibit B1.

Review by Franchise Garbage Hauler
Subsection 4.179 (.07).

B60. The applicant’s Exhibit B1 contains a letter from Republic Services indicating coordination with the franchised hauler, and that the proposed storage area and site plan meets Republic Services requirements.

Request C: DB21-0033 Site Design Review

As described in the Findings below, the request meets the applicable criteria or will by Conditions of Approval.

Site Design Review

Excessive Uniformity, Inappropriateness Design
Subsection 4.400 (.01) and Subsection 4.421 (.03)

C1. Staff summarizes the compliance with this subsection as follows:

Excessive Uniformity: The proposed development is unique to the particular development context and does not create excessive uniformity.

Inappropriate or Poor Design of the Exterior Appearance of Structures: The applicant used appropriate professional services to design structures on the site using quality materials and design. The new warehouse and office building are attractively designed utilizing metal panels, concrete, and wood accents to add visual interest. The site contains five (5) different structures, which all serve different purposes. However, each maintains a cohesive design with the general aesthetic of the office building, the most prominent structure within the development.

Inappropriate or Poor Design of Signs: The applicant used appropriate professionals to design signs meeting City sign standards compatible with the architecture of the building.

Lack of Proper Attention to Site Development: The applicant employed the skills of the appropriate professional services to design the site, demonstrating appropriate attention to site development.

Lack of Proper Attention to Landscaping: The applicant proposes landscaping exceeding the area requirements professionally designed by a landscape architect, incorporating a variety of plant materials, demonstrating appropriate attention to landscaping.

Objectives of Site Design Review

Proper Functioning of the Site

Subsection 4.400 (.02) A. and Subsection 4.421 (.03)

C2. The professionally designed site demonstrates significant thought to make the site functional and safe. A drive aisle wide enough for two-way traffic, standard size parking stalls, a complete pathway network, and access meeting City standards are among the site design features contributing to functionality and safety.

High Quality Visual Environment

Subsection 4.400 (.02) A. and Subsection 4.421 (.03)

C3. A professionally designed building landscaping and a professional, site specific, layout supports a quality visual environment.

Encourage Originality, Flexibility, and Innovation
Subsection 4.400 (.02) B. and Subsection 4.421 (.03)

- C4. The applicant proposes buildings, landscaping, and other site elements professionally designed specifically for the site. Sufficient flexibility exists to fit the planned development within the site without seeks waivers or variances.

Discourage Inharmonious Development
Subsection 4.400 (.02) C. and Subsection 4.421 (.03)

- C5. As indicated in Finding C3 above the professional unique design of the building, landscaping, and other site elements support a high quality visual environment and thus prevent monotonous, drab, unsightly, dreary development. Use of long lasting materials as well as landscaping will make the site more harmonious with adjacent and nearby development.

Proper Relationships with Site and Surroundings
Subsection 4.400 (.02) D. and Subsection 4.421 (.03)

- C6. The applicant prepared a professional site-specific design that carefully considers the relationship of the building, landscaping, and other improvements with other improvements on and adjacent to the site, existing and planned.

Regard to Natural Aesthetics
Subsection 4.400 (.02) D. and Subsection 4.421 (.03)

- C7. The site contains mature native trees within the SROZ corridor along the southern portion of the site. One Oregon White Oak is proposed for retention along the private access drive to the north. The site plan proposed by the applicant in Exhibit B2 provides a layout that preserves the predominant natural feature of the site which is the SROZ corridor and adds numerous new tree species adding to variety and natural aesthetics of the site which help soften the industrial appearance of the development.

Attention to Exterior Appearances
Subsection 4.400 (.02) D. and Subsection 4.421 (.03)

- C8. The applicant used appropriate professional services to design the exterior of the building. The main entrance of the building has been emphasized through the addition of wood siding. The other materials used are standing seam and flat metal panel, and concrete.



Protect and Enhance City's Appeal
 Subsection 4.400 (.02) E. and Subsection 4.421 (.03)

C9. The applicant is proposing a new public works facility. The proposed development will enhance the appeal of the city by providing more efficient public services through the completion of this facility.

Stabilize Property Values/Prevent Blight

Subsection 4.400 (.02) F. and Subsection 4.421 (.03)

- C10.** The applicant is developing an undeveloped site within the city, and thus prevents blight. As a publically owned building, the structure is exempt and does not contribute to property taxes.

Adequate Public Facilities

Subsection 4.400 (.02) G. and Subsection 4.421 (.03)

- C11.** As found in the Stage II Final Plan review, see Request B, adequate public facilities serve the site.

Pleasing Environments and Behavior

Subsection 4.400 (.02) H. and Subsection 4.421 (.03)

- C12.** The proposed development provides a clearly defined layout and is designed in a configuration that meets defensible space guidelines such as the inclusion of clear sightlines that allow for surveillance and clearly identified structures. See Finding B51 for additional information.

Civic Pride and Community Spirit

Subsection 4.400 (.02) I. and Subsection 4.421 (.03)

- C13.** Through implementing the proposed development of a new City of Wilsonville Public works Facility the project site will help foster civic pride and community spirit.

Favorable Environment for Residents

Subsection 4.400 (.02) J. and Subsection 4.421 (.03)

- C14.** By constructing a new City of Wilsonville Public Works Facility on an undeveloped parcel in a predominantly industrial area of the City the development will provide an overall improved environment of the City along with improved government services.

Jurisdiction and Power of the DRB for Site Design Review

Development Must Follow DRB Approved Plans

Section 4.420

- C15.** Condition of Approval PDC 1 ensures construction, site development, and landscaping are carried out in substantial accord with the Development Review Board approved plans, drawings, sketches, and other documents. The City will not issue any building permits for portions of the improvements requiring DRB review prior to DRB approval.

Design Standards

Preservation of Landscaping

Subsection 4.421 (.01) A.

- C16.** The development requires the removal of most of the trees within the development footprint. The SROZ area on site is preserved and will be enhanced with new plantings to improve the health of the natural feature. The applicant proposes to remove landscaping in poor health and replace it with new landscaping.

Harmony of Proposed Buildings to Environment

Subsection 4.421 (.01) B.

- C17.** The applicant used appropriate professional services to design the exterior of the building to ensure harmony with the environment. The area surrounding the subject property is predominantly industrial. The applicant has utilized materials that are typically employed in industrial development, but has utilized a variety of colors, materials, and textures to add interest and create harmony with the adjacent environment. Landscaping is included around all structures to either enhance the appearance of or screen industrial uses.

Special Attention to Drives, Parking, and Circulation- Access Points

Subsection 4.421 (.01) C.

- C18.** All new access points are existing and meet City standards. No changes are proposed to existing access points.

Special Attention to Drives, Parking, and Circulation- Interior Circulation

Subsection 4.421 (.01) C.

- C19.** All interior circulation areas are existing and the applicant does not propose changes to the existing circulation areas. The interior circulation is at least 24 feet wide allowing for adequate space for pulling out of the individual spaces and for two-way traffic to pass.

Special Attention to Drives, Parking, and Circulation- Pedestrian and Vehicle Separation

Subsection 4.421 (.01) C.

- C20.** The design separates pedestrian and vehicle circulation except at necessary cross walks.

Special Attention to Drives, Parking, and Circulation- Safe and Convenient Parking Areas

Subsection 4.421 (.01) C.

- C21.** The applicant has worked with a professional design team to ensure the new parking area is safe and convenient. The parking area is conveniently located for access to the building. The parking space size and drive aisle width is a typical design allowing adequate area for safe maneuvering.

Special Attention to Drives, Parking, and Circulation- Parking Detracting from Design
Subsection 4.421 (.01) C.

- C22.** The proposed development adequately separates vehicular and pedestrian traffic. Drive aisles and crosswalks are clearly indicated. The proposed parking areas are convenient and designed to be screened from off site view either through landscaping or by being located below grade.

Special Attention to Surface Water Drainage
Subsection 4.421 (.01) D.

- C23.** The proposed development provides parking areas which will contain water quality features consistent with City standards. These features are dispersed throughout the parking lot and will help improve water quality throughout the property. Three facilities are included as part of the development in the following locations: in the plaza area, between the guest parking area and equipment parking spaces within the service yard, and one large facility at the rear of the property. The proposed improvements will not adversely affect neighboring properties through the storm drainage system.

Harmonious Above Ground Utility Installations
Subsection 4.421 (.01) E.

- C24.** No above ground utility installations are proposed.

Indication of Sewage Disposal
Subsection 4.421 (.01) E.

- C25.** All sewage disposal will be via standard sewer connections to City sewer lines found to be adequate to serve the site as part of the Stage II Final Plan.

Advertising Features Do Not Detract
Subsection 4.421 (.01) F.

- C26.** All advertising features are sized and located appropriately to not detract from the design of the existing structure and surrounding properties. See also Request D.

Screening and Buffering of Special Features
Subsection 4.421 (.01) G.

- C27.** The applicant does not propose any special features requiring additional screening or buffering.

Design Standards Apply to All Buildings, Structures, Signs, and Features
Subsection 4.421 (.02)

- C28.** The applicant's design considers the design standards for all buildings, structures, and other features. The proposed monument sign is designed in accordance with all standards

for the zone and meets additional requirements of the Screening and Buffering Overlay Zone.

Conditions of Approval to Ensure Proper and Efficient Function
Subsection 4.421 (.05)

C29. Staff does not recommend any additional conditions of approval to ensure the proper and efficient functioning of the development.

Color or Materials Requirements
Subsection 4.421 (.06)

C30. The colors and materials proposed by the applicant are appropriate. Staff does not recommend any additional requirements or conditions related to colors and materials.

Standards for Mixed Solid Waste and Recycling Areas

Mixed Solid Waste and Recycling Areas Colocation
Subsection 4.430 (.02) A.

C31. The proposal provides an exterior storage area for both solid waste and recyclables.

Exterior vs Interior Storage, Fire Code, Number of Locations
Subsections 4.430 (.02) C.-F.

C32. The applicant proposes a single exterior location in a central visible location. Review of the Building Permit will ensure meeting of building and fire code. The screening enclosure is set back from the property line much more than the required 3 feet.

Collection Vehicle Access, Not Obstruct Traffic or Pedestrians
Subsections 4.430 (.02) G.

C33. The applicant has included a letter from Republic Services in Exhibit B1 which indicates the location and arrangement is accessible to collection vehicles. The location of the storage area does not impede sidewalks, parking area aisles, or public street right-of-way.

Dimensions Adequate to Accommodate Planned Containers
Subsections 4.430 (.03) A.

C34. Pursuant to a letter from Republic Services in Exhibit B1, the dimensions are adequate to accommodate the planned containers.

6-Foot Screen, 10-Foot Wide Gate
Subsections 4.430 (.03) C.

C35. The applicant provides the required screening and gate width.

Site Design Review Submission Requirements

Submission Requirements Section 4.440

C36. The applicant submitted a site plan drawn to scale and a detailed landscape plan.

Time Limit on Site Design Review Approvals

Void after 2 Years Section 4.442

C37. The Applicant plans to develop the proposed project within two years and understands that the approval will expire after two years unless the City grants an extension.

Installation of Landscaping

Landscape Installation or Bonding Subsection 4.450 (.01)

C38. Condition of Approval PDC 2 will assure installation or appropriate security.

Approved Landscape Plan Binding Subsection 4.450 (.02)

C39. Condition of Approval PDC 3 provides ongoing assurance approved landscaping is installed and maintained.

Landscape Maintenance and Watering Subsection 4.450 (.03)

C40. Condition of Approval PDC 4 will ensure continual maintenance of landscaping in a substantially similar manner as originally approved by the Board.

Limitation to Modifications of Landscaping Subsection 4.450 (.04)

C41. Condition of Approval PDC 4 provides ongoing assurance of conformance with this criterion by preventing modification or removal without the appropriate City review.

Landscaping Standards

Shrubs and Groundcover Materials Requirements Subsection 4.176 (.06) A.

C42. Condition of Approval PDC 5 requires meeting the detailed requirements of this subsection. Of particular note, the applicant's landscape plan, shows at least 2-gallon containers for shrubs and 1-gallon containers for groundcover.

Plant Materials Requirements-Trees

Subsection 4.176 (.06) B.

C43. As stated on the applicant's landscape plans, the plant material requirements for trees will be met as follows:

- Trees are B&B (Balled and Burlapped)
- Tree are 2" caliper.

Plant Species Requirements

Subsection 4.176 (.06) E.

C44. The applicant's landscape plan provides sufficient information showing the proposed landscape design meets the standards of this subsection related to use of native vegetation and prohibited plant materials.

Landscape Installation and Maintenance Standards

Subsection 4.176 (.07)

C45. The installation and maintenance standards are met or will be met by Condition of Approval PDC 6 as follows:

- Plant materials are required to be installed to current industry standards and be properly staked to ensure survival
- Within one growing season, the applicant must replace in kind plants that die, unless the City approves appropriate substitute species.
- Notes on the applicant's landscape plans provides for an irrigation system.

Landscape Plan Requirements

Subsection 4.176 (.09)

C46. Applicant's landscape plan show all existing and proposed landscape areas. The to-scale plans show the type, installation size, number and placement of materials. Plans include a plant material list. Plants identification is by both their scientific and common names.

Completion of Landscaping

Subsection 4.176 (.10)

C47. The applicant has not requested to defer installation and thus must install landscaping prior to occupancy.

Outdoor Lighting

Applicability of Outdoor Lighting Standards

Sections 4.199.20 and 4.199.60

C48. The proposed development installs new lighting as part of the development of a new industrial office project to serve as the new City of Wilsonville Public Works Facility in an industrial project. The outdoor lighting standards thus apply.

Outdoor Lighting Zones
Section 4.199.30

C49. The subject property is within LZ2.

Optional Lighting Compliance Methods
Subsection 4.199.40 (.01) A.

C50. The applicant has the option of the performance or prescriptive method. The applicant has selected to comply with the prescriptive method.

Maximum Lamp Wattage and Shielding
Subsection 4.199.40 (.01) B. 1. and Table 7

C51. The applicant has selected the prescriptive option, the project's outdoor lighting design. The applicant's narrative states that the proposed luminaires comply with the maximum luminaire lamp wattage and shielding requirements within Table 7. The luminaire cutsheets are included in Exhibit B5.

Oregon Energy Efficiency Code Compliance
Subsection 4.199.40 (.01) B. 2.

C52. The applicant will demonstrate compliance with the Oregon Energy Efficiency Code, Exterior Lighting prior to construction.

Maximum Mounting Height
Subsection 4.199.40 (.01) B. 3.

C53. As new building mounted lighting and egress lighting will be installed, this meets the definition of a major addition or modification to pre-existing sites as defined by WC 4.199.60.01. The subject property is located within Lighting Zone 2. The maximum mounting height for lighting for private drives, driveways, parking and bus stops is 40 feet. Lighting for walkways, bikeways, plazas and other pedestrian areas is 18 feet. All other lighting must not exceed a mounting height of 8 feet. The applicant's narrative states that the proposed mounting height for all proposed exterior lighting will comply with the required mounting heights within the Lighting Zone 2 Overlay.

Setback from Property Line
Subsection 4.199.40 (.01) B. 4.

C54. The applicant's narrative states that the proposed development meets the criteria outlined in exception 2 within the above subsection as the property does not abut any parcels that do not share the same based or lighting zone. However, the subject property does abut RAH zoned property to the east. However, no lighting is proposed that would violate the lighting setback provisions of this subsection.

Lighting Curfew

Subsection 4.199.40 (.01) D.

C55. The applicant proposes the standard LZ 2 curfew of 10 PM.

Request D: DB20-0030 Type C Tree Removal Plan

Type C Tree Removal-General

Tree Related Site Access

Subsection 4.600.50 (.03) A.

D1. It is understood the City has access to the property to verify information regarding trees.

Review Authority

Subsection 4.610.00 (.03) B.

D2. The requested removal is connected to site plan review by the Development Review Board for new development. The tree removal is thus being reviewed by the Development Review Board.

Conditions of Approval

Subsection 4.610.00 (.06) A.

D3. No additional conditions are recommended pursuant to this subsection.

Completion of Operation

Subsection 4.610.00 (.06) B.

D4. It is understood the tree removal will be completed prior to construction of the proposed building, which is a reasonable time frame for tree removal.

Security for Permit Compliance

Subsection 4.610.00 (.06) C.

D5. No bond is anticipated to be required to ensure compliance with the tree removal plan as a bond is required for overall landscaping.

Tree Removal Standards

Subsection 4.610.10 (.01)

D6. The standards of this subsection are met as follows:

- Standard for the Significant Resource Overlay Zone: Six (6) trees are proposed for removal within the SROZ and six (6) trees are proposed for removal within the buffer zone. These trees are in poor condition and noted by the arborist as in decline, some of the trees are dead such as Tree #31476 and Tree #30645. These trees meet the criteria for removal within the SROZ, as they are necessary for construction due to the underground utilities planned for construction or due to their condition.

- Preservation and Conservation. The arborist report inventoried 162 trees. 119 of those trees were located on the subject properties. The tree species on site are predominantly Black Cottonwood *Populus trichocarpa* and are not native trees or considered rare or endangered. Some of the trees inventoried were noted within the arborist report as dead and do not count toward mitigation requirements. The applicant proposes to preserve thirty (30) of the existing trees. 89 trees are proposed for removal. The applicant proposes to plant 120 new trees to mitigate for the 89 trees proposed for removal, which exceeds the 1:1 mitigation requirement. Condition of approval PDD 4 will ensure that protective fencing is placed around the drip line of preserved trees prior to site grading or other site work that could damage the trees
- Development Alternatives: The proposed tree removal has been minimized to the extent possible in order to redevelop the subject property.
- Land Clearing: Land clearing and grading is proposed and will be limited to areas necessary for construction of the proposed building, structures, and other site improvements.
- Compliance with Statutes and Ordinances: The necessary tree replacement and protection is planned according to the requirements of the tree preservation and protection ordinance.
- Limitation: Tree removal is limited to where it is necessary for construction (as discussed in Development Alternatives above) or to address nuisances or where the health of the trees warrants removal.
- Additional Standards: A tree survey has been provided, and no utilities are proposed to be located where they would cause adverse environmental consequences.

Review Process

Subsection 4.610.40 (.01)

D7. The plan is being reviewed concurrently with the Stage II Final Plan.

Tree Maintenance and Protection Plan

Section 4.610.40 (.02)

D8. The applicant has provided information on tree maintenance and protection in Exhibit B2. Sheets C0.1 and L1.2. The tree protection fencing shown indicates fencing around the trees preserved to the north of the site, however no tree protection fencing is shown to protect preserved trees within the SROZ. A condition of approval has been added to require the applicant to provide an updated exhibit showing tree protection fencing around the SROZ area at the southern portion of the property.

Replacement and Mitigation

Tree Replacement Requirement

Subsection 4.620.00 (.01)

D9. The applicant proposes removing 89 trees and replanting 120 trees as mitigation on the project site, exceeding a one-to-one ratio and the requirements of this subsection.

Basis for Determining Replacement and Replacement
Subsection 4.620.00 (.02) and (.03)

D10. Replacement trees will meet the minimum caliper and other replacement requirements.

Replacement Tree Stock Requirements
Subsection 4.620.00 (.04)

D11. The planting notes on the applicant's Sheet L2.0 and L2.1 Exhibit B2 indicate the appropriate quality.

Replacement Trees Locations
Subsection 4.620.00 (.05) A.

D12. The applicant proposes to mitigate for all removed trees on site and in the appropriate locations for the proposed development.

Protection of Preserved Trees

Tree Protection During Construction
Section 4.620.10

D13. Condition of Approval PDD 4 ensures the applicable requirements of this section will be met.

Request E: DB20-0023 Class III Sign Permit

As described in the Findings below, the request meets the applicable criteria or will by Conditions of Approval.

Sign Review and Submission

Class II Sign Permits Reviewed by DRB
 Subsection 4.031 (.01) M. and Subsection 4.156.02 (.03)

E1. The application qualifies as a Class III Sign Permit subject to Development Review Board review.

What Requires Class III Sign Permit Review
 Subsection 4.156.02 (.06)

E2. The request involves a single tenant scenario in a development subject to Site Design Review by the Development Review Board thus requiring a Class III Sign Permit.

Class III Sign Permit Submission Requirements
 Subsection 4.156.02 (.06) A.

E3. As indicated in the table below the applicant has satisfied the submission for Class III sign permits, which includes the submission requirements for Class II sign permits:

Requirement	Submitted	Waiver Granted		Condition of Approval	Not Applicable	Additional findings/notes
		Info Already Available to City	Info Not Necessary for Review			
Completed Application Form	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sign Drawings or Descriptions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Documentation of Tenant Spaces Used in Calculating Max. Sign Area	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Drawings of Sign Placement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Project Narrative	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Information on Any Requested Waivers or Variances	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--

Class III Sign Permit and Waiver Review Criteria

Class II Sign Permit Review Criteria: Generally and Site Design Review
 Subsection 4.156.02 (.05) F.

E4. As indicated in Findings below, the proposed sign will satisfy the sign regulations for the applicable zoning district and the relevant Site Design Review criteria.

Class II Sign Permit Review Criteria: Compatibility with Zone
 Subsection 4.156.02 (.05) F. 1.

E5. The proposed sign is typical of, proportional to, and compatible with development in the PDI zone. This includes an internally illuminated freestanding monument sign using a concrete base similar to signs found on many developments in the PDI zone. The applicant proposes one freestanding monument sign at the northeastern portion of the site near private access road that runs through the property. No evidence presented nor testimony received demonstrating the subject sign would detract from the visual appearance of the surrounding development.

Class II Sign Permit Review Criteria: Nuisance and Impact on Surrounding Properties
 Subsection 4.156.02 (.05) F. 2.

E6. There is no evidence, and no testimony has been received suggesting proposed signs would create a nuisance or negatively impact the value of surrounding properties.

Class II Sign Permit Review Criteria: Items for Special Attention
 Subsection 4.156.02 (.05) F. 3.

E7. The sign does not conflict with the design or placement of other site elements, landscaping, or building architecture has been reviewed as part of this application. The appropriate placement of the sign will be ensured by Condition of Approval PDE 3.

Sign Measurement

Measurement of Cabinet Signs
 Subsection 4.156.03 (.01) A.

E8. The sign measurement uses single rectangles, as allowed.

Freestanding and Ground Mounted Signs in the PDC, TC, PDI, and PF Zones

General Allowance

Subsection 4.156.08 (.01) A.

- E9.** The subject site has frontage on SW Boberg Road of sufficient length to be sign eligible. A single freestanding sign is proposed along SW Boberg Road. A condition of approval ensures the sign will be placed in a code compliant location on site.

Allowed Height

Subsection 4.156.08 (.01) B.

- E10.** The allowed height for the sign is 8 feet as it is located within the PDI zone. The proposed 3' 6" - freestanding sign thus meets the requirements of this subsection.

Allowed Area

Subsection 4.156.08 (.01) C.

- E11.** The proposed freestanding sign pertains to a single tenant within several buildings located on one property. The proposed sign measures 28 square feet, which is below the allowable sign area for the subject property as the single tenant occupies more than 26,000 square feet of building area.

Pole or Sign Support Placement Vertical

Subsection 4.156.08 (.01) D.

- E12.** The applicant proposes constructing the freestanding sign and its foundation in a full vertical position.

Extending Over Right-of-Way, Parking, and Maneuvering Areas

Subsection 4.156.08 (.01) E.

- E13.** The subject freestanding sign will not extend into or above right-of-way, parking, and maneuvering areas.

Design of Freestanding Signs to Match or Complement Design of Buildings

Subsection 4.156.08 (.01) G.

- E14.** The proposed sign is coordinated with the design of the building design, as proposed.

Width Not Greater Than Height for Signs Over 8 Feet

Subsection 4.156.08 (.01) H.

- E15.** The proposed freestanding sign does not exceed 8 feet, therefore the requirements of this subsection do not apply.

Sign Setback

Subsection 4.156.08 (.01) J.

E16. The applicant's narrative refers to Sheet A1.02 for freestanding sign location which is 147' from the northern property line and 17' from the eastern property line. The sign is roughly 7' from the public sidewalk. The setback requirements intend for freestanding signs to be located no further than 15 feet from the property line and no closer than two feet from a sidewalk or other hard surface in the public right-of-way. A Condition of Approval ensures the sign setback requirements will be met. If an appropriate location cannot be found the sign shall not be installed.

Address Required to be on Sign

Subsection 4.156.08 (.01) K.

E17. The site fronts SW Boberg Road. Sheet A1.02 Sign Plan in Exhibit B2 shows the proposed monument sign. The address is not shown on the proposed monument sign, therefore a condition of approval has been added to ensure the monument sign is redesigned to include the building address in compliance with the above subsection.

Site Design Review

Excessive Uniformity, Inappropriate Design

Subsection 4.400 (.01)

E18. With quality materials and design, the proposed signs will not result in excessive uniformity, inappropriateness or poor design, and the proper attention has been paid to site development.

Purpose and Objectives

Subsection 4.400 (.02) and Subsection 4.421 (.03)

E19. The signs are scaled and designed appropriately related to the subject site and the appropriate amount of attention has been given to visual appearance. The signs will provide local emergency responders and other individuals reference for the location of this development.

Design Standards

Subsection 4.421 (.01)

E20. There is no indication that the size, location, design, color, texture, lighting or material of the proposed signs would detract from the design of the surrounding properties.

Design Standards and Signs

Subsection 4.421 (.02)

E21. Design standards have been applied to the proposed sign, as applicable, see Findings E23 – E25 above.

Color or Materials Requirements

Subsection 4.421 (.06)

E22. The proposed coloring is appropriate for the sign and no additional requirements are necessary. The applicant is proposing backlit channel letters including potential tenant logos. No internally illuminated cabinet signs are proposed.

Site Design Review-Procedures and Submittal Requirements

Section 4.440

E23. The applicant has submitted a sign plan as required by this section.

Request F: AR21-0002 Lot Line Adjustment

Jurisdiction and Powers of Planning Director and Community Development Director – Lot Line Adjustments

Subsection 4.030 (.01) B. 6. a.

- F1.** The proposed lot line adjustment will eliminate the property line between Tax Lot 1800 (2.92 acres) and Tax Lot 1900 (4.72 acres). The result will be a 7.64 acre lot fronting SW Boberg Road. The Planning Director, as authorized in Section 4.030, has referred the Class II Administrative Review to the Development Review Board for review as the lot consolidation is associated with the Public Works Facility development and the Development Review Board reviews these requests concurrently.

Authorization of Land Divisions

Subsection 4.202 (.08)

- F2.** The proposed lot line adjustment is subject to the standards and procedures established in Section 4.233, and the boundaries between adjoining lots or parcels are not being altered without compliance with the standards.

Application Procedures for Land Divisions

Section 4.210

- F3.** The applicant's submittal documents satisfy the requirements of this code section. Staff notes that a traffic study is not required for a lot line adjustment. Approval of the lot line adjustment is effective for two (2) years in which time the applicant must take the action to record the adjustment with Clackamas County. Time extension may be granted per Section 4.023. If the lot line adjustment is not recorded with the Clackamas County Surveyor's office prior to its expiration, this approval is void.

Lot Line Adjustments

Section 4.233

- F4.** An application for lot line adjustment is typically reviewed through the Administrative Review procedure outlined in Section 4.035. The applicant applied for the lot line adjustment separately from the broader development of the site outlined in requests A through E. Pursuant to Section 4.030 the Planning Director has referred the administrative review AR21-0010 to the Development Review Board (DRB) for review as the DRB typically reviews land divisions such as tentative subdivision plats and condominium plats. The two lots of the subject property are vacant with no existing structures. A proposed structure would cross the existing property line; therefore, the lots are being consolidated to facilitate the development of the site. The lot consolidation will create a new lot with a total area of 7.64 acres. The requested lot line adjustment will not impact the ability for the property to meet the minimum dimensional (lot size, coverage, area, setbacks) standards required for properties in the PDI Zone.

Engineering Conditions and Requirements for Proposed Development

From: Matt Huxley, PE
 To: Philip Bradford, Associate Planner
 Date: September 21, 2021
 Proposal: Wilsonville Public Works Facility

Engineering Division Conditions:

Request D: DB21-0017 Preliminary Development Plan

CA= Conditional Approval NC=Non-Complying

	City of Wilsonville Public Works Section and Standard		Code	Comments
PFA 1.	Public Works Plans and Public Improvements shall conform to the "Public Works Plan Submittal Requirements and Other Engineering Requirements" in Exhibit C1.			
PFA 2.	101.9.04 c.1(b)	Erosion Control	NC	A wheel wash is required at temporary construction entrances as site is >5 acres.
PFA 3.	201.2.23	Driveways	CA	Street trees are shown close to proposed driveways. Provide sight distance triangles to verify vision clearance.
PFA 4.	201.2.25	Sidewalks	NC	Proposed sidewalk to office building and parking lot - separation from roadway should be increased to 5-feet per Table 2.13 of the PWS.
PFA 5.	201.2.25	Sidewalks	NC	Provide ADA ramp from accessible parking stall to proposed sidewalk
PFA 6.	301.1.100	Stormwater and Surface Water Design – General	CA	A catch basin is required at the low point next to north curb in the staff parking lot.
PFA 7.	301.1.100	Stormwater and Surface Water Design – General	CA	Suggest connecting all laterals in the courtyard to a manhole. Will make it easier to inspect and maintain.
PFA 8.	301.1.100	Stormwater and Surface Water Design – General	CA	Suggest eliminating the water quality facility in the northeast corner of maintenance area. It discharges to another water quality facility so serves no purpose.
PFA 9.	301.1.100	Stormwater and Surface	CA	Water quality facility in SW corner – northern portion of facility will be difficult



		Water Design – General		to access behind storage bins. Suggest eliminating this piece and enlarging southern and eastern portion.
PFA 10.	301.4.11	Stormwater Pretreatment Manholes	NC	These are required for all outfalls to stormwater management facilities. Plans show multiple outfalls but a manhole on just one outfall.
PFA 11.	301.12	Source Controls	CA	Required for vehicle washing, above-ground storage of liquid materials, solid waste storage, and exterior storage of bulk materials. Sedimentation tanks are shown for two buildings. Oil/water separators are required at vehicle maintenance bays, and covered spill containment for chemical and fuel storage tanks.
PFA 12.	401.1.00	Sanitary Sewer Design - General	CA	Water and sewer line horizontal separation in front of the maintenance building is 7-feet. 5-feet to 10-feet separation is only allowed if the invert water line is higher than the crown of the sewer line.
PFA 13.	401.2.01.i	Lateral Connections	NC	Sewer laterals from buildings B and D should not connect to manholes.
PFA 14.	501.2.01	Fire Hydrants	CA	Only two fire hydrants are shown and are close to each other at the northwest corner of the site. Confirm fire hydrant spacing, locations, and coverage are adequate with TVF&R
PFA 15.	501.8.05.e.	Bollards	CA	Provide bollards around hydrants in areas exposed to vehicle traffic
PFA 16.	501.2.04	Dead-End Mains	NC	Dead end mains are not allowed. Proposed fire line should be looped instead of dead-ending at the northwest corner of the site.
PFA 17.	501.2.05	Valves	NC	Provide valves at all junctions in mainlines.
PFA 18.	501.2.07	Water Services	CA	Separate meters are required for domestic and irrigation services. Drawing C3.0 shows two water meters but one is not connected to anything. Confirm if this is for irrigation.

Exhibit C1

Public Works Plan Submittal Requirements
and Other Engineering Requirements

1. All construction or improvements to public works facilities shall be in conformance to the City of Wilsonville Public Works Standards - 2017.
2. Applicant shall submit insurance requirements to the City of Wilsonville in the following amounts:

Coverage (<i>Aggregate, accept where noted</i>)	Limit
<u>Commercial General Liability:</u>	
▪ General Aggregate (per project)	\$3,000,000
▪ General Aggregate (per occurrence)	\$2,000,000
▪ Fire Damage (any one fire)	\$50,000
▪ Medical Expense (any one person)	\$10,000
<u>Business Automobile Liability Insurance:</u>	
▪ Each Occurrence	\$1,000,000
▪ Aggregate	\$2,000,000
<u>Workers Compensation Insurance</u>	\$500,000

3. No construction of, or connection to, any existing or proposed public utility/improvements will be permitted until all plans are approved by Staff, all fees have been paid, all necessary permits, right-of-way and easements have been obtained and Staff is notified a minimum of 24 hours in advance.
4. All public utility/improvement plans submitted for review shall be based upon a 22" x 34" format and shall be prepared in accordance with the City of Wilsonville Public Work's Standards.
5. Plans submitted for review shall meet the following general criteria:
 - a. Utility improvements that shall be maintained by the public and are not contained within a public right-of-way shall be provided a maintenance access acceptable to the City. The public utility improvements shall be centered in a minimum 15-ft. wide public easement for single utilities and a minimum 20-ft wide public easement for two parallel utilities and shall be conveyed to the City on its dedication forms.
 - b. Design of any public utility improvements shall be approved at the time of the issuance of a Public Works Permit. Private utility improvements are subject to review and approval by the City Building Department.

- c. In the plan set for the PW Permit, existing utilities and features, and proposed new private utilities shall be shown in a lighter, grey print. Proposed public improvements shall be shown in bolder, black print.
 - d. All elevations on design plans and record drawings shall be based on NAVD 88 Datum.
 - e. All proposed on and off-site public/private utility improvements shall comply with the State of Oregon and the City of Wilsonville requirements and any other applicable codes.
 - f. Design plans shall identify locations for street lighting, gas service, power lines, telephone poles, cable television, mailboxes and any other public or private utility within the general construction area.
 - g. As per City of Wilsonville Ordinance No. 615, all new gas, telephone, cable, fiber-optic and electric improvements etc. shall be installed underground. Existing overhead utilities shall be undergrounded wherever reasonably possible.
 - h. Any final site landscaping and signing shall not impede any proposed or existing driveway or interior maneuvering sight distance.
 - i. Erosion Control Plan that conforms to City of Wilsonville Ordinance No. 482.
 - j. Existing/proposed right-of-way, easements and adjacent driveways shall be identified.
 - k. All engineering plans shall be printed to PDF, combined to a single file, stamped and digitally signed by a Professional Engineer registered in the State of Oregon.
 - l. All plans submitted for review shall be in sets of a digitally signed PDF and three printed sets.
6. Submit plans in the following general format and order for all public works construction to be maintained by the City:
- a. Cover sheet
 - b. City of Wilsonville construction note sheet
 - c. General construction note sheet
 - d. Existing conditions plan.
 - e. Erosion control and tree protection plan.
 - f. Site plan. Include property line boundaries, water quality pond boundaries, sidewalk improvements, right-of-way (existing/proposed), easements (existing/proposed), and sidewalk and road connections to adjoining properties.
 - g. Grading plan, with 1-foot contours.
 - h. Composite utility plan; identify storm, sanitary, and water lines; identify storm and sanitary manholes.
 - i. Detailed plans; show plan view and either profile view or provide i.e.'s at all utility crossings; include laterals in profile view or provide table with i.e.'s at crossings; vertical scale 1"= 5', horizontal scale 1"= 20' or 1"= 30'.
 - j. Street plans.
 - k. Storm sewer/drainage plans; number all lines, manholes, catch basins, and cleanouts for easier reference.
 - l. Stormwater LIDA facilities (Low Impact Development): provide plan and profile views of all LIDA facilities.

- m. Water and sanitary sewer plans; plan; number all lines, manholes, and cleanouts for easier reference.
 - n. Where depth of water mains are designed deeper than the 3-foot minimum (to clear other pipe lines or obstructions), the design engineer shall add the required depth information to the plan sheets.
 - o. Detailed plan for storm water detention facility (both plan and profile views), including water quality orifice diameter and manhole rim elevations. Provide detail of inlet structure and energy dissipation device. Provide details of drain inlets, structures, and piping for outfall structure. Note that although storm water detention facilities are typically privately maintained they will be inspected by engineering, and the plans must be part of the Public Works Permit set.
 - p. Detailed plan for water quality facility (both plan and profile views). Note that although storm water quality facilities are typically privately maintained they will be inspected by Natural Resources, and the plans must be part of the Public Works Permit set.
 - q. Composite franchise utility plan.
 - r. City of Wilsonville detail drawings.
 - s. Illumination plan.
 - t. Striping and signage plan.
 - u. Landscape plan.
7. Design engineer shall coordinate with the City in numbering the sanitary and stormwater sewer systems to reflect the City's numbering system. Video testing and sanitary manhole testing will refer to City's numbering system.
 8. The applicant shall install, operate and maintain adequate erosion control measures in conformance with the standards adopted by the City of Wilsonville Ordinance No. 482 during the construction of any public/private utility and building improvements until such time as approved permanent vegetative materials have been installed.
 9. Applicant shall work with City Engineering before disturbing any soil on the respective site. If 5 or more acres of the site will be disturbed applicant shall obtain a 1200-C permit from the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality. If 1 to less than 5 acres of the site will be disturbed a 1200-CN permit from the City of Wilsonville is required.
 10. The applicant shall be in conformance with all stormwater and flow control requirements for the proposed development per the Public Works Standards.
 11. A storm water analysis prepared by a Professional Engineer registered in the State of Oregon shall be submitted for review and approval by the City.
 12. The applicant shall be in conformance with all water quality requirements for the proposed development per the Public Works Standards. If a mechanical water quality system is used, prior to City acceptance of the project the applicant shall provide a letter from the system

manufacturer stating that the system was installed per specifications and is functioning as designed.

13. Storm water quality facilities shall have approved landscape planted and/or some other erosion control method installed and approved by the City of Wilsonville prior to streets and/or alleys being paved.
14. The applicant shall contact the Oregon Water Resources Department and inform them of any existing wells located on the subject site. Any existing well shall be limited to irrigation purposes only. Proper separation, in conformance with applicable State standards, shall be maintained between irrigation systems, public water systems, and public sanitary systems. Should the project abandon any existing wells, they shall be properly abandoned in conformance with State standards.
15. All survey monuments on the subject site, or that may be subject to disturbance within the construction area, or the construction of any off-site improvements shall be adequately referenced and protected prior to commencement of any construction activity. If the survey monuments are disturbed, moved, relocated or destroyed as a result of any construction, the project shall, at its cost, retain the services of a registered professional land surveyor in the State of Oregon to restore the monument to its original condition and file the necessary surveys as required by Oregon State law. A copy of any recorded survey shall be submitted to Staff.
16. Streetlights shall be in compliance with City dark sky, LED, and PGE Option C requirements.
17. Sidewalks, crosswalks and pedestrian linkages in the public right-of-way shall be in compliance with the requirements of the U.S. Access Board.
18. No surcharging of sanitary or storm water manholes is allowed.
19. The project shall connect to an existing manhole or install a manhole at each connection point to the public storm system and sanitary sewer system.
20. A City approved energy dissipation device shall be installed at all proposed storm system outfalls. Storm outfall facilities shall be designed and constructed in conformance with the Public Works Standards.
21. The applicant shall provide a 'stamped' engineering plan and supporting information that shows the proposed street light locations meet the appropriate AASHTO lighting standards for all proposed streets and pedestrian alleyways.
22. All required pavement markings, in conformance with the Transportation Systems Plan and the Bike and Pedestrian Master Plan, shall be completed in conjunction with any conditioned street improvements.

23. Street and traffic signs shall have a hi-intensity prismatic finish meeting ASTM 4956 Spec Type 4 standards.
24. The applicant shall provide adequate sight distance at all project driveways by driveway placement or vegetation control. Specific designs to be submitted and approved by the City Engineer. Coordinate and align proposed driveways with driveways on the opposite side of the proposed project site.
25. The applicant shall provide adequate sight distance at all project street intersections, alley intersections and commercial driveways by properly designing intersection alignments, establishing set-backs, driveway placement and/or vegetation control. Coordinate and align proposed streets, alleys and commercial driveways with existing streets, alleys and commercial driveways located on the opposite side of the proposed project site existing roadways. Specific designs shall be approved by a Professional Engineer registered in the State of Oregon. As part of project acceptance by the City the Applicant shall have the sight distance at all project intersections, alley intersections and commercial driveways verified and approved by a Professional Engineer registered in the State of Oregon, with the approval(s) submitted to the City (on City approved forms).
26. Access requirements, including sight distance, shall conform to the City's Transportation Systems Plan (TSP) or as approved by the City Engineer. Landscaping plantings shall be low enough to provide adequate sight distance at all street intersections and alley/street intersections.
27. Applicant shall design interior streets and alleys to meet specifications of Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue and Allied Waste Management (United Disposal) for access and use of their vehicles.
28. The applicant shall provide the City with a Stormwater Maintenance and Access Easement Agreement (on City approved forms) for City inspection of those portions of the storm system to be privately maintained. Applicant shall provide City with a map exhibit showing the location of all stormwater facilities which will be maintained by the Applicant or designee. Stormwater or rainwater LID facilities may be located within the public right-of-way upon approval of the City Engineer. Applicant shall maintain all LID storm water components and private conventional storm water facilities; maintenance shall transfer to the respective homeowners association when it is formed.
29. The applicant shall "loop" proposed waterlines by connecting to the existing City waterlines where applicable.
30. Applicant shall provide a minimum 6-foot Public Utility Easement on lot frontages to all public right-of-ways. An 8-foot PUE shall be provided along Collectors. A 10-ft PUE shall be provided along Minor and Major Arterials.

31. For any new public easements created with the project the Applicant shall be required to produce the specific survey exhibits establishing the easement and shall provide the City with the appropriate Easement document (on City approved forms).

32. Mylar Record Drawings:

At the completion of the installation of any required public improvements, and before a 'punch list' inspection is scheduled, the Engineer shall perform a record survey. Said survey shall be the basis for the preparation of 'record drawings' which will serve as the physical record of those changes made to the plans and/or specifications, originally approved by Staff, that occurred during construction. Using the record survey as a guide, the appropriate changes will be made to the construction plans and/or specifications and a complete revised 'set' shall be submitted. The 'set' shall consist of drawings on 3 mil. Mylar and an electronic copy in AutoCAD, current version, and a digitally signed PDF.

Natural Resource Findings, Conditions, and Requirements for Proposed Development

From: Kerry Rappold, Natural Resources Manager
To: Philip Bradford, Associate Planner
Date: September 28, 2021
Proposal: Public Works Facility

Natural Resources Division Conditions:

All Requests

NR 1. Natural Resource Division Requirements and Advisories listed in Exhibit C3 apply to the proposed development.
--



Exhibit C3
Natural Resources Findings & Requirements

Findings for SI1_-00__

(if SRIR include related findings here)

Significant Resource Overlay Zone

1. All landscaping, including herbicides used to eradicate invasive plant species and existing vegetation, in the SROZ shall be reviewed and approved by the Natural Resources Manager. Native plants are required for landscaping in the SROZ.
2. Prior to any site grading or ground disturbance, the applicant is required to delineate the boundary of the SROZ. Six-foot (6') tall cyclone fences with metal posts pounded into the ground at 6'-8' centers shall be used to protect the significant natural resource area where development encroaches into the 25-foot Impact Area.

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING
OCTOBER 11, 2021
6:30 PM

- VII. Board Member Communications:
 - A. Results of the May 24, 2021 DRB Panel B meeting

City of Wilsonville

Development Review Board Panel B Meeting Meeting Results

DATE: MAY 24, 2021		TIME END: 8:45 P.M.
LOCATION: 29799 SW TOWN CENTER LOOP EAST, WILSONVILLE, OR		
TIME START: 6:30 P.M.		

ATTENDANCE LOG

BOARD MEMBERS	STAFF
Samy Nada	Daniel Pauly
Nichole Hendrix	Barbara Jacobson
Jason Abernathy	Miranda Bateschell
Michael Horn	Kimberly Rybold
	Cindy Luxhoj
	Kerry Rappold
	Khoi Le
	Shelley White

AGENDA RESULTS

AGENDA	ACTIONS
CITIZENS' INPUT	None.
CONSENT AGENDA	
A. Approval of minutes of the March 22, 2021 DRB Panel B meeting	A. Approved as presented
PUBLIC HEARING	
<p>A. Resolution No. 391. Wilsonville High School Auditorium Addition and Site Improvements: West Linn-Wilsonville School District – Owner/Applicant. The applicant is requesting approval of a Stage II Final Plan Modification and Height Waiver, Site Design Review, Type C Tree Removal Plan and Class III Sign Review and Waiver for construction of a 55 foot high, 29,300 square foot auditorium addition and associated site improvements, including parking lot modifications, synthetic turf installation, and LED lighting installation, at Wilsonville High School. The subject property is located at 6800 SW Wilsonville Road and is legally described as Tax Lot 100 of Section 13, Township 3 South, Range 1 West, Willamette Meridian, City Of Wilsonville, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Kimberly Rybold</p> <p>Case Files: DB21-0001 Stage II Final Plan Modification and Height Waiver DB21-0002 Site Design Review DB21-0003 Type C Tree Removal Plan DB21-0004 Class III Sign Review and Waiver</p>	<p>A. Resolution No. 391 was unanimously approved with the addition of</p>
<p>B. Resolution No. 392. 6585 SW Montgomery Way SRIR & SROZ Review: Nick and Taryn VanderPyl – Owner/Applicant. The applicant is requesting approval of an Abbreviated Significant</p>	<p>B. Resolution No. 392 was unanimously approved with the</p>

<p>Resource Impact Report (SRIR) and Significant Resource Overlay Zone (SROZ) Large Lot Exception for construction of a single-family home with an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) at 6585 SW Montgomery Way. The subject property is located on Tax Lot 1500 of Section 24A, Township 3 South, Range 1 West, Willamette Meridian, City of Wilsonville, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Cindy Luxhoj</p> <p>Case Files: S121-0002 Abbreviated SRIR & SROZ Large Lot Exception</p>	<p>addition of one additional exhibit.</p>
<p>BOARD MEMBER COMMUNICATIONS</p>	<p>Packet materials not discussed</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Results of the April 12, 2021 DRB Panel A meeting B. Results of the May 10, 2021 DRB Panel A meeting C. Recent City Council Action Minutes 	<p>Staff assured the Board would receive notice as early as possible about when in-person meetings would resume</p>
<p>STAFF COMMUNICATIONS</p>	<p>None</p>

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING
OCTOBER 11, 2021
6:30 PM

- VII. Board Member Communications:
 - B. Results of the September 27, 2021 DRB Panel B meeting

City of Wilsonville

Development Review Board Panel B Meeting Meeting Results

DATE:	SEPTEMBER 27, 2021	
LOCATION:	29799 SW TOWN CENTER LOOP EAST, WILSONVILLE, OR	
TIME START:	6:31 P.M.	TIME END: 10:45 P.M.

ATTENDANCE LOG

BOARD MEMBERS	STAFF
Samy Nada	Daniel Pauly
Nichole Hendrix	Barbara Jacobson
Jason Abernathy	Miranda Bateschell
Katie Dunwell	Cindy Luxhoj
	Shelley White
	Kim Rybold

AGENDA RESULTS

AGENDA	ACTIONS
CITIZENS' INPUT	None.
CONSENT AGENDA	
A. Approval of minutes of the May 24, 2021 DRB Panel B meeting	A. Approved as presented
PUBLIC HEARING	
<p>A. Resolution No. 393. Villebois Village Center Mixed Use Development: Pacific Community Design – Representative for Costa Pacific Communities – Applicant and RCS Villebois Development LLC – Owner. The applicant is requesting approval of a Zone Map Amendment from Public Facility (PF) to Village (V) and adopting findings and conditions approving a SAP Central Amendment, Preliminary Development Plan (1) and Plan Modifications (2), Final Development Plans (3), and Type C Tree Plans (3) for a mixed-use development located in the Villebois Village Center. The subject sites are located on Tax Lots 2100 and 2800 of Section 15AC and Tax Lot 8600 of Section 15DB, Township 3 South, Range 1 West, Willamette Meridian, City of Wilsonville, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Cindy Luxhoj</p> <p>Case Files: DB21-0008 Zone Map Amendment (PDP 12 C Lot 76, Bldgs A, B) DB21-0010 SAP Central Amendment (PDP 12 C Lot 76, Bldgs A, B) DB21-0011 Preliminary Development Plan (PDP 12 C Lot 76, Bldg A, B) DB21-0012 Final Development Plan (PDP 12 C Lot 76, Bldgs A, B) DB21-0013 Type C Tree Removal Plan (PDP 12 C Lot 76, Bldgs A, B) DB21-0014 Preliminary Development Plan (PDP 2 C Lot 73, Bldg C) DB21-0015 Final Development Plan (PDP 2 C Lot 73, Bldg C) DB21-0016 Type C Tree Removal Plan (PDP 2 C Lot 73, Bldg C)</p>	<p>A. DB21-0008 was recommended to City Council for approval by a 3 to 1 vote with Samy Nada opposed.</p> <p>The public hearing was unanimously continued to October 25, 2021 date certain.</p>

DB21-0022 Preliminary Development Plan (PDP 1 C Lot 12, Parking) DB21-0023 Final Development Plan (PDP 1 C Lot 12, Parking) DB21-0024 Type C Tree Removal Plan (PDP 1 C Lot 12, Parking)	
BOARD MEMBER COMMUNICATIONS	
A. Recent City Council Action Minutes	Including time estimates on the agenda for agenda items and presentations was suggested.
STAFF COMMUNICATIONS	
	Mr. Pauly welcomed Katie Dunwell to the Board.

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING
OCTOBER 11, 2021
6:30 PM

- VII. Board Member Communications:
 - C. Recent City Council Action Minutes

City Council Meeting Action Minutes
May 3, 2021

City Council members present included:

Mayor Fitzgerald
Council President Akervall
Councilor Lehan
Councilor West – Arrived 7:03 p.m.
Councilor Linville

Kimberly Veliz, City Recorder
Jeanna Troha, Assistant City Manager
Beth Wolf, Senior Systems Analyst
Kim Rybold, Senior Planner
Jordan Vance, Economic Development Manager
Andy Stone, IT Director
Zoe Monahan, Assistant to the City Manager
Dwight Brashear, Transit Director
Scott Simonton, Fleet Services Manager

Staff present included:

Bryan Cosgrove, City Manager
Barbara Jacobson, City Attorney

AGENDA ITEM	ACTIONS
WORK SESSION	START: 5:00 p.m.
A. Vertical Housing Development Zones	Staff provided a short overview on VHDZ and sought Council’s input.
B. Community Enhancement Program Recommendations	Council heard about Resolution No. 2894, which allocates Community Enhancement Funds for FY 2021/2022.
C. Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Committee Bylaws	Staff reviewed DEI Committee bylaws with Council.
D. Purchase of Three 21 Passenger CNG Buses	Council was informed of Resolution No. 2892, which authorizes SMART to purchase three 21 passenger CNG buses.
REGULAR MEETING	
<u>Mayor’s Business</u>	
A. Upcoming Meetings	Upcoming meetings were announced by the Mayor as well as the regional meetings she attended on behalf of the City.
<u>Communications</u>	
A. None.	
<u>Consent Agenda</u>	
A. <u>Resolution No. 2892</u> A Resolution Of The City Of Wilsonville Authorizing South Metro Area Regional Transit (SMART) To Purchase Three 21 Passenger Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) Buses From Davey Coach Sales, Inc.	The Consent Agenda was approved 5-0.

<p>B. <u>Resolution No. 2893</u> A Resolution Of The City Council Creating The Diversity, Equity And Inclusion (DEI) Committee.</p> <p>C. <u>Resolution No. 2894</u> A Resolution To Allocate Community Enhancement Funds For Fiscal Year 2021/2022.</p> <p>D. Minutes of the April 19, 2021 City Council Meeting.</p>	
<p><u>New Business</u> A. None.</p>	
<p><u>Continuing Business</u> A. None.</p>	
<p><u>Public Hearing</u> A. None.</p>	
<p><u>City Manager's Business</u></p>	<p>Reminded Council of their upcoming Council Retreat and Goal Setting scheduled for May 14 -15, 2021.</p>
<p><u>Legal Business</u></p>	<p>No report.</p>
<p>ADJOURN</p>	<p>7:35 p.m.</p>

City Council Meeting Action Minutes
May 17, 2021

City Council members present included:

Mayor Fitzgerald
Council President Akervall
Councilor Lehan
Councilor West
Councilor Linville

Kimberly Veliz, City Recorder
Jeanna Troha, Assistant City Manager
Beth Wolf, Senior Systems Analyst
Andy Stone, IT Director
Zoe Monahan, Assistant to the City Manager
Delora Kerber, Public Works Director
Dominique Huffman, Civil Engineer
Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director

Staff present included:

Bryan Cosgrove, City Manager
Barbara Jacobson, City Attorney

AGENDA ITEM	ACTIONS
WORK SESSION	
START: 5:02 p.m.	
A. Community Enhancement Program IGA with Metro	Council heard about Resolution No. 2897, which adopts an IGA between Metro and the City to Continue the Wilsonville - Metro Community Enhancement Program.
B. Tourism Promotion Committee 1/5 Year Plan	Staff presented on Resolution No. 2898, which adopts the FY 2021/22 Five-Year Action Plan and Annual One-Year Implementation Plan for the Wilsonville Tourism Development Strategy.
REGULAR MEETING	
<u>Mayor's Business</u>	
A. Upcoming Meetings	Upcoming meetings were announced by the Mayor as well as the regional meetings she attended on behalf of the City.
B. Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Committee Appointments	<p><u>Positions 1 – 5 (1 year appointment)</u> Appointments of Malak El Manhawym, Camryn Lau, Erika Pham, Luis Gonzalez and Rudyane Rivera-Lindstrom to the Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Committee for a term beginning 6/1/2021 to 12/31/2022. Passed 5-0.</p> <p><u>Position 6 – 9 (2 year appointment)</u> Appointments of Joni McNeil, Sudeep Taksali, Tracy Hester and Fay Gyapong-Porter to the Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Committee for a term beginning 6/1/2021 to 12/31/2023. Passed 5-0.</p>

<p>C. Pride Month Proclamation</p> <p>D. National Public Works Week Proclamation</p>	<p><u>Position 10 – 13 (3 year appointment)</u> Appointments of Imran Haider, Eugenia Imel, Santiago Landazuri and Jay Edwards to the Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Committee for a term beginning 6/1/2021 to 12/31/2024. Passed 5-0.</p> <p>The Mayor read a proclamation declaring the month of June 2021 as Pride Month in Wilsonville.</p> <p>The Mayor read a proclamation declaring the week of May 16 – 22, 2021 Public Works Week in Wilsonville.</p>
<p><u>Communications</u></p> <p>A. Recognition of Delora Kerber, Public Works Director, as National Public Works Leader of the Year</p>	<p>Public Works Director Delora Kerber was congratulated for being named 2021 Top 10 Public Works Leader of the Year by the American Public Works Association (APWA).</p>
<p><u>Consent Agenda</u></p> <p>A. <u>Resolution No. 2895</u> A Resolution Of The City Of Wilsonville Authorizing The City Manager To Execute A Construction Contract With Eagle-Elsner, Inc. For Construction Of The 2021 Street Maintenance Project (Capital Improvement Project # 4014, 4118 And 4725).</p> <p>B. <u>Resolution No. 2896</u> A Resolution Of The City Of Wilsonville Authorizing The City Manager To Execute A Memorandum Of Understanding With The Willamette Falls And Landings Heritage Area Coalition.</p> <p>C. <u>Resolution No. 2897</u> A Resolution Of The Wilsonville City Council Adopting An Intergovernmental Agreement Between Metro And The City Of Wilsonville To Continue The Wilsonville - Metro Community Enhancement Program.</p> <p>D. <u>Resolution No. 2898</u> A Resolution Of The City Of Wilsonville Adopting The FY 2021/22 Five-Year Action Plan And Annual One-Year Implementation Plan For The Wilsonville Tourism Development Strategy.</p>	<p>The Consent Agenda was approved 5-0.</p>

<p>E. <u>Resolution No. 2899</u> A Resolution And Order Amending Resolution No. 2882 To Further Extend The Local State Of Emergency And Emergency Measures, As Authorized By Resolution No. 2803.</p> <p>F. Minutes of the May 3, 2021 City Council Meeting.</p>	
<p><u>New Business</u> A. None.</p>	
<p><u>Continuing Business</u> A. None.</p>	
<p><u>Public Hearing</u> A. None.</p>	
<p><u>City Manager's Business</u></p>	<p>Council moved to cancel the first City Council meeting in July 2021. Passed 5-0.</p> <p>Updated that staff is working to figure out new mask requirements for City Employees.</p> <p>Clarified the Budget Committee would be held on May 19, 20 and 25 if needed.</p> <p>Shared over the past weekend a Public Works employee, former Public Works employee and Kitakata Sister City Advisory Board member all had passed away.</p>
<p><u>Legal Business</u></p>	<p>No report.</p>
<p>ADJOURN</p>	<p>8:05 p.m.</p>

Special City Council Meeting Action Minutes
May 26, 2021

City Council members present included:

Mayor Fitzgerald
Council President Akervall
Councilor Lehan - Excused
Councilor West - Absent
Councilor Linville

Staff present included:

Bryan Cosgrove, City Manager
Barbara Jacobson, City Attorney
Kimberly Veliz, City Recorder
Beth Wolf, Senior Systems Analyst
Andy Stone, IT Director
Philip Bradford, Associate Planner
Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director
Dan Pauly, Planning Manager

AGENDA ITEM	ACTIONS
WORK SESSION	START: 6:32 p.m.
A. None.	
REGULAR MEETING	
<u>Mayor's Business</u> None.	
<u>Communications</u> A. None.	
<u>Consent Agenda</u> A. None.	
<u>New Business</u> A. None.	
<u>Continuing Business</u> A. None.	
<u>Public Hearing</u> A. <u>Ordinance No. 847</u> An Ordinance Of The City Of Wilsonville Approving A Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment From Residential 0-1 Dwelling Units Per Acre To Residential 4-5 Dwelling Units Per Acre On Approximately 2.25 Acres Located At 28700 SW Canyon Creek Road South; The Land Is More Particularly Described As Tax Lot 6400, Section 13BD, Township 3 South, Range 1 West, Willamette Meridian, City Of Wilsonville, Clackamas County, Oregon. Scott Miller, Samm-Miller, LLC – Applicant For William Z. Spring – Owner.	After a public hearing was conducted, Ordinance No. 847 was approved on first reading by a vote of 3-0.

<p>B. <u>Ordinance No. 848</u> An Ordinance Of The City Of Wilsonville Approving A Zone Map Amendment From The Residential Agriculture-Holding (RA-H) Zone To The Planned Development Residential-3 (PDR-3) Zone On Approximately 2.25 Acres Located At 28700 SW Canyon Creek Road South; The Land Is More Particularly Described As Tax Lot 6400, Section 13BD, Township 3 South, Range 1 West, Willamette Meridian, City Of Wilsonville, Clackamas County, Oregon. Scott Miller, Samm-Miller, LLC – Applicant For William Z. Spring – Owner.</p>	<p>After a public hearing was conducted, Ordinance No. 848 was approved on first reading by a vote of 3-0.</p>
<p><u>City Manager’s Business</u></p>	<p>No report.</p>
<p><u>Legal Business</u></p>	<p>No report.</p>
<p>ADJOURN</p>	<p>8:16 p.m.</p>

City Council Meeting Action Minutes
June 7, 2021

City Council members present included:

Mayor Fitzgerald
Council President Akervall
Councilor Lehan
Councilor West
Councilor Linville

Kimberly Veliz, City Recorder
Jeanna Troha, Assistant City Manager
Beth Wolf, Senior Systems Analyst
Cathy Rodocker, Finance Director
Keith Katko, Assistant Finance Director
Andy Stone, IT Director
Jordan Vance, Economic Development Manager
Dan Pauly, Planning Manager
Zach Weigel, Capital Projects Engineering Manager

Staff present included:

Bryan Cosgrove, City Manager
Barbara Jacobson, City Attorney

AGENDA ITEM	ACTIONS
WORK SESSION	START: 5:00 p.m.
A. City Council Goals	Council discussed the goals brought forth in the retreat.
B. Middle Housing in Wilsonville Project	Staff and Council reviewed the draft Code and policy changes for the Middle Housing in Wilsonville project.
C. Twist Bioscience WIN Zone Development Agreement	Staff presented on URA Resolution No. 315, which authorizes a development agreement establishing the conditions of the Wilsonville Investment Now (WIN) program benefits with the Twist Bioscience Corporation.
D. Boeckman Dip Bridge Finance Plan	Due to time constraints this item was moved to the Communications portion of the Council meeting.
REGULAR MEETING	
<u>Mayor's Business</u>	
A. Juneteenth Proclamation	The Mayor read a proclamation declaring the 19 th day of June 2021 as "Celebration of Juneteenth in Wilsonville".
B. Appointments / Reappointments	<u>DRB Panel B - Appointment</u> Appointment of Katherine Dunwell to the Development Review Board Panel B for a term beginning 7/1/2021 to 12/31/2022. Passed 5-0.

<p>C. Upcoming Meetings</p>	<p><u>Library Board - Appointment</u> Appointment of Joseph Mallet to the Library Board for a term beginning 7/1/2021 to 6/30/2025. Passed 5-0.</p> <p><u>Tourism Promotion Committee - Reappointment</u> Reappointments of Brian Everest and Lizabeth Price to the Tourism Promotion Committee for a term beginning 7/1/2021 to 6/30/2024. Passed 5-0.</p> <p><u>Tourism Promotion Committee – Appointment – Unexpired Term</u> Appointment of Elaine Owen to the Tourism Promotion Committee, Position 3 for a term beginning 7/1/2021 to 6/30/2023. Passed 5-0.</p> <p><u>Tourism Promotion Committee - Appointment</u> Appointment of Jennifer Gage to the Tourism Promotion Committee, Position 5 for a term beginning 7/1/2021 to 6/30/2024. Passed 5-0.</p> <p><u>Wilsonville-Metro Community Enhancement Committee - Reappointment</u> Reappointments of Amy Day and Jordan Snyder to the Wilsonville-Metro Community Enhancement Committee for a term beginning 7/1/2021 to 6/30/2024. Passed 5-0.</p> <p>Upcoming meetings were announced by the Mayor as well as the regional meetings she attended on behalf of the City.</p>
<p><u>Communications</u></p> <p>A. Wilsonville Community Sharing</p> <p>B. Boeckman Dip Bridge Finance Plan</p>	<p>Wilsonville Community Sharing updated Council on how City’s grant funding helps Wilsonville residents in need.</p> <p>Staff provided a proposed financing plan for the Boeckman Dip Bridge project.</p>
<p><u>Consent Agenda</u></p> <p>A. <u>Resolution No. 2900</u> A Resolution Of The City Of Wilsonville Authorizing Support Grant Agreement With Wilsonville Community Sharing.</p> <p>B. Minutes of the May 17, 2021 City Council Meeting.</p>	<p>The Consent Agenda was approved 5-0.</p>

<p><u>New Business</u></p> <p>A. City Council Goals</p>	<p>Council Goals were held over for the June 21, 2021 City Council meeting.</p>
<p><u>Continuing Business</u></p> <p>A. <u>Ordinance No. 847</u> An Ordinance Of The City Of Wilsonville Approving A Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment From Residential 0-1 Dwelling Units Per Acre To Residential 4-5 Dwelling Units Per Acre On Approximately 2.25 Acres Located At 28700 SW Canyon Creek Road South; The Land Is More Particularly Described As Tax Lot 6400, Section 13BD, Township 3 South, Range 1 West, Willamette Meridian, City Of Wilsonville, Clackamas County, Oregon. Scott Miller, Samm-Miller, LLC – Applicant For William Z. Spring – Owner.</p> <p>B. <u>Ordinance No. 848</u> An Ordinance Of The City Of Wilsonville Approving A Zone Map Amendment From The Residential Agriculture-Holding (RA-H) Zone To The Planned Development Residential-3 (PDR-3) Zone On Approximately 2.25 Acres Located At 28700 SW Canyon Creek Road South; The Land Is More Particularly Described As Tax Lot 6400, Section 13BD, Township 3 South, Range 1 West, Willamette Meridian, City Of Wilsonville, Clackamas County, Oregon. Scott Miller, Samm-Miller, LLC – Applicant For William Z. Spring – Owner.</p>	<p>Ordinance No. 847 was adopted on second reading by a vote of 5-0.</p> <p>Ordinance No. 848 was adopted on second reading by a vote of 5-0.</p>
<p><u>Public Hearing</u></p> <p>A. <u>Resolution No. 2901</u> A Resolution Declaring The City’s Eligibility To Receive State Shared Revenues.</p> <p>B. <u>Resolution No. 2902</u> A Resolution Declaring The City’s Election To Receive State Shared Revenues.</p> <p>C. <u>Resolution No. 2903</u> A Resolution Of The City Of Wilsonville Adopting The Budget, Making Appropriations, Declaring The Ad Valorem Tax Levy, And Classifying The Levy As Provided By ORS 310.060(2) For Fiscal Year 2021-22.</p> <p>D. <u>Resolution No. 2904</u></p>	<p>After a public hearing was conducted, Resolution No. 2901 was approved 5-0.</p> <p>After a public hearing was conducted, Resolution No. 2901 was approved 5-0.</p> <p>After a public hearing was conducted, Resolution No. 2901 was approved 5-0.</p>

A Resolution Authorizing A Supplemental Budget Adjustment For Fiscal Year 2020-21.	After a public hearing was conducted, Resolution No. 2901 was approved 5-0.
<u>City Manager's Business</u>	Council authorized staff to waive the final year of lease payments owed to the City by the West Linn-Wilsonville School District.
<u>Legal Business</u>	Read a brief statement about the quasi-judicial/land use appeal process for Ordinance Nos. 847 and 848.
URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY	
<u>URA Consent Agenda</u> A. Minutes of the March 15, 2021 URA Meeting.	The URA Consent Agenda was approved 5-0.
<u>New Business</u> A. <u>URA Resolution No. 315</u> A Resolution Of The City Of Wilsonville Urban Renewal Agency Authorizing A Development Agreement Establishing The Conditions Of The Wilsonville Investment Now (WIN) Program Benefits Between The Urban Renewal Agency Of The City Of Wilsonville And Twist Bioscience Corporation.	URA Resolution No. 315 was approved 5-0.
<u>Continuing Business</u>	None.
<u>URA Public Hearing</u> A. <u>URA Resolution No. 317</u> A Resolution Of The Urban Renewal Agency Of The City Of Wilsonville Adopting The Budget, Making Appropriations, And Declaring The Intent To Collect Tax Increment For Fiscal Year 2021-22.	After a public hearing was conducted, URA Resolution No. 317 was approved 5-0.
ADJOURN	9:17 p.m.

City Council Meeting Action Minutes
June 21, 2021

City Council members present included:

Mayor Fitzgerald
Council President Akervall
Councilor Lehan
Councilor West
Councilor Linville

Beth Wolf, Senior Systems Analyst
Andrea Villagrana, Human Resource Manager
Kim Rybold, Senior Planner
Chris Neamtzu, Community Development Director
Philip Bradford, Associate Planner
Cindy Luxhoj, Associate Planner
Jordan Vance, Economic and Development Manager
Andy Stone, IT Director
Dan Pauly, Planning Manager

Staff present included:

Bryan Cosgrove, City Manager
Barbara Jacobson, City Attorney
Kimberly Veliz, City Recorder
Jeanna Troha, Assistant City Manager

AGENDA ITEM	ACTIONS
WORK SESSION	START: 5:04 p.m.
A. Town Center Streetscape Plan	The project team provided an update on the Town Center Streetscape project and shared proposed street design elements included within the first draft of the Streetscape Plan.
B. Amending the City’s Fee Schedule for Wireless Communication Facilities	Staff informed Council of Resolution No. 2905, which approves an amendment to the City’s fee schedule adding a wireless communication facilities section.
C. Presentation by Bird Scooters	A representative from Bird provided an overview of how the system works.
D. Twist Bioscience Wilsonville Investment Now Zone URA Implementation	Council heard a presentation on URA Resolution No. 318, which authorizes staff to take necessary steps to create a single-property Urban Renewal Area for economic development purposes to be called the Twist Bioscience WIN Zone.
REGULAR MEETING	
<u>Mayor’s Business</u>	
A. Upcoming Meetings	Upcoming meetings were announced by the Mayor as well as the regional meetings she attended on behalf of the City.

<p>B. Wilsonville-Metro Community Enhancement Committee Appointments</p> <p>C. Council Goals</p>	<p><u>Wilsonville-Metro Community Enhancement Committee - Appointment</u> Appointments of Natasha Hancock and Sageera Oravil Abdulla Koya to the Wilsonville-Metro Community Enhancement Committee for a term beginning 7/1/2021 to 6/30/2023. Passed 5-0.</p> <p>Council made a motion to approve the 2021 – 2023 City Council Goals. Passed 5-0.</p>
<p><u>Communications</u></p> <p>A. Patriotic Employer Award.</p>	<p>The Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve (ESGR) representatives presented City Manager and City Attorney with the Patriot Award.</p>
<p><u>Consent Agenda</u></p> <p>A. Minutes of the May 26, 2021 and June 7, 2021 Council Meetings.</p>	<p>The Consent Agenda was approved 5-0.</p>
<p><u>New Business</u></p> <p>A. <u>Resolution No. 2905</u> A Resolution Of The City Of Wilsonville Approving An Amendment To The City’s Fee Schedule Adding A Wireless Communication Facilities Section To Include Planning Application Review Fees, Technical Design Review Fees, And An Appeal Of Decision Fee.</p> <p>B. <u>Resolution No. 2906</u> Service Employees International Union Local 503 Collective Bargaining Agreement.</p>	<p>Resolution No. 2905 was adopted 5-0.</p> <p>Resolution No. 2906 was adopted 5-0.</p>
<p><u>Continuing Business</u></p> <p>A. None.</p>	
<p><u>Public Hearing</u></p> <p>A. None.</p>	
<p><u>City Manager’s Business</u></p>	<p>Reminded the audience of the City Manager reports, which are created monthly and included in the City Council packet.</p> <p>Publicized the first DEI Committee meeting would be held July 13, 2021.</p> <p>Announced upcoming vacation plans.</p>

<u>Legal Business</u>	No report.
URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY	
<u>URA Consent Agenda</u> A. Minutes of the June 7, 2021 URA Meeting.	The URA Consent Agenda was approved 5-0.
<u>New Business</u> A. <u>URA Resolution No. 318</u> A Resolution Of The City Of Wilsonville Urban Renewal Agency Authorizing Staff To Take Necessary Steps To Create A Single-Property Urban Renewal Area For Economic Development Purposes To Be Called The Twist Bioscience Wilsonville Investment Now (WIN) Zone.	URA Resolution No. 318 was adopted 5-0.
<u>URA Continuing Business</u> A. None.	
<u>URA Public Hearing</u> A. None.	
ADJOURN	8:17 p.m.

City Council Meeting Action Minutes
July 19, 2021

City Council members present included:

Mayor Fitzgerald
Council President Akervall
Councilor Lehan
Councilor West
Councilor Linville – Work Session Only

Mike Nacrelli, Civil Engineer
Dan Pauly, Planning Manager
Martin Montalvo, Public Works Ops. Manager
Delora Kerber, Public Works Director
Keith Katko, Assistant Finance Director
Andy Stone, IT Director
Zoe Mombert, Assistant to the City Manager
Dwight Brashear, Transit Director
Eric Loomis, Transit Operations Manager
Chris Neamtzu, Community Development Director

Staff present included:

Bryan Cosgrove, City Manager
Barbara Jacobson, City Attorney
Kimberly Veliz, City Recorder
Jeanna Troha, Assistant City Manager
Beth Wolf, Senior Systems Analyst

AGENDA ITEM	ACTIONS
WORK SESSION	START: 5:03 p.m.
A. IGA with Sherwood to Share Costs of the Willamette River Water Treatment Plant Expansion Project	City Council was briefed on Resolution No. 2907, which authorizes an intergovernmental agreement with the City Of Sherwood to share costs of the Willamette River Water Treatment Plant Expansion Project
B. Bus on the Shoulder	Staff shared details of the Bus on Shoulder (BoS) pilot program, which is a partnership with the ODOT to allow SMART buses to and from Tualatin to drive on the shoulder of I-5 when traffic slows below 35 mph.
C. Middle Housing in Wilsonville Project	Staff reviewed materials with City Council for the Middle Housing in Wilsonville project relating to design standards and infrastructure impacts.
D. February 2021 Ice Storm After Action Report	Staff and Council discussed and reviewed the February 2021 Ice Storm After Action Report and subsequent recommendations.
REGULAR MEETING	
<u>Mayor’s Business</u> A. Upcoming Meetings	Upcoming meetings were announced by the Mayor as well as the regional meetings she attended on behalf of the City.

<p>B. <u>Resolution No. 2910</u> A Resolution Authorizing An Intergovernmental Agreement With The Urban Renewal Agency Of The City Of Wilsonville Pertaining To Short Term Subordinate Urban Renewal Debt For The West Side Plan District.</p> <p>C. <u>Resolution No. 2911</u> A Resolution Of The City Of Wilsonville Supporting A 2021-23 Planning Assistance Direct Grant Application To The Oregon Department Of Land Conservation And Development For The 2023 Wilsonville Housing Needs Analysis.</p> <p>D. <u>Resolution No. 2912</u> A Resolution Of The City Of Wilsonville Supporting A 2021-23 Planning Assistance Direct Grant Application To The Oregon Department Of Land Conservation And Development For Additional Funding Of Housing Affordability Components Of The Frog Pond East And South Master Plan.</p>	<p>Resolution No. 2910 was adopted 4-0.</p> <p>Resolution No. 2911 was adopted 4-0.</p> <p>Resolution No. 2912 was adopted 4-0.</p>
<p><u>Continuing Business</u> A. None.</p>	
<p><u>Public Hearing</u> A. None.</p>	
<p><u>City Manager’s Business</u></p>	<p>No report.</p>
<p><u>Legal Business</u></p>	<p>No report.</p>
<p>URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY</p>	
<p><u>URA Consent Agenda</u> A. Minutes of the June 21, 2021 URA Meeting</p>	<p>The URA Consent Agenda was approved 4-0.</p>
<p><u>URA Continuing Business</u> A. None.</p>	
<p><u>URA Public Hearing</u> A. None.</p>	
<p><u>New Business</u> A. <u>URA Resolution No. 319</u> A Resolution Authorizing An Intergovernmental Agreement With The City Of Wilsonville Pertaining To Short Term Subordinate Urban Renewal Debt For The Year 2000 Plan District For The Purpose Of Funding The Construction Of Capital Improvement Project By The Agency.</p>	<p>URA Resolution No. 319 was adopted 4-0.</p>

<p>B. <u>URA Resolution No. 320</u> A Resolution Authorizing An Intergovernmental Agreement With The City Of Wilsonville Pertaining To Short Term Subordinate Urban Renewal Debt For The West Side Plan District For The Purpose Of Funding The Construction Of Capital Improvement Project By The Agency.</p>	<p>URA Resolution No. 320 was adopted 4-0.</p>
<p>ADJOURN</p>	<p>8:33 p.m.</p>

City Council Meeting Action Minutes
August 2, 2021

City Council members present included:

Mayor Fitzgerald
Council President Akervall
Councilor Lehan
Councilor West - Excused
Councilor Linville

Beth Wolf, Senior Systems Analyst
Kim Rybold, Senior Planner
Andy Stone, IT Director
Zoe Mombert, Assistant to the City Manager
Dominique Huffman, PE, Civil Engineer
Nancy Kraushaar, PE, Civil Engineer
Andrea Villagrana, Human Resource Manager
Chelsea Sabella, Law Clerk
Zach Weigel, Capital Projects Engineering Manager
Miranda Bateschell, Planning Director
Chelsea Sabella, Law Clerk

Staff present included:

Bryan Cosgrove, City Manager
Barbara Jacobson, City Attorney
Kimberly Veliz, City Recorder
Jeanna Troha, Assistant City Manager

AGENDA ITEM	ACTIONS
WORK SESSION	START: 5:00 p.m.
A. Vertical Housing Development Zones	Staff shared research on implementation of Vertical Housing Development Zones and sought Council direction on implementation in the Villebois Village Center and Town Center.
B. PDB Alternative Contracting Method for the Boeckman Road Corridor Project	Council heard a presentation on Resolution No. 2916. The resolution authorizes the use of a Progressive Design Build (PDB) alternative contracting method for the Boeckman Road Corridor Project.
C. Community Enhancement Program Recommendations	Staff presented on Resolution No. 2920, which allocates the second round of Community Enhancement funds for FY 2021/2022.
REGULAR MEETING	
<u>Mayor's Business</u>	
A. Citizens Academy Graduation	Signs were awarded to the graduates of the 2021 Citizens Academy.
B. City Manager Employment Agreement	City Council moved to approve the extension of Bryan Cosgrove's employment agreement as City Manager from June 20, 2011 to June 19, 2025, as outlined in the employment agreement. Motion passed 4-0.

C. Upcoming Meetings	Upcoming meetings were announced by the Mayor as well as the regional meetings she attended on behalf of the City.
<u>Communications</u> A. Student Advocacy and Voices	Miss Oregon Teen USA presented on her platform, which is to support Oregon youth struggling with mental health challenges.
<u>Consent Agenda</u> A. Minutes of the July 19, 2021 Council Meeting.	The Consent Agenda was approved 4-0.
<u>New Business</u> A. <u>Resolution No. 2920</u> A Resolution To Allocate The Second Round Of Community Enhancement Funds For Fiscal Year 2021/2022.	The Resolution No. 2920 was approved 3-0-1.
<u>Continuing Business</u> A. None.	
<u>Public Hearing</u> A. <u>Resolution No. 2916</u> A Resolution Of The City Of Wilsonville Authorizing The Use Of A Progressive Design Build (PDB) Alternative Contracting Method For The Boeckman Road Corridor Project (Capital Improvement Projects 4212, 4206, 4205, 2102).	After a public hearing was conducted, Resolution No. 2916 was approved 4-0.
<u>City Manager's Business</u>	The City Manager updated Council on the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Night Out • Employee Picnic • Community Block Party • Eviction Moratorium • Masking • American Rescue Plan Act Funds • Bridge Landing Property
<u>Legal Business</u>	The City Attorney provided an update that the contractor hired by Fry's was scheduled to clean up their lot that week.
ADJOURN	9:04 p.m.

City Council Meeting Action Minutes
August 16, 2021

City Council members present included:

Mayor Fitzgerald
Council President Akervall - Excused
Councilor Lehan
Councilor West
Councilor Linville

Beth Wolf, Senior Systems Analyst
Andy Stone, IT Director
Zoe Mombert, Assistant to the City Manager
Dwight Brashear, Transit Director
Scott Simonton, Fleet Services Manager
Zach Weigel, Capital Projects Engineering Manager
Chris Neamtzu, Community Development Director
Martin Montalvo, Public Works Ops. Manager
Dan Pauly, Planning Manager
Mike Nacrelli, Civil Engineer
Mark Ottenad, Public/Government Affairs Director
Delora Kerber, Public Works Director

Staff present included:

Bryan Cosgrove, City Manager
Barbara Jacobson, City Attorney
Kimberly Veliz, City Recorder
Jeanna Troha, Assistant City Manager

AGENDA ITEM	ACTIONS
WORK SESSION	START: 5:01 p.m.
A. I-5 Pedestrian Bridge and Gateway Plaza Project Update	Staff provided an update on the progress of the I-5 Pedestrian Bridge and Gateway Plaza design and shared initial recommendations for design elements, including lighting, seating, walls, and landscape materials.
B. Middle Housing in Wilsonville Project	Staff reviewed with Council the materials for the Middle Housing in Wilsonville project relating to driveway design and parking.
C. City Hall Water Leak Repairs	Staff shared costs estimates to mitigate effects of a recent City Hall water leak, and detailed plans to make customer service and safety improvements within public lobby areas in conjunction with the repair work.
D. Twist Bioscience WIN Zone Adoption	Council was briefed on Ordinance No. 849, which makes certain determinations and findings relating to and approving a single-property urban renewal plan for economic development purposes known as the Twist Bioscience Wilsonville Investment Now (WIN) Zone.
E. NW Natural Gas Installation of High Pressure Fueling Equipment	Council was informed of Resolution No. 2918, which authorizes SMART to enter into an agreement with NW Natural Gas, to provide high-pressure gas service at 28879 SW Boberg Road.

REGULAR MEETING	
<u>Mayor's Business</u> A. Upcoming Meetings B. Kitakata Sister City Advisory Board Appointments	Upcoming meetings were announced by the Mayor as well as the regional meetings she attended on behalf of the City. Appointment of Kevin Stewart to the Kitakata Sister City Advisory Board for a term beginning 8/16/2021 to 12/31/2021. Approved 4-0. Appointment of Sruthy Menon to the Kitakata Sister City Advisory Board for a term beginning 8/16/2021 to 12/31/2023. Approved 4-0.
<u>Communications</u> A. 2021 State Legislative Session Report.	Council heard a summary of the most recent State legislative session and its impacts on Wilsonville.
<u>Consent Agenda</u> A. <u>Resolution No. 2917</u> A Resolution Of The City Of Wilsonville Authorizing The City Manager To Execute A Construction Manager/General Contractor (CM/GC) Contract With Kiewit Infrastructure West Co. To Provide Preconstruction Services For The Willamette River Water Treatment Plant Expansion Project (Capital Improvement Project #1144). B. <u>Resolution No. 2918</u> A Resolution Authorizing SMART (South Metro Area Regional Transit) To Enter Into An Agreement With NW Natural Gas, To Provide High Pressure Gas Service At 28879 SW Boberg Road. C. <u>Resolution No. 2923</u> A Resolution Of The City Of Wilsonville Authorizing The Sole Source Selection Of Friends Of Trees For FY 2021-22. D. Minutes of the August 2, 2021 City Council Meeting.	The Consent Agenda was approved 4-0.
<u>New Business</u> A. None.	
<u>Continuing Business</u> A. None.	

<p><u>Public Hearing</u></p> <p>A. <u>Ordinance No. 849</u> An Ordinance Of The City Of Wilsonville Making Certain Determinations And Findings Relating To And Approving A Single-Property Urban Renewal Plan For Economic Development Purposes Known As The Twist Bioscience Wilsonville Investment Now (WIN) Zone.</p>	<p>After a public hearing was conducted, Ordinance No. 849 was approved on first reading by a vote of 4-0.</p>
<p><u>City Manager's Business</u></p>	<p>It was determined Council would return to Zoom meetings as long as the indoor mask mandate was required.</p> <p>Council was reminded August 26, 2021 is the Community Block Party and Women's Suffrage Day.</p>
<p><u>Legal Business</u></p>	<p>No report.</p>
<p>ADJOURN</p>	<p>8:56 p.m.</p>

City Council Meeting Action Minutes
September 9, 2021

City Council members present included:

Mayor Fitzgerald
Council President Akervall
Councilor Lehan
Councilor West
Councilor Linville – Arrived at 5:04 p.m.

Kimberly Veliz, City Recorder
Jeanna Troha, Assistant City Manager
Beth Wolf, Senior Systems Analyst
Andy Stone, IT Director
Kimberly Rybold, Senior Planner
Delora Kerber, Public Works Director
Mark Ottenad, Public/Government Affairs Director
Zoe Mombert, Assistant to the City Manager
Dwight Brashear, Transit Director
Andrea Villagrana, Human Resource Manager

Staff present included:

Bryan Cosgrove, City Manager
Barbara Jacobson, City Attorney

AGENDA ITEM	ACTIONS
WORK SESSION	START: 5:00 p.m.
A. Wilsonville Transit Center Transit-Oriented Development	Staff shared an assessment of existing conditions and gathered input on project vision and goals for transit-oriented development at the Transit Center.
B. ODOT Presentation on I-5/I-205 Tolling and Congestion Management and I-5 Boone Bridge Project	Council heard an update on the status of regional transportation projects, including the Regional Mobility Pricing Project, a plan to implement tolling and congestion pricing on I-5 and I-205.
C. Redistricting for Congressional Districts and State Legislative Districts	Due to time constraints, this item was moved to the regular meeting.
REGULAR MEETING	
<u>Mayor's Business</u>	
A. Redistricting for Congressional Districts and State Legislative Districts	Council shared their preferences for the draft proposals for redistricting maps for Congressional and state legislative districts.
B. Upcoming Meetings	Upcoming meetings were announced by the Mayor as well as the regional meetings she attended on behalf of the City.
<u>Communications</u>	
A. Wilsonville Boones Ferry Historical Society CEP Report	Wilsonville Boones Ferry Historical Society delivered a report summarizing recent work funded by a Community Enhancement Program grant for archiving of historical artifacts.

B. PGE Outage Discussion	PGE summarized causes and impacts of February's ice storm and discussed actions being taken to develop a more resilient electrical grid for future outages.
<u>Consent Agenda</u> A. Minutes of the August 16, 2021 Council Meeting.	The Consent Agenda was approved 5-0.
<u>New Business</u> A. <u>Resolution No. 2922</u> A Resolution Adopting Collective Bargaining Agreement Between The City Of Wilsonville And Wilsonville Municipal Employees Association.	Resolution No. 2922 was adopted 5-0.
<u>Continuing Business</u> A. <u>Ordinance No. 849</u> An Ordinance Of The City Of Wilsonville Making Certain Determinations And Findings Relating To And Approving A Single-Property Urban Renewal Plan For Economic Development Purposes Known As The Twist Bioscience Wilsonville Investment Now (WIN) Zone.	Ordinance No. 849 was adopted on second reading by a vote of 5-0.
<u>Public Hearing</u> A. None.	
<u>City Manager's Business</u>	Reported that the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) fund discussion would occur at the next Work Session.
<u>Legal Business</u>	No report.
ADJOURN	9:12 p.m.

City Council Meeting Action Minutes
September 20, 2021

City Council members present included:

Mayor Fitzgerald
Council President Akervall
Councilor Lehan – Arrived at 5:07 p.m.
Councilor West
Councilor Linville

Kimberly Veliz, City Recorder
Jeanna Troha, Assistant City Manager
Martin Montalvo, Public Works Ops. Manager
Zach Weigel, Capital Projects Engineering Manager
Dan Pauly, Planning Manager
Delora Kerber, Public Works Director
Dustin Schull, Parks Supervisor
Chris Neamtzu, Community Development Director
Zoe Mombert, Assistant to the City Manager

Staff present included:

Bryan Cosgrove, City Manager
Barbara Jacobson, City Attorney

AGENDA ITEM	ACTIONS
WORK SESSION	START: 5:07 p.m.
A. Replacement of Central Memorial Park Restroom	Staff informed City Council of Resolution No. 2921, which approves a construction contract with Romtec, Inc. for the Memorial Park central restroom construction project.
B. Purchase of a 5-yard Combination Cleaning Truck	City Council heard about Resolution No. 2924, which authorizes staff to purchase a 5-yard combination cleaning truck from McCoy Freightliner.
C. Willamette Water Supply Project Overview	The Council was updated on the Willamette Water Supply Program (WWSP) and informed about the first amendment to the ground lease agreement.
D. Middle Housing in Wilsonville Project	Staff discussed details of the Middle Housing in Wilsonville Project, which is scheduled for City Council consideration for adoption and a public hearing on October 4, 2021.
REGULAR MEETING	
<u>Mayor's Business</u>	
A. Upcoming Meetings	Upcoming meetings were announced by the Mayor as well as the regional meetings she attended on behalf of the City.
B. State of the City Address	The State of the City video was viewed by City Council.

<u>Communications</u> A. None.	
<u>Consent Agenda</u> A. <u>Resolution No. 2919</u> A Resolution Of The City Of Wilsonville Authorizing The City Manager To Enter Into First Amendment To Ground Lease For Raw Water Pipeline With The Willamette Water Supply System Commission. B. <u>Resolution No. 2921</u> A Resolution Of The City Of Wilsonville Approving A Construction Contract With Romtec, Inc. For The Memorial Park Central Restroom Construction Project. C. <u>Resolution No. 2924</u> A Resolution Authorizing City Staff To Purchase A 5-Yard Combination Cleaning Truck From McCoy Freightliner Of Portland. D. <u>Resolution No. 2927</u> A Resolution Of The City Of Wilsonville Adding Kimberly Graves To The City's Established Pool Of Eligible Pro Tem Judges For The City's Municipal Court. E. Minutes of the September 9, 2021 City Council meeting.	The Consent Agenda was approved 5-0.
<u>New Business</u> A. None.	
<u>Continuing Business</u> A. None.	
<u>Public Hearing</u> A. None.	
<u>City Manager's Business</u>	City Manager Cosgrove shared he attended the Walnut Grove Dedication where he learned many facts about walnuts.
<u>Legal Business</u>	No report.
ADJOURN	7:37 p.m.