

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

**Development Review Board – Panel B
Minutes – May 29, 2014 6:30 PM**

Approved June 23, 2014

I. Call to Order:

Chair Andrew Karr called the DRB-Panel B meeting to order at 6:31 p.m.

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, Daniel Pauly and Keith Liden, City Planning Consultant

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 thanked everyone who attended the citywide Spring Training a couple of weeks ago where everyone obtained a good overview of various things at the City. She stated she was out of town for the most recent City Council meeting and reported on the May 5th Council meeting as follows:

- Council adopted the Tourism Development Strategy Task Force recommendation and expected to receive an analysis from City Staff in two to four weeks regarding specific ways to implement that recommendation.
- The Tualatin Valley Water District (TVWD) Willamette River Water Supply group made a presentation to Council about updates needed to the water system to ensure a 20- year water supply. The update would involve either some use of the City's water plant or the addition of a plant similar to the City's. Decisions had not been finalized yet, but the update would involve a lot of construction. Although the updates were very long term, she encouraged the Board to look for news about the project which would be beneficial for everyone to tune into it.
- Metro's also gave a presentation about Metro's expectations of Wilsonville's role as a city, both as part of Metro and as a city in the state of Oregon, to be in compliance with the Climate Smart Communities goals. The goal was to achieve a 20% reduction of greenhouse gas emissions by 2035, which focused on the output from light cars and trucks. As a result of planning and infrastructure, the City of Wilsonville was doing really well in comparison to other cities. A number of different decisions had been made regarding how to get further gains toward achieving that goal in the year 2035 across Oregon.
- Council adopted a Zone Map Amendment for the Grande Pointe development adjacent to Villebois, as well as the Residential Land Study, which involved a lot of work by the Planning Commission.
- She announced a public workshop on the Basalt Creek Concept Plan would be held Tuesday, June 17th. The workshop would take place at the Horizon Christian High School gym in Tualatin on Tuesday, June 17th, from 6:00 pm to 8:30 pm.

VI. Consent Agenda:

A. Approval of minutes of March 24, 2014 meeting

Chair Karr moved to approve the March 24, 2014 minutes as presented. Cheryl Dorman seconded the motion, which passed 3 to 0 to 2 with Dianne Knight and Jhuma Chaudhuri abstaining.

B. Approval of minutes of April 28, 2014 meeting

Chair Karr moved to approve the April 28, 2014 minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Dianne Knight and passed 4 to 0 to 1 with Cheryl Dorman abstaining.

VII. Public Hearing:

Barbara Jacobson, Assistant City Attorney, reported that in the course of the last week the Applicant and Staff decided that more work was needed on Resolution No. 279. Concerns had been expressed about some conditions of approval that in the Staff report and following a subsequent meeting, both parties believed a resolution had been found, but because Washington County was involved, there was not enough time to address the matter for tonight's hearing. The Applicant and Staff agreed that continuing Resolution No. 279 to the June DRB meeting would be best. She confirmed that the Applicant, who was present in the audience, concurred with the continuance. She suggested proceeding to that agenda item in case any member of the audience was present for that hearing.

The Board proceeded to Agenda Item B Resolution 279 at this time.

A. Resolution 278. Republic Services Expansion Stage I Master Plan Revision and Phase 1 Improvements: SFA Design Group – representative for Republic Services –owner.

The applicant is requesting a Stage I Master Plan Revision to update the Master Plan for Republic Services, and Stage II Final Plan, Site Design Review and Type C Tree Plan for phase 1 improvements consisting of a new maintenance building and new container storage area, along with associated improvements including storm detention and landscape screening. The site is located on Tax Lots 1400 and 1500, Section 02C; T3S-R1W; Washington County; Wilsonville, Oregon. Staff: Keith Liden and Dan Pauly

Case Files: DB14-0032 – Stage I Master Plan Revision
DB14-0033 – Stage II Final Plan
DB14-0034 – Site Design Review
DB14-0035 – Type C Tree Plan

This agenda item was addressed following Resolution 279.

Chair Karr called the public hearing to order at 6:45 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.

Cheryl Dorman noted that the Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce had submitted a memorandum regarding the application and disclosed that she was treasurer for the Chamber. She was unaware the memorandum had been submitted and in no way would it influence her decision.

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

Mr. Pauly introduced Keith Liden, a consultant hired by the City to help accommodate the Applicant's construction timeline. He reviewed and entered the following items into the record:

- Exhibit A4: Memorandum dated May 28, 2014 from Daniel Pauly, AICP, discussing the division of phases and the amendments to the Staff report. The draft amended Staff report, which included corrections to findings and removed all items related to Phase 2, was attached.
- Exhibit A5: Memorandum dated May 29, 2014 from Daniel Pauly, AICP, recommending additional amendments to the Staff report. The first line was corrected to state, "This memo should be entered into the record.
- Exhibit A6: Memorandum dated May 29, 2014 from Nancy Kraushaar, PE, Community Development Director, regarding conditions related to the right-of-way in response to a letter in the record.

Keith Liden, Consultant, presented the amended Staff report via PowerPoint, displaying an aerial photo of the proposed site and noting an existing recycling operation with container storage, truck storage and an office located at the eastern portion of the site. His key comments were as follows:

- He noted that the site became what it was today based on approvals received in the 1990's, which were detailed in the Staff report.
- As discussed in the amended Staff report, only Resolution No 278 was being considered at this time for the Phase 1 improvements, which included a maintenance building, some movement of the existing container storage and some stormwater treatment improvements. Phase 2 improvements, which would be considered later, included the addition of some office use, additional parking, moving and changing the container storage more towards Garden Acres Rd and a new driveway onto Ridder Rd.
- The Phase 1 Improvement Summary showed the new maintenance shop addition, as well as some additional parking located immediately to the west to accommodate the employees for that building. A new asphalt pad would be added for container storage to the west of where it currently existed. The new stormwater detention and treatment facility was new to the site and would be an improvement from existing conditions.
- Other aspects of the site included two other driveways on Ridder Rd, some additional truck fueling facilities on the east side and an office building, which would be added to the main building extending to the southeast.

Mr. Pauly explained the Phase 2 diagram was shown in the PowerPoint presentation because no good Stage I Master Plan drawing existed. The Board was addressing the full approval of the Stage I Master Plan, but the Phase 2 diagram provided a bubble diagram of where things would eventually be located on the site. Staff did not see any reason to hold back on saying what things would be and where they would be located in the future, but those particular design elements were not being considered tonight. The Board would be approving the Master Plan for things that would eventually exist, however the details of the function and design would be addressed at the next meeting.

Chair Karr confirmed the Board would approve the overall Master Plan for the site and then talk specifically about the new maintenance building, new container storage, storm retention and landscaping.

Ms. Chaudhuri stated the Board had the diagram of Phase 1.

Mr. Pauly clarified there was the Stage I Master Plan approval, which was the bubble diagram level of review and covered both phases; the rest of the review was covering only Phase 1.

Chair Karr stated the Stage I Master Plan was the entire renovation.

Mr. Pauly answered yes, adding it essentially covered the eventual build out of what was currently within the city limits.

Chair Karr confirmed then the Board would address the specifics of the maintenance building, container parking and landscaping of Phase 1 and then the retention pond.

Ms. Jacobson added another good way to put it was that the Master Plan was an overall design of what the site would look like, assuming the Board approved both developments. The Board was not approving the second development tonight; however, if the applications met the recommended criteria and the Board believed they were appropriate, they would be approved. She added that just because the Master Plan was before the Board tonight did not mean the second development would be approved by the Board.

Chair Karr confirmed Phase 2 would have to go through its own approval, and by approving the Master Plan, the Board was essentially laying the groundwork for Phase 2.

Mr. Woods said he noticed a Phase 1 Site Plan in the packet and asked Staff to help him understand the difference

Mr. Pauly explained a Stage I Master Plan was in many ways a more detailed zoning identifying the type of use that would be there in the future without going into any design of that use. When considering Stage I's, an important part of that review was looking at phasing. As part of the Stage I Master Plan, there are two phases that would be built over time because there were specific requirements that the Stage II for a Stage I approval needed to come in within a few years, which would be happening in this case. However, there also needs to be documentation that two different plan stages existed as part of that overall master plan.

Ms. Chaudhuri noted the Board had the Phase 1 Site Plan, adding she believed it was confusing to enter forms that were not going to be decided on tonight.

Chair Karr responded the Board was deciding on the overall Master Plan and in the same resolution they were also deciding on Phase 1.

Ms. Chaudhuri agreed, but reiterated that the Board was looking at a Phase 2 diagram.

Mr. Pauly explained the diagram was just to indicate the area that would be container storage; the Board was not considering screening, traffic or anything related to it.

Blaise Edmonds, Manager, Current Planning, agreed it was confusing, normally not that much detail is seen in Stage I master plans, but this was how this Stage I plan was provided, so the Board should just blur their eyes to the detail.

Mr. Pauly said the Board should imagine the picture was blurry. The bottom line was nothing could be done with Stage I until the Applicant returned with the next resolution.

Mr. Liden continued presenting the amended Staff report via PowerPoint with these comments:

- The Stage II Final Plan Phase 1 plan showed a bit more detail about what the maintenance building would look like. The building would have a number of bays for servicing trucks, a little bit of office space on the west side, and as mentioned, some employee parking for the new portion of the site.
- Also discussed in the Staff report, particularly pertaining to circulation was the barrier represented by what was becoming the middle of the site where trucks were entering the building to unload. The grade change associated with that entrance made it very difficult to walk or drive across that part of the site and he believed Staff had acknowledged that was an existing condition that could be worked around in other ways.

Mr. Pauly added when it came to parking required for the new use, existing Code language talked about parking spaces needing to be accessible and usable in order to be called parking. As a result of the discussed barrier, parking on the east side of the site could not really be called usable for the new use on the west side, which was why a condition required additional striping of parking on the west side, so someone parking would not have to walk through garbage trucks backing up.

Mr. Liden continued with the report, noting the area where the container storage would be moved farther to the west from where the proposed maintenance building's location. The landscape and half street improvements would be discussed in the other resolution.

Mr. Pauly stated that because outdoor storage was associated with Phase 1, the high screen standard was required along the section of Ridder Rd and the portion of Garden Acres Rd within the city, so landscape screening would keep the containers from being seen from the street

Mr. Liden continued, displaying diagrams showing the location of the new detention pond and water treatment facility, which was a new feature for the site. The traffic analysis completed for the property determined that the traffic impact would be very minimal and was not a particular issue.

Mr. Pauly noted the issues and impacts on the improvements came with the future phase. The Applicants stated they were fine with right-of-way and what was proposed, and would be dedicating the land for future street improvements with Phase 1 as a condition of approval. Besides that, Ridder Rd could handle the traffic associated with Phase 1.

Mr. Liden continued with the Phase 1 Site Design Review, noting the building elevations were included in the application packet. The architecture, finish materials and colors were consistent with the existing buildings and Staff found them to be appropriate for this use and building.

- The Landscaping Plan was in compliance with Code requirements for trees and landscaped islands. Landscaping along the third driveway would also help buffer the site from truck parking and so forth from Ridder Rd. Plantings along the street and plantings along the south side of the parking and truck parking areas would also help keep the vehicles out of view.

Mr. Pauly noted Staff did not have a good picture for the Phase 1 landscaping, but it was important to realize that two areas with existing landscaping were actually being changed with Phase 1 and most of the planned landscaping would happen with Phase 2. For Phase 1, the maintenance building was being built in an existing paved lot and the Applicants would hold off on the parking lot landscaping until it was expanded out. They had discussed completing the parking lot and building Phase 2 within it, but the Applicant had expressed that working in an existing pad rather than pulling out parking and building everything with Phase 2 brought construction challenges.

- To provide access to the new storage area, the Applicant was taking out some landscape trees with Phase 1 and much of the landscaping had to do with the new detention pond, which would be landscaped. Many more site changes would come later, but as part of Phase 1, there would not be much more landscaping outside of removing the landscape trees and landscaping the new detention pond.
- He stated there were no issues with outdoor lighting as it met Code requirements.

Mr. Liden stated the Type C Tree Plan indicated in total what potentially would be removed when the different development actions took place. The trees being removed were primarily involved trees installed as part of the landscaping from before.

Mr. Pauly added a Type A Tree Removal Permit had been issued for three trees toward the middle of the site because the Applicant was eligible and was working on an agreement for early grading to meet some deadlines. The other trees were being protected during early grading until any approval was final for Phase 1. One unrelated tree on the east side of the site was being worked into this approval because of its hazardous condition.

Mr. Woods asked what the reasoning was for the six new bicycle racks shown on the Phase 1 Site Plan.

Mr. Pauly replied that involved an existing condition of approval. He explained that the recently adopted Code with the Transportation System Plan (TSP) update included new bicycle parking requirements. Originally, the Applicant proposed putting the required bicycle parking by the existing office, but the barrier created by the trucks entering the building would result in insufficient pedestrian connection to the maintenance building. The decision was ultimately up to the Applicant to place the parking by the existing office, but with Phase 1, Staff required that the bicycle parking required for this particular use be near the maintenance building. Staff would work with the Applicant on the exact location.

Mr. Woods noted the applicant's report included an objection to having bike lanes and he wondered how there could be bicycle parking on the premises when an objection to having a bicycle lane existed; the two did not seem to coincide to him.

Ms. Jacobson stated the bike lanes were one issue that would be resolved with the Phase 2 negotiations.

Mr. Pauly said generally speaking, no one business would generate enough bike traffic to be related to six more feet of right-of-way necessarily; it related to the general network of bicycles. Although not a lot of truck drivers were expected to be riding their bikes to work, Staff wanted to allow that opportunity while also providing safety, as discussed by Nancy Kraushaar in Exhibit A6. With all of the big trucks, providing a through connection for bicycles and additional protection from heavy truck traffic was important in a growing industrial area that would likely have more and more truck traffic on Ridder Rd.

Mr. Liden added that building bike and pedestrian infrastructure was sometimes a building block approach in which sometimes there was nothing for a while, because different pieces are completed that are needed and as the City had the opportunity to do so. One factor affecting this application was that Kinsman Rd would be coming through with bike lanes at some point and would be reasonably close. The City was considering other improvements and over time, there would be a more bike friendly opportunity. He agreed it was not exactly the best bicycling area right now.

Chair Karr asked if there was any challenge or confusion in the fact that the new container storage area and detention pond were in Washington County.

Mr. Pauly answered no, the standards would be the same related to that for the Board's purposes, adding the only area involving Washington County was how system development charges were collected and reimbursed.

Chair Karr confirmed the Wilsonville Code still applied to the area even though it was in two different counties.

Chair Karr called for the Applicant's presentation.

Ben Altman, SFA Design Group, 9020 SW Washington Square Rd, Suite #505, Portland, OR 97223, representing the Applicant, Republic Services, noted Derek Ruckman, General Manager for Republic, was also present at tonight's meeting. He believed Staff had done a good job summarizing what Republic

was doing with the split phasing and staging, adding the easy part of the process was Phase 1 and he believed the Applicant complicated the project when they decided to add Phase 2. The Applicant discerned Phase 2 would be necessary sooner rather than later, so the Applicant decided to go ahead and obtain approval for that as well. The Applicant was working out all of the details with Staff and would return next month.

- He clarified the whole site was located in Washington County; the county boundary ran down the center of Ridder Rd. Not being addressed at all right now were two additional lots to the north that were also in Washington County and not currently in the city yet.

Chair Karr asked if the whole site was in the City of Wilsonville.

Mr. Altman replied yes, but the two lots to the north were not. The entire site, the Phase 1 and Phase 2 area before the Board, was within the city. The development plan being reviewed by the Board tonight and next month would result in a full build out of the property inside the city now and at some point the Applicant would be back to talk about the area to the north, but annexation and some other steps needed to be done first.

- Phase 1 was fairly simple and the Applicant supported all of Staff's findings and conditions linked to this phase. For the most part, the Applicant supported those in Phase 2 as well, but just had a few issues that were being resolved.

Chair Karr confirmed there were no questions from the Board and called for public testimony in favor of opposed and neutral to the application. There being none, there was no Applicant rebuttal. He called for Board discussion.

Dianne Knight said she was a little bit confused on the Garden Acres Rd landscaping and asked if anything needed to be done with it tonight or if that was part of Phase 2.

Mr. Pauly responded as part of Phase 1, the Applicant was dedicating the right-of-way, so Staff knew where the right-of-way line would be. The proposed storage area would be visible from Garden Acres Rd, so the screening along Garden Acres Rd was part of Phase 1 and part of what the Board was deciding tonight.

Chair Karr asked if any conditions of approval accounted for that.

Mr. Pauly replied yes, Condition PDP 3 required the Applicant to put in screening on Garden Acres Rd that matched would be put on Ridder Rd. The area shown in yellow would be a matching screen.

Ms. Jacobson asked if that was the revision in the Staff report that talked about the Applicant bringing the finalized plan?

Mr. Pauly replied yes, noting a screen shown in the Landscape Plan was all vegetation, but that might need to be shrunk down to make the site design work with the additional right-of-way. The Code allowed some options for a slotted fence versus shrubs, essentially allowing the Applicant to have their landscape architect design the appropriate screen and have that reviewed administratively. He confirmed Exhibit A5 talked about that.

Chair Karr closed the public hearing at 7:18 pm.

Chair Karr moved to accept the amended Staff report with the addition of Exhibits A4, A5 and A6 Dianne Knight seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Cheryl Dorman moved to approve Resolution No 278. The motion was seconded by Jhuma Chaudhuri.

Chair Karr confirmed approval of the resolution included a Stage I Master Plan revision, as well as the Stage II Final Plan, Site Design Review, and Type C Tree Plan for Phase 1; nothing was being approved for Phase 2.

The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Karr read the rules of appeal into the record.

The Board proceeded to Agenda Item VIII Board Member Concerns and Communications.

B. Resolution 279. Republic Services Expansion Phase 2 Improvements: SFA Design Group – representative for Republic Services –owner. The applicant is requesting a Stage II Final Plan, Site Design Review and Type C Tree Plan for phase 2 improvements consisting of new office expansion, parking area, container storage area, and driveway from Ridder Road along with associated improvements. The site is located on Tax Lots 1400 and 1500, Section 02C; T3S-R1W; Washington County; Wilsonville, Oregon. Staff: Keith Liden and Dan Pauly

Case Files: DB14-0033 – Stage II Final Plan
DB14-0034 – Site Design Review
DB14-0035 – Type C Tree Plan

This agenda item was addressed following the Consent Agenda.

Chair Karr called the public hearing to order at 6:41 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.

Barbara Jacobson, Assistant City Attorney, noted for the record that both the Applicant and Staff agreed additional work was needed to get the conditions of approval ready for the Board's consideration and that the hearing should be continued to the June DRB Panel B meeting.

Chair Karr moved to continue Resolution No 279 to the DRB Panel B meeting on June 23, 2014 date certain. Aaron Woods seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

VIII. Board Member Concerns and Communications

A. Results of the May 12, 2013 DRB Panel A meeting

IX. Staff Communications

X. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:22 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

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