

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

**Development Review Board – Panel B  
Minutes–March 23, 2015 6:30 PM**

**Approved**  
April 27, 2015

**I. Call to Order**

Vice Chair Dianne Knight called the meeting to order at 6:29 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: Dianne Knight, Richard Martens, Shawn O'Neil, and Council Liaison Julie Fitzgerald. Aaron Woods and Cheryl Dorman were absent.

Staff present: Blaise Edmonds, Barbara Jacobson, and Michael Wheeler

**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 reported that on March 16, 2015, City Council:

- Discussed the proposed route for the waterline pipe that would be developed between Wilsonville and Hillsboro over the next several years and operational by 2026, which sounded like a long time away, now was the time to pay attention to it. After a long process looking at different routes for the pipe, a preferred route had been determined. There would be opportunities for public hearings, and she urged the Commissioners to look at the route and go to those hearings with any questions they had. She believed they had done the best job possible with the route design, but there were still a couple of options to be considered.
- Approved the purchase of two new, clean-fuel buses, continuing the efficient use of fuel for the City's SMART transportation buses.
- Approved rents again this year after an annual review of the tax-exempt multifamily properties in Wilsonville.
- Decided after receiving citizen input to reconsider the logo which was part of the City's branding process. There would probably be one more iteration of the logo.
- Would be hearing the Downs Appeal on April 6, 2015, adding that Council had received voluminous amounts of materials to review from the work done at previous hearings.

**Blaise Edmonds, Manager, Current Planning**, noted that specifically, the engineering Condition PFA 27 that discussed sidewalk and street improvements for the entire 150 feet would be reviewed on the record. He believed Mr. Downs was willing to build those improvements for his new house, but not for his parent's property adjacent to the north.

**Richard Martens** confirmed that DRB members could attend the City Council hearing. He added he was glad to learn that the City was purchasing property near the river.

**Councilor Fitzgerald** added that the Frog Pond Open House would be held on April 2, 2015. She hoped citizens with a lot of diversity of interest would attend as opposed to just nearby residents; people who

appreciate the housing they had and liked certain things might want to discuss what they liked about different types of housing as there was an interest in getting some larger lots in Frog Pond than the city had in other places. There had been a lot of public input and a lot of work had been put into the concept plan, and April 2<sup>nd</sup> would be an important open house. Following would be a ten-day to two-week online open house for people to comment about their preferences and what they would like to see in Frog Pond.

#### **VI. Consent Agenda:**

A. Approval of minutes of February 23, 2015 meeting

**Richard Martens moved to approve the February 23, 2015 DRB Panel B meeting minutes as presented. Shawn O'Neil seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.**

#### **VIII. Public Hearing:**

A. **Resolution 300. Grove Single Family North Temporary Use Permit: Westlake Consultants, Inc. – representative for Lennar Northwest, Inc. – owner/applicant.** The applicant is requesting approval of a five (5) year temporary use permit for a model home/sales office, signs and flags on lots 7 and 8 of Grove Single Family North, a previously-approved residential planned development. The site is located on Tax Lots 700 and 800, Section 14AA, T3S-R1W, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Michael Wheeler

Case Files: DB15-0007 – Five (5) Year Temporary Use Permit

**Vice Chair Knight** 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.

**Michael Wheeler, 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. Wheeler** presented the Staff report via PowerPoint, noting the location of the model home/sales office and parking on Lots 7 and 8, as well as the proposed signage with these key additional comments:

- The application regarded a phase of Brenchley Estates now platted as Grove Single Family North. The proposed model home was actually under construction and nearly complete. The certificate of temporary occupancy would enable the Applicant to occupy the dwelling as a retail sales office, which would be in the garage, and a model facility to show what the homes would look like in the project.
- Page 3 of the Staff report discussed two issues that were addressed with conditions listed on Page 4.
  - The signs proposed at the two intersections, where Ash Meadows Lane intersected both Ash Meadows Circle and Parkway Ave, were twice the size of the allowed 32 sq ft maximum at each location. The Applicant understood that was a problem and agreed to reduce the signs' sizes.
  - The Applicant had also proposed installing eight flags in front of Lots 7 and 8 to draw attention to the sales site. Portions of the Sign Code recognized that was an intent to treat the flags as signs which were not allowed within the structure of the Sign Code.
- The Site Plan (Exhibit B3) showed the model home directly at the end of the street, and the parking lot directly adjacent to the east. The landscaping was already in place, softening the appearance of the home and making it look more appealing.
- He reviewed several slides illustrating the proposed signage and its proposed locations, noting the signs on Slide 7 were those that exceeded the maximum.
  - Additional directional signs were proposed along the frontage of the site and were exempt from permit and fee. The signs were allowed and, as long as they were back-to-back, would be in

compliance. Slide 11 showed a location in another jurisdiction, but reflected the intent the Applicant proposed for erecting the signs along the sidewalk.

- The proposed flag locations were marked by yellow dots on Slide 9. The flags were prohibited and the embedded conditions simply underscored that prohibition.
- Staff found that all of the review criteria were satisfied and, with the conditions of approval addressing the sign corrections and flag eliminations, recommended approval of Case File DB15-0007.

**Shawn O'Neil** noted language in the Staff report did not definitively state that the flags were prohibited. In Flags, under Issues on Page 3 of 8, the Staff report stated, "Flags used for such purposes are considered to be signs and is prohibited by the Code. See the discussion." Finding A9 on Page 7 of the Staff report stated, "Condition of Approval PD8 will guarantee that the requirements of the Code are satisfied for these eight (8) proposed flags." He preferred more direct language to clarify that the flags were in violation of the City's Sign Code and the flags were not allowed.

**Mr. Wheeler** proposed amending the last line of Finding A9 on Page 7 of 8 of the Staff report to read, "Requirements of the Code are satisfied ~~for~~ *in prohibiting* these eight (8) proposed flags."

**Vice Chair Knight** called for the Applicant's presentation.

**Ken Sandblast, West Lake Consultants, 15115 SW Sequoia Pkwy, #150, Tigard, OR 97224**, stated West Lake was the Applicant's representative, noting they supported the Staff report and all the conditions of approval. The Applicant accepted the back-to-back signage and the prohibition on the flags. He asked for the Board's support of the Staff report as written, including the change just made to Finding A9, which the Applicant supported as well.

**Vice Chair Knight** called for public testimony in favor of, opposed and neutral to the application. Seeing none, she closed the public hearing at 6:52 pm.

**Shawn O'Neil moved to amend Finding A9 on Page 7 of 8 of the Staff report to state, "Requirements of the Code are satisfied ~~for~~ in prohibiting these eight (8) proposed flags." Richard Martens seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.**

**Richard Martens moved to approve Resolution No. 300 with the Staff report as amended. The motion was seconded by Shawn O'Neil and passed unanimously.**

**Vice Chair Knight** read the rules of appeal into the record.

#### **IX. Board Member Communications**

#### **X. Staff Communications**

#### **XI. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 6:54 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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