

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

**Development Review Board – Panel A  
Minutes–April 11, 2016 6:30 PM**

<p><b>Approved</b> May 9, 2016</p>
--

**I. Call to Order**

**Chair Mary Fierros Bower** called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm.

**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, and Fred Ruby. City Council Liaison Julie Fitzgerald was absent.

Staff present: Chris Neamtzu, Barbara Jacobson, Daniel Pauly, Steve Adams, and Connie Randall

**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**

No City Council liaison report was provided due to Councilor Fitzgerald’s absence.

**VI. Welcome New DRB Member Fred Ruby!**

**Chair Fierros Bower** welcomed Mr. Ruby as a new member of the DRB.

**Fred Ruby** noted that attending the prior DRB-Panel A meeting had been helpful. He explained that he had recently moved to Wilsonville, having retired from being an attorney, and he looked forward to being a member of the DRB.

**VII. Election of 2016 Chair and Vice-Chair:**

- Chair

**James Frinell** nominated **Mary Fierros Bower** as the 2016 Development Review Board Panel A Chair. **Ronald Heberlein** seconded the nomination.

There were no further nominations.

**Mary Fierros Bower** was unanimously elected as the 2016 Development Review Board Panel A Chair.

- Vice-Chair

**James Frinell** nominated **Kristin Akervall** as the 2016 Development Review Board Panel A Vice Chair. **Mary Fierros Bower** seconded the nomination.

There were no further nominations.

**Kirstin Akervall** was unanimously elected as the 2016 Development Review Board Panel A Vice Chair.

**VIII. Consent Agenda:**

- A. Approval of minutes of February 8, 2016 DRB Panel A meeting

**Chair Fierros Bower** noted that Lenka Keith was incorrectly shown as present.

**Ron Heberlein moved to approve the February 8, 2016 DRB Panel A meeting minutes as corrected. James Frinell seconded the motion, which passed 4 to 0 to 1 with Fred Ruby abstaining.**

**IX. Public Hearing:**

- A. Resolution No. 325. Coca Cola Warehouse Expansion: Coca Cola Refreshments – Owner. Monte Pershall, Trecore Construction Management LLC - Applicant.** The applicant is requesting approval of Stage I Preliminary Plan Revision, a Stage II Final Plan Revision and Site Design Review for a 35,120 Sq Ft warehouse addition, new automobile and bicycle parking spaces, landscaping and upgraded exterior lighting. The site is located at 9750 SW Barber Street on Tax Lot 103 of Section 14C, Township 3 South, Range 1 West, Willamette Meridian, City of Wilsonville, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Connie Randall.

Case Files: DB16-0001 – Stage I Preliminary Plan Revision  
DB16-0002 – Stage II Final Plan Revision  
DB16-0003 – Site Design Review

**Chair Fierros Bower** called the public hearing to order at 6:37 p.m. and 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.

**Connie Randall, 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.

**Ms. Randall** presented the Staff report via PowerPoint, noting the site's history location and describing the proposed requests with these key comments:

- Public notice was provided in accordance with the City's Planning and Land Development Ordinance on March 22, 2016. To date, Staff had received no public comments on the proposal. Agency comments were addressed in the Staff report and included as Exhibits C1 through C4.
- The subject 26.2-acre property was designated for industrial development on the Comprehensive Plan and zoned for Planned Development Industrial (PDI). Slide 4 Properties immediately surrounding the site were similarly zoned PDI.
- Stage I Preliminary Plan Revision. A master plan was originally approved for the Coca-Cola bottling and warehouse facility in 1986, modified in 1987, and again in 2008 which resulted in today's existing 305,915 sq ft facility and represented by Phases 1, 2, and 3 on Slide 6.
  - The current proposal, Phase IV, would expand the facility by adding 35,120 sq ft of warehouse space at the southern end of the facility. The proposed addition represented an 11.5 percent increase in total building square footage. Warehousing was a permitted use in the PDI Zone.
  - No modifications were proposed to any access points and no new access points were proposed to the site. Per the Preliminary Plan approval, there were currently three existing unrestricted access points from Barber St, shown in green; two controlled access points from Kinsman Rd and two controlled internal access points shown in orange; and one controlled pedestrian access point from Kinsman Rd that also served an employee parking lot, shown in yellow. (Slide 8)
- The Stage II Final Plan revisions included expansion of the warehouse, new fire access, new automobile, truck, and bicycle parking, and landscaping. The Stage II Final Plan revisions were consistent with the Stage I Preliminary Plan Revisions.
  - The community development director approved the waiver requested to the traffic impact analysis, noting the proposed development was expected to general minimal traffic, approximately six new trips.

- The warehouse expansion would extend the current warehouse building farther south on the site. All activity would be conducted indoors with the exception of loading and unloading activities at the loading dock.
- No outdoor storage was proposed with the request.
- A pedestrian access to the warehouse addition would be provided internally through the existing buildings to minimize any pedestrian/truck conflicts.
- The new fire access route would connect around the expansion and provide access to all sides of the building, shown in purple. (Slide 12)
- A portion of the existing drive aisle would be restriped for truck parking (Slide 13) and new automobile parking spaces would be added to the existing Lots 1 and 3 on the north end of the site near the building's main entrance. Associated parking lot landscaping was also proposed and would be discussed in more detail with the Site Development Review.
- Bicycle parking was also proposed adjacent to the primary entrance.
- Site Design Review. The site was designed typical of an industrial development and, as discussed in the Staff report, the proposed project appeared to meet the site design criteria. She highlighted how the proposal met those criteria with these comments:
  - Of the proposed Phase IV addition, 60 percent would be located on existing pavement with 40 percent extending into existing grass turf in the landscaped area.
    - The fire department access, shown in purple (Slide 18) would also be located on an existing grass turf area. No shrubs or trees were proposed for removal with the addition and the existing perimeter landscaping would remain intact.
    - While a portion of the existing landscape area would be removed, 28.6 percent of the site would still remain landscaped, exceeding the required 15 percent.
  - A new field of truck parking would be provided adjacent to the building, south of the proposed loading docks. Additionally, the existing truck parking located across the drive aisle was proposed to be restriped with angled parking to facilitate that movement.
  - As mentioned, automobile and bicycle parking would be provided to the north end of the site. Ten new parking spaces would be added to Parking Lot 3 near the main facility entrance.
  - A new parking island, new landscaping and trees were proposed, as well as new grass turf area. The proposed landscape materials and quantities were consistent with Code requirements.
    - Staff recommended Conditions PDC 2 through PDC 7 to ensure that landscaping installation was completed in accordance with the plans as may be approved by the Development Review Board tonight and in a manner consistent with City Code.
  - A new concrete pad and bicycle rack was proposed adjacent to the primary building entrance. The bicycle parking area was designed in accordance with City Code requirements.
    - Two additional car spaces were proposed in the northeast corner of the site, and a small landscaped strip was proposed between the parking area and site wall. (Slides 20 and 21)
  - She explained that the existing building was a mix of prefinished metal siding and tilt-up concrete with a maximum building height of 38 ft and the proposed building addition was designed to match both the existing materials and height of the buildings on site.
  - The proposed addition, combined with the prior facility expansion in 2008, triggered site wide compliance with the City's Outdoor Lighting Code requirements.
    - The Applicant proposed replacing all exterior site lighting with fully-shielded light fixtures (Slide 26) and the exterior site lighting would comply with the performance method outlined in the City's Code.
    - Staff recommended Condition PCD 8 to ensure that all pole-lighting height did not exceed 40-ft as outlined in the Code.
- Based on the findings of fact and information presented tonight and in the Staff report, Staff recommended approval of DB16-0001 through DB16-0003 with the conditions included in the Staff report.

**Chair Fierros Bower** confirmed that no additional mechanical equipment was proposed on the new expansion.

**Ron Heberlein** noted the requested waiver for the traffic impact analysis and that the proposed new expansion was estimated to generate six new PM Peak Trips and asked what the current PM Peak Trips were for the existing facility.

**Steve Adams, Development Engineering Manager**, said he would check his files and return with an answer, noting he had based the subject report on the data from an expansion Coca-Cola had done in 2008 or 2009.

**Kristin Akervall** noted it appeared that the last traffic study was conducted in 2007. She asked if any metrics existed to look at whether the data from 2007 was still highly applicable to the streets and surrounding areas because those streets had changed a lot in nine years.

**Mr. Adams** responded that street traffic had picked up on Wilsonville Rd and Kinsman Rd since 2007, especially now that Barber St was open. The 2007 traffic study had considered how big the operation was, and in this case, Staff looked at the predicted increase in traffic. During the 2008 construction, only the warehouse, which was used to store goods, was expanded, not the office space and all the staffing stayed the same, so the predicted amount of trips was low. The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) predicted a certain amount of traffic for a warehouse, using a certain percentage of the building for office, and many vehicle trips were associated with office space.

- The subject expansion was similar; no office staff was being added, so Staff believed the impact to city streets would be about the same, which would only be about six trips and he did not believe any additional traffic impacts would be triggered.
- He confirmed that an expansion of .17 trips per 1,000 sq ft of building had been determined in 2007, and he had multiplied that same ratio of trips by the 32,000 sq ft planned addition, which resulted in the six additional trips.

**Ms. Akervall** noted that when she visited the site, the grass turf area was divided with black plastic sheeting and it looked quite muddy with standing water. She inquired whether emergency vehicles would be able to drive on the perimeter of that area or would the proposed addition change the drainage in that area for the better.

**Ms. Randall** clarified that the fire access (shown in purple on Slide 18) would be paved. Vehicles would not be driving on the turf, which would be replaced with pavement. She reiterated that 40 percent of the proposed addition would replace some of the turf area, but more than 15 percent of the landscaping would still be retained on the site as required by the Code.

**Daniel Pauly, Associate Planner**, added that some soil was stockpiled on the site and the Applicant recently was recently granted a grading permit by the Building Department to move that soil in preparation for the proposed addition.

**Ms. Randall** noted the drainage would be reviewed when the Applicant came in with their building plans due to the condition of approval from the Natural Resources Department. Any part of the site that was disturbed, such as the lawn where the dirt was stockpiled, would be replaced with lawn.

**Chair Fierros Bower** noted a hammerhead on one portion of the site for the fire truck turning radius and an area that zigzagged where the vehicles would exit the site. She asked if the turning radii had been studied for vehicles going around the existing warehouse.

**Ms. Randall** confirmed the proposed hammerhead met the fire department's required turning radius, even with the proposed parking, building extension and existing loading dock. Emergency vehicles could follow the proposed fire access that wrapped around to the east and then go around the existing warehouse.

**Chair Fierros Bower** called for the Applicant's presentation.

**Babrak Amiri, Project Engineer, Associated Consultants**, stated that based on the previously approved zoning for the proposed project, the application was a perfect fit. As Staff described, it met all of the Code and City requirements and the Applicant fully supported it.

**Chair Fierros Bower** called for public testimony in favor of, opposed, and neutral to the application. Seeing none, she closed the public hearing at 7:00 pm and called for Board member deliberations.

**Ron Heberlein moved to approve Resolution No. 325. James Frinell seconded the motion.**

**Mr. Heberlein** stated that using the .17 trips per 1,000 sq ft with the existing warehouse, he calculated about 52 peak trips, so the Applicant was adding approximately 10 percent to the existing trips for that location. The Associated Consultants' letter dated February 19th discussed the traffic study done during the 2007 expansion. He clarified that he had divided the 305,000 sq ft of the existing warehouse by 1,000, and multiplied that by .17. Adding six more trips to that would result in a 10 percent increase in traffic from the site, which did not seem too bad.

**Ms. Randall** noted a more complicated component was involved because part of the square footage was office space, which had a higher trip rate, whereas in 2007 only warehouse was added. Considering the existing office space and the revisions from the original approval, the new six trips would probably equate to lower than 10 percent.

- She confirmed the proposed addition was all warehouse. No office space was proposed nor was there a proposal to convert any existing facility to more office space.

**Ms. Akervall** added the addition of only 11 or 12 parking spaces underscored the low traffic impact anticipated.

**Ms. Randall** said that Coca-Cola operated longer business hours than a typical 8:00 am to 5:00 pm, so staff would likely be coming and going at varied hours.

**Mr. Adams** stated that the previous Coca-Cola traffic report done in December of 2007 most likely reflected traffic counts taken in mid-November. At the Kinsman/Wilsonville Rd intersection, Kinsman Rd had 453 PM peak hour trips, Wilsonville Rd east of Kinsman Rd had 1,648 trips, and Wilsonville Rd west of Kinsman had 1,209 trips.

- Staff was working on a possible expansion of the Fred Meyer fuel station, which was still active, but had not went to the DRB because Staff had traffic impact concerns. Related to that application, a report was done in September 2014, which meant the traffic counts were probably taken in August 2014. In that report, the Kinsman Rd leg had 622 trips, an increase of about 170 trips; however, the report did not state what accounted for the increase. Wilsonville Rd east of Kinsman Rd increased slightly to 1,712, a 64 trip increase, which was pretty minor for that seven year period. The leg west of Kinsman Rd had a significant increase to 1,872 trips, a 663 vehicle increase, which was unusual.
- He did not fully understand why west of Kinsman/Wilsonville Rd was busier than east of Kinsman Rd as it did not pan out with other studies in the area. The critical piece was Wilsonville Rd from

Kinsman Rd to the freeway, and in the seven-year period, it had a 50 to 64 vehicle increase out of 1,648 total trips, or roughly a 4 percent increase.

**Ms. Akervall** confirmed the 2014 traffic study had not come before the Board because of the concerns about traffic, and asked if those were the most recent numbers for the Kinsman/Wilsonville Rd area.

**Mr. Adams** confirmed the September 2014 report was the most recent for the Kinsman/Wilsonville Rd intersection. He did not recall another report done in that area, but noted another study of the intersection would be done within the next few months due to other work.

**Ms. Akervall** asked if the 2014 report changed Mr. Adams' opinions about the traffic study waiver for the current application.

**Mr. Adams** answered no. He explained that a rule of thumb for traffic studies was to multiply the PM peak hour by 10 to get the approximate daily traffic load for a road. On Kinsman Rd, the new figure of 622 trips would mean about 6,200 vehicles per day on that road, which could handle approximately 12,000 vehicles per day, so only about half the capacity was being used. Though he was not familiar with the traffic study related to the Kinsman Road Extension, there was probably some traffic data associated with that project. However, he was comfortable given the capacity available on Kinsman Rd.

- On Wilsonville Rd, the 1,700 trips multiplied by 10 was 17,000, but as a four-lane road, it would support 30,000 to 35,000 vehicles per day. Currently, the section of Wilsonville Rd under the I-5 bridge hit about 28,000 vehicles routinely. With four lanes all the way to the freeway, Wilsonville Rd had the capacity and the current proposed expansion would only add six trips per day, so he did not anticipate any problems. The truck traffic was not increasing because Coca-Cola's trucks leave in the early morning and return mid-afternoon. Coca-Cola did not run trucks during the PM Peak Hours. The added trips would only be the warehouse workers getting off shift and going home.

**The motion passed unanimously.**

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

## **X. Board Member Communications**

### **A. Results of the March 28, 2016 DRB Panel B meeting**

**Daniel Pauly, Associate Planner**, commented that Panel B's hearing involved an infill project with neighbors and some revised plans had been submitted to Staff and discussions were ongoing. The hearing had been continued to April 25<sup>th</sup> and would subsequently go to City Council on May 18, 2016. The Applicants had indicated a willingness to make some changes, and Staff was working on some additional traffic information in support of the project.

- He explained that the development was located along Canyon Creek Rd South and provided a brief background of the proposed project's site, location, zoning, and the surrounding developments. He noted that the lot sizes were compressed a bit more due to the pressure of more Significant Resource Overlay Zone (SROZ) area and the housing density transfer out of the SROZ. Beyond the SROZ, the four-acre project was required to have a quarter-acre open space, which also removed buildable area. The Applicants was able to meet the minimum lot size, but were requesting a waiver from the average lot size to achieve the planned density.
- Panel B was looking at it thoroughly and considering all the comments from the neighbors. The argument to make the area more densely populated was supported by the existing utility infrastructure and numerous local amenities.

## **XI. Staff Communications**

**Daniel Pauly, Associate Planner** congratulated Chair Fierros Bower on being elected as chair for another year and updated that Blaise Edmonds was doing well and expected in the office tomorrow.

**X. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 7:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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