

**Wilsonville City Hall
29799 SW Town Center Loop E
Wilsonville, Oregon 97070**

Approved
September 22, 2014

**Development Review Board – Panel B
Minutes – August 25, 2014 6:30 PM**

I. Call to Order:

Chair Andrew Karr called the DRB-Panel B meeting to order at 6:30 pm.

II. Chairman's Remarks:

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

III. Roll Call:

Present for roll call were: Andrew Karr, Dianne Knight, Cheryl Dorman, Jhuma Chaudhuri, Aaron Woods and City Council Liaison Julie Fitzgerald

Staff present were: Blaise Edmonds, Barbara Jacobson, Michael Wheeler, and Daniel Pauly

IV. Citizens' Input: This is an opportunity for visitors to address the Development Review Board on items not on the agenda. There was none.

V. City Council Liaison Report: Councilor Fitzgerald reported City Council only met once in August. On August 4, 2014, the Council primarily discussed the Charbonneau Consolidated Improvement Plan, which has a large price tag and some short-term, immediate needs were being addressed right away. A lot of work was needed to determine the best way to fund the 20 to 30 years of improvements needed to sewer, stormwater, etc.

- The Charbonneau findings were part of a citywide Asset Management Plan being done to ensure that those same types of issues were being considered around the city. Council would be provided with an in depth report about everything involved in the Asset Management Plan so everyone had an idea of what would be looked at across the city.
- She announced that the Clackamas County Sheriff's Department was awarded a special accreditation they had been working on for a number of years. She encouraged the Board to look into the accreditation, as it was a nice indicator of the management of the Wilsonville Police Department, which was part of the Clackamas County Sheriff's Department.
- She also announced that the Parks and Recreation office had completed its move into the former visitors' center in Town Center Park and a grand opening was planned soon.
- City Council expected to hear the Recreation and Aquatic Center Task Force study results regarding the community recreation center/pool fairly shortly. No news about what would be done or what looked like a good plan was available yet, but the Task Force was complete.

VI. Consent Agenda:

A. Approval of minutes of June 23, 2014 meeting

Andrew Karr moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Dianne Knight seconded the motion, which passed 3 to 0 to 2 with Cheryl Dorman and Jhuma Chaudhuri abstaining.

VII. Public Hearing:

A. Resolution 288. Renaissance Boat Club Temporary Use Permit: SFA Design Group LLC – applicant for Renaissance Development Corp – owner. The applicant is requesting a three-year Temporary Use Permit for a model home/sales office building on Lot

19 of Renaissance Boat Club, a previously approved residential planned development. The subject site is located on Tax Lots 800, 850, 860, 870, 880 and 900, Section 24; T3S-R1W; Clackamas County; Wilsonville, Oregon. Staff: Michael Wheeler

Case Files: DB14-0048 – Temporary Use Permit

Chair Karr called the public hearing to order at 6:36 pm 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 with these comments:

- He entered “Landscape Plan-Concept C” submitted by the Applicant into the record as Exhibit B8, which was distributed to the Board at the dais.
- The proposal was fairly straightforward. The development had been in the works since 2007, gained approval in 2008, and then suffered from the slowdown of the economy before finally being built. The project was currently in the final plat review stages, so it was very close to being recorded and the lots sold and built upon. All of the current tax lots, which were consolidated in ownership, would go away as the plat was recorded
- Typically, the duration allowed for temporary use permits of this type was up to five years, but the Applicant proposed a three-year Temporary Use Permit because they believed the lots would be sold within three years and a model home or sales office facility would no longer be needed at that point.
- He provided a brief overview of the project’s location and surrounding features, noting several maps that highlighted the location of the project along the Willamette River..
- The home on Lot 19 was already under construction, meeting the setbacks approved by the DRB. The Applicant was allowed a single permit to replace the home that was removed from the project site before the street system was installed.
 - A single sign was proposed in the front yard just to the left of the entry to identify the model home and sales center for the project. The sign would likely be affixed to the ground with 4x4’s.
 - The exterior appearance of the home being constructed on Lot 19 was displayed. No outward changes would be made to the structure to make it look any different than the home it would be, except for the fact that a portion of it would be used for the sales office.
 - The Landscape Plan included landscaping that consisted of simple lawn, shrub and tree plantings around the property. Staff appreciated that the Applicant brought the Landscape Plan in early, as it was nice to have it in the record for the DRB to review.
- The proposal met all of the relevant criteria and Staff recommended approval of the requested Temporary Use Permit for three years, as reflected in the proposed conditions of approval.

Chair Karr confirmed there were no questions for Staff and called for the Applicant’s testimony.

Amy Schnell, Renaissance Development, 16771 Boones Ferry Rd, Lake Oswego, OR, 97035, stated she did not have any further testimony, as Mr. Wheeler was very concise and accurate. She reiterated that Renaissance Development sought the Temporary Use Permit to sell its homes.

Chair Karr confirmed there were no questions for the Applicant and called for public testimony in favor of, opposed, and neutral to the application.

Chris Owen, 31000 SW Sandy Ct, Wilsonville, OR, 97070, asked if anything would be done to slow down traffic in the neighborhood. The neighborhood went from having a cul-de-sac to a thoroughfare. While some people not familiar with the neighborhood drive smoothly, some speed through the neighborhood. The new fence built at the last house of the old development on SW Sandy Ct made it difficult to see cars coming around the corner until the last second. The nine kids living on the street have to hide in the back yard now. He understood homes would sell and more traffic was inevitable, but it would be nice if something could be done to slow down the traffic through there.

Chair Karr called for the Applicant's rebuttal.

Ms. Schnell stated she had no rebuttal at this time. She noted that stop signs and traffic signals already existed in the neighborhood and no plans had been made to do anything else at this point.

Blaise Edmonds, Manager, Current Planning, asked if the fence was obstructing traffic.

Ms. Schnell responded the fence was not obstructing any view. She indicated the fence was located at Lot 11, where no fence existed previously, so it was probably a matter of getting used to it. The fence was setback about 10 ft from the corner to ensure it would not impede site distance. She also indicated the model home's location on Lot 19; noting areas where dead ends had existed previously and traffic now flowed through.

Jhuma Chaudhuri asked what street signs were currently present in the neighborhood.

Mr. Wheeler responded the neighborhood's streets were considered local streets, so they would be limited to a speed of 25 miles per hour but that was not posted on a sign.

Dianne Knight asked if there was a stop sign where SW Sandy Ct entered into the new development.

Ms. Schnell answered no, it was a through street. The only signs that existed now were the private street signs and no parking signs, which were located on only one side of the street. She noted that no requirement was made to post any additional signage.

Cheryl Dorman asked if local residents could approach the City and ask for measures to slow the traffic if speeding continued to be a problem.

Mr. Wheeler responded residents could contact the city engineer, but a study would have to be done to determine whether warrants existed for a change of any kind. In a local neighborhood like this, the City Engineer would not usually have any authority to make a physical change, such as installing speed bumps or posting a speed limit sign unless sufficient warrants exist.

Ms. Chaudhuri asked if a traffic study was undertaken.

Mr. Wheeler replied no, noting a traffic analysis had been done for the project based only on the number of trips generated by the additional homes, but not with respect to traffic control.

Barbara Jacobson, Assistant City Attorney, believed the answer to the question was if speeding traffic continued to be a problem or if things did not settle down, then a call to the Community Development Director, who was the City Engineer, would be appropriate. Any concerned citizen could call at any time and approach City Council if a concern existed. While a legitimate citizen concern, the issue was not before the DRB tonight and the only thing being reviewed tonight was the model home.

Chair Karr added that hopefully, as the construction trucks left and homeowners moved in, traffic would calm down.

Chair Karr closed the public hearing at 6:50 pm.

Ms. Jacobson clarified the new exhibit was already entered into the record, so all the DRB needed to do was move to approve the resolution, which included the Staff report.

Aaron Woods moved to approve Resolution 288. Jhuma Chaudhuri seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Chair Karr read the rules of appeal into the record.

- B. Resolution 289. Wilsonville Crossing Restaurants: Thatch Moyle, CARDNO WRG – representative for Nathan Sasaki – applicant.** The applicant is requesting a Site Design Review request and a Class III Sign approval and Sign Waiver for the exterior remodel, landscape and hardscape changes, and a new sign package for the restaurant building at the northwest corner of Wilsonville Road and Town Center Loop West. The site is located at 29991 SW Town Center Loop West on Tax Lot 211, Section 14D; T3S-R1W; Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Daniel Pauly

Case Files: DB14-0049 – Site Design Review
DB14-0054 – Class III Sign approval

Chair Karr called the public hearing to order at 6:50 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.

Daniel Pauly, 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. Pauly presented the Staff report via PowerPoint, briefly reviewing the site's history, location and surrounding features within Town Center, with the following key additional comments:

- He emphasized that the focus of tonight's hearing was not on the use of the building, but on the architecture and signage. He displayed an aerial photo of Town Center from the 1980s, noting that the building had been around for a while, and the architectural style dated from another era.
- The Site Design Review request regarded architectural and some minor site changes. He displayed each of the building's proposed façades to indicate the proposed changes, noting the brick banding on the building would remain and the large eave would be removed.
 - He explained that when Kraven's previously occupied the building they came in for an administrative review of some outdoor seating, which already included removing the tree on the west façade facing the parking lot, so the existing tree was not shown on the plan.
 - Staff discussed adding more windows to the east façade facing Town Center Loop, but considering how the building functioned and with the tree remaining, Staff did not recommend pushing for more windows.
 - The color materials board, which was circulated to the Board, showed a variety of colors and many of the materials could be seen in other commercial areas. In analyzing the Site Design Review criteria, Staff determined the proposed design fit in the context of this Wilsonville location and the materials and colors were appropriate for the application.

- Other proposed site changes included additional outdoor seating for the two restaurant tenants, some reconfiguration of the parking and landscaping area at the north part of the site, as well as removing the ramp and placing the ADA spaces in more appropriate locations; all of which would result in two additional parking spaces. The parking requirements remained the same because the parking ratio remained the same.
- Appropriate landscaping would be added where changes were being made to enhance the overall look of the site.
- While the parking lot could obviously use some repairs, that was not part of the subject review. However, the Applicant would be doing a lot of repair to enhance the site and bring it back to be functional and aesthetically pleasing.
- Class III Sign Approval. In the Sign Code, sign allowance was based on the exterior wall length of each tenant space. In this case, the Master Sign Plan was not required because there would only be two tenants. All six exterior walls of both tenants qualified for signage, either because they faced the parking lot, had an exterior entrance or faced the street. Each space fell into the category that allowed for 36 sq ft of signage on each façade, which was proposed on five of the six façades.
 - The Applicant requested a waiver for a larger sign on the west façade of the northern tenant due to the name of the tenant being pursued. The letters would have the same height as other letters to be consistent with other signs in the project and also to enhance and focus on that as the entrance. The Applicant would discuss that signage more, but Staff did not see anything wrong with it and believed it was a reasonable request. Staff understood the lettering was well within the sign band.
 - Staff was not able to present a drawing with the actual name of the company on the façade, as some of the transactions had not been finalized, but the displayed image provided an idea of how the proposed sign would fit on the proposed façade.
 - No changes would be made to the existing monument sign, as the Applicant was keeping the existing sign and just making a copy change.

Cheryl Dorman asked how much of the parking lot was the Applicant's responsibility.

Mr. Pauly displayed a site plan from the plan set and noted that the solid shaded area was where a full depth pavement replacement would be done and the crosshatched area was where a grind and overlay would be done. Shared easements existed between the properties as well, but the indicated area was what the Applicant proposed to actually fix and repair as part of the project.

Jhuma Chaudhuri asked about improving the landscaping along the row of parking spaces located right next to the sidewalk to the west of the building.

Mr. Pauly replied the situation was unique, as the Code did require landscaping. However, the building was built in 1983, when Wilsonville Rd was much smaller, and much of the land was taken for right-of-way as Wilsonville Rd was widened. While the landscaping did not meet current standards, no expansion of the building or change of use was being made to trigger bringing it up to current standards.

Dianne Knight asked about provisions for bikes, she believed that bike racks were in the proposal.

Mr. Pauly responded that because the Applicant was not expanding the square footage or changing the use, there was no requirement for them to meet current bike parking standards. Staff encouraged the Applicant to meet those standards, as this would be a place where bikes would come, but he deferred to the Applicant to answer that question. He noted the DRB's review focused on the architecture, because there was no change to the building area or use, nothing triggered a review of parking or needing to meet current parking standards. He encouraged the Applicant to provide some bicycle parking as he hoped to bike there to have lunch there someday as well.

Chair Karr called for the Applicant's testimony.

Thatch Moyle, CARDNO WRG, 5415 SW Westgate, Ste 100, Portland, OR, 97221, thanked the DRB and City Staff for their consideration of CARDNO's application.- He stated the proposal was to bring the styling of the outdated building up to current design standards that would reflect what was seen in Town Center and other commercial areas within the City of Wilsonville. The site improvements included reconfiguring the ADA parking spaces, which added two additional parking stalls; outdoor patio areas, which would be screened with additional shrubs; the addition of two maple trees on the northern portion of the site; and replacing pavement in the areas of disrepair in the parking lot, in addition to grinding and resurfacing the remainder of the parking area.

- No bike parking was proposed at this point due to limited spacing on the site with the two tenant spaces.
- For increased pedestrian access, the Applicant proposed adding a sidewalk to the east side of the building to provide connectivity along Town Center Loop, in addition to adding ramps both for the ADA access along the parking stalls and also to the north end of the site. Changing out the fencing around the trash enclosure was also proposed and would include adding a gate.
- As far as the signage was concerned, all but one of the signs would be in conformance with the 36 sq ft of area allowed. He noted Tenant B wanted a larger central entry for their main sign that would be located on the west side of the building. The lettering would be white with a red background and a yellow trim behind the red background. Tenant B's signs would be LED illuminated. He said he could explain the colors proposed by the tenant spaces, but for confidentiality reasons and the sale going through, he could not speak to specific logos or trademarks.
 - For Tenant A, the wall sign would be aluminum and also LED illuminated. The color would be the tenant's trademark, red and brown.

Kevin Godwin, Benner Stange Architects, 5200 SW Meadows Rd, Ste B130, Lake Oswego, OR, 97035, explained how the proposed architectural design was determined and provided a brief overview of the overall design and materials with the following key comments:

- Quite a melting pot of architectural design existed in the Town Center area as buildings were built over the years. To the south were newer, nicely designed brick buildings with nice canopies and hard, clean lines. Further east, building designs reflected more of the residential theme often seen in a subdivision with a retail center with more wood, cedar shakes, etc. Buildings to the north included all kinds of buildings; standalone buildings with their own architecture, corporate identity, etc.
 - The Applicant's approach for the design of this building incorporated a little bit of everything; however, one advantage they had upfront was knowing the tenants possibly coming into the building so, while the leases were not signed yet, they knew what corporate identities and images to portray to the consumer.
 - The subject design was proposed following input from the preapplication meeting and discussion with one of the City planners to work more with the materials on the elevations as too much stucco had been proposed at one time.
 - He agreed with comments made during in the pre-application that this building was like the gateway building into the retail corridor, so the Applicant wanted to ensure the proposed building stood out, but also blended into the area while bringing in the corporate identity of the tenants.
- The existing brick on the building, which they were told the City paid for as a result of improvements made to Wilsonville Rd, was in great shape and provided a great base to the building, so the brick was retained on the front (west), south, and east elevations of the building. The brick was used as the base of the design and then the Applicant started layering the building in materials.
 - The Applicant did not want the brick to be too powerful, but the corner of the building was very visible from the Wilsonville Rd, so they wanted to make sure to bring that identity out and wrap the brick around the corner of the building, instead of just ending it in the front.

- That corner tenant would have a nice, flat, steel awning that would come out and also wrap around the building. Some seating and lighting would be provided in the area underneath the awning as well.
- While a new storefront would be constructed, every window shown on the proposed elevations were actually existing windows that would be retained. When doing the demolition, they discovered 5"x5" steel columns between each window. The building was in good structural shape, so they believed it was important to work around that design, keeping the windows exactly where they were at, and instead, enhance a few windows down to the floor in an effort to bring more light into the building, as well as better visibility into the building at night.
 - The same format of the front elevation continued around the building along the south side along Wilsonville Rd, instead of just cutting off the architecture at the corner.
- Stucco-type looking materials were shown in white on the elevation, in addition to horizontal HardiePlank residential siding with a 50-year warranty. The materials were of good quality and would last for the future.
- Not a lot of architecture was done to the rear of the building because that was usually where the tenants would have exit or service doors, and the Applicant did not want to propose a lot of architecture there only to deal with a door that might run into the middle of an element. As a result, that design had already been forced onto the tenants and the door on the plans indicated where the door would actually be located.
- A new trash enclosure would be provided in the same location as the existing enclosure at the rear of the building with the addition of new slats to ensure it was hidden.
- More storefront would be provided on the northwest corner, along with more outdoor seating, which would extend all of the way across the front of the building. The canopies would be fabric, so in a sense, each tenant would have their own identity regarding what they wanted the exterior to look like.
- He indicated a flat plane on the plans that actually came out at an angle, adding more of a modern look to the overall design. Between the modern look of the design and the addition of the residential materials, the Applicant believed they had reached a happy medium. All parties favored the design and the tenants were happy with what was being projected.

Aaron Woods noted Tenant B had two exit doors, one into the trash enclosure and one out to the patio. He asked what the path Tenant A would use to take their trash out.

Mr. Godwin indicated single and double doors that were the legal exit doors for the tenant, adding that one door was a service door for their kitchen. Code required two exits when a certain square footage was reached. He noted one door on the plans was an existing door that was never erased from the displayed drawing. He indicated the location of an exit and service door for Tenant A, noting they would most likely have to go across and go in the back to reach the trash service. Putting in a sidewalk was discussed at one time, as well as just having them come around the front. He also noted a signal that was getting close to the corner of the building and they were working with the tenant on having the door possibly go out to the sidewalk instead of having the door go out that way. He believed both tenants should be able to have service to the trash pretty easily.

Mr. Pauly added that Staff also considered that question specifically and initially discussed a sidewalk, but found that kind of tenant-to-tenant access was typical of a multi-tenant retail development like this. Many such tenants had to walk a bit through the parking lot to reach a shared trash enclosure. Staff did not see anything out of the ordinary or as being a concern when they reviewed that.

Blaise Edmonds, Manager, Current Planning, strongly encouraged the Applicant to consider a bicycle rack. He understood it was not a Code requirement, but believed this type of property would attract bicyclists and he envisioned bicycles leaning against tables and tripping up the wait staff. He noted the Code only required one bicycle parking space per 4,000 sq ft, so just adding a typical horseshoe rack,

which holds up to two bicycles, the Code would be met with one bicycle rack.

Mr. Pauly concurred.

Ms. Knight inquired about the possibility of adding a few trees to screen or shield the parking lot from Wilsonville Rd.

Mr. Pauly replied the parking lot and sidewalk were concrete-to-concrete, so no landscape area existed.

Ms. Chaudhuri asked if the parking spaces could be removed, as it looked terrible.

Mr. Pauly replied the parking spaces were needed to meet parking requirements. He clarified one tree that was previously approved for removal in a separate administrative action would be removed.

Ms. Knight said it looked like Cypress trees were proposed, but no Cyprus type trees were there.

Mr. Godwin confirmed the Cypress trees were just for more of an architectural rendering look and were not actually proposed.

Mr. Moyle indicated the addition of two maples on the displayed Landscape Plan. He confirmed all trees located on the right hand side were existing deciduous and evergreen trees.

Mr. Edmonds explained that unfortunately, the widening of Wilsonville Rd over the years kept encroaching into the site. When the City widened the sidewalk the City paid for the brick edge treatment facing Wilsonville Rd and the owner paid for the brick treatment on the east and west sides of the structure. Staff was concerned over time about the building getting closer and closer to the street every time the road was widened. He believed this was a welcome change, as the scale of the building would be reduced without the eave, so it would not look so imposing. The unfortunate scenario was that public street improvements had been encroaching into the site on the east and south sides, leaving no room for additional planning.

Ms. Knight asked if exterior lighting was discussed.

Mr. Godwin indicated where exterior lighting was proposed on the building, noting lighting would also be located underneath the canopy. Some lights would also be placed on the outside of the doors for exiting, shining down to provide safe traveling around the building at night. Some lighting would also be provided over the trash enclosure on the back side of the building. Exterior lighting was typically proposed at the corners of the building.

Mr. Pauly said Staff routinely reviewed finalized lighting plan administratively to ensure compliance with the Outdoor Lighting Ordinance, which involved objective criteria.

Chair Karr called for public testimony regarding the application. There being none, there was no Applicant rebuttal. He closed the public hearing at 7:25 pm.

Mr. Woods believed bicycle parking was important as it was in keeping with the overall style of the city.

Ms. Knight agreed, noting she brought up the bicycle parking because of Wilsonville's Healthy Living Initiative which promoted bicycling and pedestrian routes, so she was a bit surprised that the City did not push harder to get some bike racks. She realized it was not required, but believed if such initiatives were put in place within the city, the Board needed to follow through with applicants.

Ms. Chaudhuri believed that also applied to the row of parking spaces that faced south. The sidewalk narrowed quite a bit and had a busy road on one side and parking directly on the other side. She believed the proposal was a great improvement, but wished more could be done about the parking lot.

Ms. Dorman believed the proposed improvements would make a vast difference.

Ms. Knight responded architecturally, yes, but she believed Ms. Chaudhuri was talking about the parking and the parking area along Wilsonville Rd.

Ms. Chaudhuri responded it was a pedestrian spot that was quite narrow. She confirmed bump stops existed, so the cars did not encroach on the sidewalk, but it was still very close with both Wilsonville Rd, which was very busy, and the ramp onto the highway right there. She wanted to confirm with City Staff whether anything could be done.

Mr. Pauly reiterated no parking requirements were being triggered.

Chair Karr did not believe the Board could make those changes. He asked what flexibility the Board had or what conditions of approval could be added.

Mr. Pauly replied the best thing would be to see if Staff could work something out with the Applicant. The first consideration was to ensure that a feasible location existed, as it was not wise to include a requirement that could not be met realistically. He recommended including a condition stating Staff would write a memo explaining why a bike rack was not feasible. Glancing at the Site Plan, he saw a couple locations where it was probably feasible, but in any condition, he would leave that open to ensure Staff was not backing themselves into a corner with the Building Official, for example. If a bike rack was not there, he believed people would probably lock their bikes to the railing, but having an actual bike rack was definitely preferable.

Mr. Edmonds reiterated the minimum Code requirement was simply one space per 4,000 sq ft and the combined space was approximately 5,000 sq ft. The inverted “U” bike racks typically accommodated two bicycles. He confirmed Mr. Pauly was correct, he did not believe the DRB could design where the bike rack should be located tonight because it would take too much time. He believed the Applicant heard loud and clear that it would be foolish not to have a bike rack with the kind of clientele expected at two casual dining restaurants. He strongly believed the Applicant should install a bike rack, but he did not know if that could be made a condition of approval. He hoped the Applicant would work with Staff to find a location.

- He clarified the DRB could make installing a bicycle rack a condition, as it was included in the decision criteria of the Staff report on page 2 of 28. He suggested requiring one bicycle rack to lock two bicycles with both wheels and frames at some location to be determined. The problem with leaving an open ended condition was if the Applicant did not like the condition, and the appeal period went by, he would not have the right to appeal. Therefore, he suggested making a recommendation instead of a condition, because uncertainty existed about whether a bike rack could fit on the site.

Ms. Knight confirmed the DRB wanted to make a strong recommendation in accordance with the City of Wilsonville’s Healthy Living Initiative.

Ms. Chaudhuri asked if the DRB would also recommend that the parking spots be reviewed again.

Mr. Pauly did not believe a solution existed there. The parking was necessary to serve the site and, although he agreed it made sense aesthetically, no nexus existed to have that requirement based on what the Applicant was doing there.

Ms. Jacobson confirmed the Board's recommendation to add the bicycle rack was already on the record.

Cheryl Dorman moved to approve Resolution 289. The motion was seconded by Jhuma Chaudhuri and passed unanimously.

Chair Karr read the rules of appeal into the record.

VIII. Board Member Concerns and Communications

- A. Results of the July 14, 2014 DRB Panel A meeting
- B. Results of the August 11, 2014 DRB Panel A meeting

IX. Staff Communications:

There were none.

X. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:33 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Paula Pinyerd, ABC Transcription for
Shelley White, Planning Administrative Assistant