

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

**Development Review Board – Panel A
Minutes–June 13, 2016 6:30 PM**

Approved
July 11, 2016

I. Call to Order

Chair Mary Fierros Bower called the meeting to order at 6:30 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: Mary Fierros Bower, Kristin Akervall, James Frinell, Ronald Heberlein, Fred Ruby and City Council Liaison Julie Fitzgerald

Staff present: Barbara Jacobson, Daniel Pauly and Jennifer Scola

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. City Council Liaison Report

Councilor Fitzgerald highlighted City Council’s recent activities:

- The City, along with several other cities, successfully participated in an emergency exercise in preparation for a large scale earthquake.
- Council discussed the Water Treatment Master Plan Update regarding projections of increased use over time and the best way to maintain high water quality.
- The budget committee processes had concluded with approval of the budget by the committee. The budget will move on to City Council.
- The Council continued work on the Basalt Creek Plan, working on land use in the area and the best way to manage traffic flow. She referred board members to the Planning Department for more information.
- The City was just awarded a Walk Friendly Communities bronze level designation. The City was one of 7 cities across the country awarded that designation.

VI. Consent Agenda:

- A.** Approval of minutes of May 9, 2016 DRB Panel A meeting

Chair Fierros Bower noted that she was not present at the May 9 meeting.

Ronald Heberlein moved to approve the May 9, 2016 DRB Panel A meeting minutes as amended to show that Chair Fierros Bower was not present at the May 9 meeting. Fred Ruby seconded the motion, which passed 4 to 0 to 1 with Mary Fierros Bower abstaining.

VII. Public Hearing:

- A. Resolution No. 328. 8855 SW Holly Lane Monument Sign: Two G’s Real Estate – Owner/Applicant.** The applicant is requesting approval of a Class 3 Sign Permit for a new multi-tenant monument sign at 8855 SW Holly Lane. The site is located on Tax Lot 303, Section 23AA, T3S, R1W, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Jennifer Scola.

Chair Fierros Bower called the public hearing to order at 6:39 p.m. and read the conduct of hearing format into the record. All Board members except James Frinell 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.

Jennifer Scola, Assistant Planner, announced that the criteria applicable to the application were stated on page 1 and 2 of the Staff report, which was entered into the record. Copies of the report were made available to the side of the room.

Ms. Scola presented the Staff report via PowerPoint, briefly reviewing the site's history and noting the project's location and surrounding features, with these key comments:

- When approved in 1979, the complex known as the Crown Building was built for a single tenant, but has since become a multi-tenant complex that has outgrown its current monument sign.
- While the Code would ordinarily allow staff to process a monument sign as a Class 2 review, with the proposed sign being over 8 feet in height and in a new location, it was being reviewed through a Class 3 process.
- The proposed replacement sign was overall shorter and smaller in area than the current sign.
- The current wooden monument sign was 11 feet in height and 5 feet in width and located in a landscaped area adjacent to Parkway Avenue. Since the monument sign was initially designed for far fewer tenants than what now existed, the applicant was encountering difficulty ensuring that all tenants on site had visibility from the right of way.
- There were currently 34 units. While some of those units were not in use, the sign was still limiting for providing adequate signage for everyone on site thus prompting the application.
- The property was zoned Planned Development Commercial and allowed a monument sign up to 20 feet in height, but the proposal was only for 10 feet in height.
- Additionally, buildings in the PDC zone were permitted 32 square feet plus an additional 3 square feet per tenant space under 1,000 square feet. The number in tenants in the complex meant that the subject site was permitted a sign up to 134 square feet total. The applicant was only proposing 55 square feet in area.
- Overall the proposed sign would be 10 feet in height by 5 feet 6 inches in width with 32 individual cells for signage for each individual tenant and have a masonry base, metal dividers and changeable signs for the tenants.
- In working with the applicant to determine a final location for the monument sign, the Engineering Division noted a 15 inch storm line that ran through the landscape area adjacent Parkway Avenue. Both the current and the proposed replacement monument signs were shown to be located within the prescriptive easement of the storm line which was buried at least 20 feet deep. Engineering had approved the location of the proposed sign, which allowed it to encroach within the 2 foot setback of the storm line although in a more northern location along the west property line.
- The proposed sign had been designed with a removable metal frame so that the City could easily access the storm line in the future.

While Engineering had approved the new location, Staff proposed a modified condition as noted in a Planning Division memo that had been circulated to the Board. The modified condition would ensure a proper easement agreement was reached prior to the construction of the subject sign. The modified condition PD 5 would read as followed:

“The Applicant/Owner shall ensure that the approved sign is installed outside of all City Easements, particularly pipeline easements, unless appropriate agreement is reached between the Applicant/Owner and the City.”

Kristin Akervall had two questions:

- 1) If there were 34 tenants, why were there only 32 spots on the sign?
- 2) Thirty two small sections on the sign seemed like a lot of reading to do while driving by. Would there be a place on the sign for the street address?

Ms. Scola said that the Code required that the site address be on the sign, unless explicitly waived by the fire department. Planning Condition PD2 required the actual building address on the sign. The individual signs would show the individual tenant space and address on them.

Ms. Akervall asked if they would be large enough to read.

The Board decided to let the Applicant answer that question.

Ms. Scola noted that, as far as the individual tenant spaces were concerned, there were some spaces that were not filled and some tenants that took up multiple spaces.

Chair Fierros Bower asked if there were any other questions for staff. Seeing none, she called the Applicant forward to present testimony.

Russ Goddard, Property Manager for Two G’s Real Estate noted that the sign would say “Crown Building – 8855 Holly Lane” in 6 inch letters at the top of the sign. He confirmed that Ms. Scola was right that several tenants occupied two or more spaces and that some tenants did not want signs at all. At the Tigard location tenants were allowed to do their own logos, which resulted in confusion. This time, signs would be in Times New Roman Bold, their name and suite number with no logos or fancy pictures of birds or things like that. It would make them easier to read. He had turned down multiple requests for A-frame signs, flags, banners, etc. He wanted to keep it simple to avoid confusion.

Ms. Akervall confirmed that the sign would look like the example provided and say “Crown Building” with the address below.

Mr. Goddard confirmed that top two spaces on both sides of the sign would say “8855 Holly Lane.”

Chair Fierros Bower called for public testimony in favor of, opposed and neutral to the application. Seeing none, she closed the public hearing at 6:53 pm.

James Frinell moved to approve Resolution No. 328 and the staff report as amended with condition PD5 as presented in the memorandum. The motion was seconded by Ronald Heberlein and passed unanimously.

Chair Fierros Bower read the rules of appeal into the record.

VIII. Board Member Communications: There were none.

IX. Staff Communications:

Daniel Pauly updated the Board on the Republic Services/SORT Bioenergy application, which was approved by City Council on first reading.

X. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Shelley White, Planning Administrative Assistant