

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING

MONDAY, APRIL 22, 2024

6:30 PM

Consent Agenda:

1. Approval of minutes from the March 11, 2024 DRB
Panel A meeting



**DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD PANEL B
MEETING MINUTES**

March 11, 2024 at 6:30 PM

City Hall Council Chambers & Remote Video Conferencing

CALL TO ORDER

A regular meeting of the Development Review Board Panel A was held at City Hall beginning at 6:30 p.m. on Monday, March 11, 2024. Chair Jean Svadlenka called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

CHAIR'S REMARKS

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

ROLL CALL

Present for roll call were: Jean Svadlenka, Clark Hildum, Rob Candrian, and Jordan Herron. Yara Alatawy was absent.

Staff present: Daniel Pauly, Stephanie Davidson, Kimberly Rybold, Amy Pepper, Amanda Guile-Hinman, Miranda Bateschell, Georgia McAlister, Sarah Pearlman, and Shelley White

CITIZENS INPUT – This is an opportunity for visitors to address the Development Review Board on items not on the agenda. There were no comments.

CONSENT AGENDA

1. Approval of Minutes of the February 12, 2024 DRB Panel A meeting

Rob Candrian moved to approve the February 12, 2024 DRB Panel A meeting minutes as presented. Clark Hildum seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

2. **Resolution No. 422. ParkWorks Industrial Building and Partition.** The applicant is requesting approval of a Stage I Preliminary Plan, Stage 2 Final Plan, Site Design Review, Type C Tree Removal Plan and Tentative Partition Plat for development of an industrial spec building with accessory office space and associated road and site improvements at 26600 SW Parkway Avenue.

Case Files:

DB22-0009 ParkWorks Industrial Building and Partition

-Stage 1 Preliminary Plan (STG122-0007)

-Stage 2 Final Plan (STG222-0009)

- Site Design Review (SDR22-0009)
- Type C Tree Removal Plan (TPLN22-0007)
- Tentative Partition Plat (PART22-0002)

This item was continued to this date certain at the February 12, 2024 DRB Panel A meeting.

Chair Svadlenka called the public hearing to order at 6:36 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, ex parte contact, bias, or conclusion from a site visit. No board member participation was challenged by any member of the audience.

Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager, reminded that this hearing had been continued at the January 8, 2024 meeting to a date certain of February 12, 2024, where it was continued to a date certain of March 11, 2024.

Georgia McAlister, Associate Planner, announced that the criteria applicable to the application were stated starting 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 and on the City's website.

Ms. McAlister presented the Staff report via PowerPoint, noting the project's location and list of applications, as well as the updates and revisions made since the initial hearing with these key comments:

- The proposed ParkWorks building would be constructed on Future Parcel 5 within the existing Parkway Woods development and Future Parcel 6. A significant portion of the northeast section of the existing parcel was within the Significant Resource Overlay Zone (SROZ). Future Parcel 5 was currently greenfield with some parking. The site was designated Industrial in the Comprehensive Plan, and surrounding land uses included Industrial to the north, east, and south with the I-5 freeway to the west. (Slide 2)
- All five applications before the DRB tonight were objective in nature, as they all involved verifying compliance with Code Standards. As a continued hearing, she noted she would not review the applications in detail. (Slide 3)
- Several changes had been proposed by Staff and the Applicant since the original hearing which included updates to the northwest corner façade and associated condition of approval, as well as a different approach to ensuring street improvements along Parkway Ave and Printer Parkway were completed in association with the proposed development.
- Being adjacent to the I-5 freeway, the proposed project would be a prominent building in Wilsonville and one of the first large industrial developments seen by travelers heading south on I-5. Due to the prominence of the building and lack of variety in materials and color on the corner of the proposed building, Staff recommended improving its design to reflect the City's goal of harmonious development.
- Three different designs for the building's northwest corner were shown. The top image was the first design submitted to the City for review with the northwest corner originally intended to be painted gray with little variation in color or material, making its massing overwhelming in scale. Therefore, the City asked the Applicant to work on a design that would better meet the objective of

harmonious development within the city as stated in the Wilsonville Development Code Section 4.400 and 4.412(.03). (Slide 6)

- In response, the Applicant proposed a perforated screen treatment, as seen in the rendering labeled Revised Design, which was accepted by the City.
- Upon further discussion, the Applicant noted the screen would be an additional cost significant enough to impact the project. Understanding that the City's Site Design Standards were intended to improve design without burdening an applicant with excessive cost, the Applicant's team submitted a redesign that relied solely on paint for the enhanced design as opposed to a variation of materials or articulation.
 - After discussion, the Applicant agreed that Staff would create a condition of approval that required the addition of architectural articulation and/or variation in materials at the northwest corner of the building in order to enhance the appearance of the building and the site from offsite locations.
- At the December 11th hearing, the Applicant raised concerns regarding the proposed condition of approval and whether the condition would result in further land use review due to lack of specificity. Staff heard the Applicant's request, and with the hearing continued, reached out to the Applicant's team to collaborate on a new condition of approval or façade design that met the standards in the Development Code. City Staff contacted the Applicant to collaborate and proposed two conditions of approval, but no feedback was provided by the Applicant.
- On March 4, 2024, the Applicant sent Staff the proposed design in the rendering shown on Slide 7, and now included in the packet as Exhibit B7, as well as a proposed condition of approval, essentially conditioning the design as shown in the proposed rendering.
 - Because the updated design was submitted on the same date as the meeting packet's publication, Staff was unable to incorporate the proposal into the Staff report and provide feedback to the DRB regarding whether the proposal met the objectives and standards outlined in the Code.
 - The proposed design relied on a variation of color and gray paints, mature landscaping for screening, and a monument sign not yet reviewed and approved by City Staff. The Applicant requested the inclusion of the proposed design for the review of the DRB. (Slide 7)
- Staff proposed revising Condition of Approval PDC 7 for the northwest façade as follows, "**Prior to Non-Grading Building Permit Issuance:** To meet the objectives and standards of Section 4.400(.01) to (.02) and 4.421(.03) the applicant shall submit revised architectural elevations for the northwest corner of the property to include additional architectural treatments. Treatments shall include ~~the incorporation of materials used at the entrances of the building, or substantially similar, for the purpose of façade articulation breaking up the massing of the building~~ **metal panels used at the entrance of the building (MP-1) applied in place of the areas painted Dark Marmalade (PT-7), breaking up the façade and uniform massing of that corner of the building.**" (Slide 8)
 - The condition of approval would result in the use of a variety of materials and colors and avoid drab and dreary design while utilizing materials already proposed on the building as to not add excessive cost.
- The City's Transportation System Plan (TSP) helped to ensure the City developed and operated consistent with its goal and vision. Two high-priority projects identified in the TSP were directly adjacent to the subject project. At the December 11, 2023 hearing, the Applicant had objected to the required road improvements along Printer Parkway and Parkway Ave. The required road

improvements included the standard half-street improvements required with development along non-urbanized roads. (Slide 9)

- The Applicant's objection to the City's required improvements regarded proportionality. Prior to and at the December 11, 2023 hearing, the Applicant stated that in their opinion, the cost of requirements as set forth in the Staff report and associated exhibits were not proportional to the impact of the proposed development and therefore would be considered a taking as defined in the Fifth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution and Article I, Section 18 of the Oregon Constitution.
 - In response to the Applicant's objections, the City assessed the rough proportionality of the impact of the project in multiple ways, which was included in the rough Proportionality Analysis included in Attachment A2. It was important to note that proportionality was in relation to what portion of the improvements were the financial responsibility of the Applicant versus what portion of the improvements were the financial responsibility of the City. All improvements were necessary to be constructed for the proposed development to be safely served by the street network.
- Following the December 11, 2023 hearing, the Applicant and City Staff resumed negotiations regarding the improvement requirements. Staff and the Applicant agreed to move forward with a Local Improvement District (LID) to guarantee the construction of the road improvements along Parkway Ave and Printer Parkway. With that decision, discussion of proportionality was no longer relevant to the approval of the subject application. For clarity, a response to the Applicant's objections to the City's Proportionality Analysis was included with the case record as Exhibit A5. (Slide 10)
 - An LID was a financing mechanism that can create capital for construction of infrastructure and covered an area in which one party, typically a city, built infrastructure that benefitted multiple property owners. The cost of the infrastructure was divided among those property owners in an equitable manner and was paid by an assessment.
 - The LID created a lien against each individual property until all assessments were paid in full, and the lien created a secure income stream against which the City could issue a bond debt. The LID debt was always issued by a government agency, taking advantage of lower interest rates.
- While the LID had not yet been formed, Condition of Approval PF 2 ensured the LID would be formed in a timely manner. The scope of the LID was not yet fully established but would include the portions of Parkway Ave adjacent to the ParkWorks project and Printer Parkway with the possibility to expand the LID beyond the subject project's site. (Slide 11)
 - To ensure that an LID was formed and the required improvements were completed in a timely manner, City Staff proposed updating Condition PF 2, stating, "Within 90 days of the Land Use Decision prior to submittal of any City permits, or prior to Final Plat Review, whichever occurs first: A waiver of remonstrance against formation of a local improvement district (LID) shall be recorded in the Clackamas County Recorder's Office as well as the City's Lien Docket."

Chair Svadlenka confirmed there were no questions for Staff and called for the Applicant's presentation.

Christe White, Radler White Parks and Alexander, stated she was the land use counsel for the Applicant, SKB, and that the Applicant's representative, John Olivier was on vacation and attending via Zoom.

- At the prior hearing, the Applicant had contested the Public Facilities conditions of approval, as well as the condition of approval related to the design of the building's northwest corner addressed earlier by Staff.
- Staff and the Applicant had conducted several productive meetings on the public facilities conditions of approval. The Applicant had made a record in this proceeding of their objections to the City's Dolan analysis and the calculation of proportionate share. She reiterated the Applicant's belief that the City's findings on essential nexus and rough proportionality were not correct. The Applicant believed they had demonstrated on the record that their percentage impact was much lower than the City's estimate. Even with that disagreement, both parties agreed that the Applicant could not be made responsible for 100% of the improvement when their impact was only a proportionate share.
 - Subsequently, the City responded with a different analysis on Dolan, but both the Applicant and the City agreed that in a case such as this, where the Applicant had a low percentage share of the improvements not sufficient to build out all of the requested improvements that an LID was a highly effective means to complete the work. As such, the Applicant had agreed not to remonstrate against the formation of an LID to complete the work.
- The City was aware that through the LID, the Applicant would be mindful to not exceed their proportionate share; however, the LID would allow the Applicant to pull in other entities that would also benefit from the subject improvement that served other properties.
 - Subsequently, the Applicant had received very positive feedback from at least two major landowners of adjacent properties who were interested in participating in the LID.
- The LID solution was an example of working out a problem that would have otherwise prohibited the subject development, and the Applicant had worked cooperatively with the City to reach what they believed was a far superior result. The project could be built with all of its benefits to the city, and a fair funding mechanism could be tapped to resolve what would have otherwise been a financially infeasible and disproportionate result.
- She thanked the City Attorney and the City's Design and Public Facility Staffs for rolling up their sleeves and finding this path through the process because in so many cases, that did not happen. Everybody was willing to figure out what else could be done to solve the problem, and she believed they had reached a very fine result.

Amalia Mohr, Principal, LRS Architects stated she was the Project Manager of the proposed ParkWorks development. She explained that her brief presentation would provide additional insight into the design and illustrate how the Applicant was addressing Wilsonville design standards. The Applicant was excited for the opportunity to enhance the ParkWorks campus and believed the new facility could attract new companies and additional jobs to the region. She reviewed the Applicant's presentation via PowerPoint with these comments:

- Since the 1970s, the area had been home to innovative industry leaders, including Twist Bioscience, Xerox, and 3D Systems. The Applicant's goal was to use the proposed development as an opportunity to update and elevate the ParkWorks campus while providing new opportunities to the Wilsonville community.

- The site was located along the I-5 corridor at the Parkway Ave/Printer Parkway intersection. Existing buildings neighboring the site included the ESS building and a 300,000 sq ft business park, and the Applicant had referenced the scale and materiality of that neighboring context with their design. It was important to note the simplicity of the neighboring buildings and the subtlety of the architecture of the campus as a whole, against which the Applicant was able to create a bolder design.
- The proposed development would consist of approximately 90,000 sq ft of research and development manufacturing facility, which would include an approximately 20,000 sq ft two-story office space and entrances at the building's southwest and northeast corners.
 - The building had been strategically oriented to emphasize the prominent tenant entries on the corners while de-emphasizing the loading docks along the east and away from the main street and highway.
- The Applicant team had worked tirelessly with the owner and their brokerage team to create a site that was functional to both the tenants and their customers who visited the facility. The site itself, and its prominence on the corner, lent itself to being visible on all sides of the building.
 - As the Applicant further developed the building's interior to make it highly functional for future tenants, the south portion of the building was dedicated to office use and windows were introduced to bring in plenty of natural light for the occupants and to activate the façade at the building's main entry.
 - The façade was also the most visible portion of the building due to its proximity to the northbound traffic along I-5 and Parkway Ave.
- The need to respond to the market's demands included a need for a second tenant to occupy the building. By studying the site and access via Printer Parkway, the second tenant entry was articulated in the northeast corner of the building. While a defined entry was designed, it was important that the entry was smaller and did not compete with the main tenant entry along the south façade. The tenant entries were also directly tied to the entries into the site via Printer Parkway and SW Parkway Ave. The direct adjacencies to the entry to the site, and therefore, the tenant entries, were directly correlated.
- With the tenants' locations and the loading determined on the site, the necessary and required utilities, including the electrical and fire riser rooms in the building, were located in northwest corner due to its proximity to the public utilities along Parkway Ave, as well as the need for fire and service access to the spaces from the parking lot. Through work on similar buildings, the Applicant had learned the importance of having the electrical service be located close to the street to accommodate the potential size and service requirements of future manufacturing tenants.
- Site improvements also included added and enhanced landscaping, bioswales, and updated parking in accordance with zoning requirements.
- The Applicant's design concept for the building was to create a visually interesting and compelling building within a campus of brick buildings with dark windows. The Applicant wanted to honor the existing architecture of the campus, while also celebrating the rhythm of the adjacent highway. The Applicant utilized a design principal of visual gradient to provide interest from both the highway and pedestrian views.
 - After studying the building's façade in countless ways, the Applicant decided the rhythm and variation were particularly compelling along the location of the I-5 Corridor. Whether at a walking pace or traveling 60 miles per hour, the design offered contrast and movement.

- The contrast was apparent in the bold tenant entries, which had been articulated with rust-look metals panels and steel canopies, tying back to the steel and brick design of the neighboring campus buildings. It was important to note that the contrast was a way of finding the tenant entries, something that was vital to a successful building and project, and the same elements had been applied to the secondary tenant entry at the northeast corner.
- The northwest corner of the building, located at the cross streets of ParkWorks Ave and Printer Parkway, housed the electrical and fire riser rooms required for the tenant to successfully use the facility. It was not a tenant entry corner and was meant to be subtle in nature. She noted the tenant entry shown on the left side of the image was articulated due to tenant wayfinding.
 - After studying many design options for the northwest corner, the Applicant believed deviating from the visual pattern would hinder the attention to the overall campus and the tenant entries. (Slide 6)
- The Applicant partnered with Staff, who was particularly interested in the design of the corner. Iterations included other materials and treatments, yet the Applicant believed they all distracted from the overall design intent and focused too much on a corner that merely housed basic utility functions for the building.
- Throughout the process, Staff had mentioned the ability to emphasize the corner with enhanced landscaping, and the Applicant believed that idea truly embraced the design intent and welcomed employees and visitors to the ParkWorks campus seamlessly and naturally.
 - The team worked with the landscape architect to select mature trees that were within City guidelines to create a natural transition from street to building. The maturity of the trees focused the attention to the tenant entries and concealed the utility functions in the northwest corner.
- The Applicant believed any articulation would be lost and unseen with the landscaping, and as such, the landscaping was the perfect treatment for the northwest corner. Any articulation along the street side of Target on SW Parkway Center Dr would be unseen due to the foliage of the trees as they matured. (Slide 7)
- Because the northwest corner was a major entrance to the ParkWorks campus, the Applicant was committed to making the corner as welcoming as possible. For example, the corner was designed to accommodate campus signage, which would be submitted separately under a Signage Permit in the future.
- The Applicant's design intended to reflect and elevate the existing ParkWorks campus while also embracing the design standards of the Development Code.
 - The Applicant looked forward to working in partnership with the City of Wilsonville to provide a unique development that could bring new opportunities and additional jobs to the city and its communities.

Rob Candrian asked how long it would take the newly planted trees at the northwest corner to reach the level of maturity depicted in the displayed rendering. (Slide 7)

Ryan Craney, Architect, LRS Architects, stated he had worked with the landscape architect on the design and they had determined it would be roughly 10 to 15 years for those specific species of trees to reach that level of growth. He noted that the specific image displayed only showed the trees on the

site; however, additional street trees would provide additional screening from Parkway and I-5. (Slide 7)

Ms. Mohr added the trees being installed on the subject property were more mature than what was normally installed on day one for other developments so, the Applicant could follow-up about the height of the trees as they were installed.

Mr. Candrian asked why the Applicant had changed from having an architectural design on the northwest corner as initially depicted in the renderings to using landscaping features instead.

John Olivier, SKB, explained that the renderings the DRB had seen were not an official submittal of what the Applicant wanted to do. Because the northwest corner of the building was back-of-house and an area that ultimately would be covered by landscaping, the Applicant did not want that corner to compete with the actual campus entry feature, like the monument sign and so forth. The Applicant had never intended for the northwest corner to have any kind of metal panel or screen.

- When Staff had originally cited the architectural standards that the Applicant had to comply with, it involved avoiding designs that were drab or dreary.
 - The Applicant tried to work through that with Staff and evaluated different options, and the options the Board members had seen were not actually formal submittals that the Applicant wanted approved, but simply the Applicant indicating to Staff the different design options they were evaluating. The Applicant had not settled on doing a particular metal screen or panel; they were just items that the Applicant was evaluating.
 - Ultimately, given that the northwest corner was back-of-house and considering the overall design of the building and the site itself, the Applicant felt it was more important to focus on enhanced landscaping so that the eye was drawn to the ParkWorks campus entry features and not an odd design on the corner of the building that would be mostly obscured over time.
 - The landscaping option was not a design change as the Applicant had always intended a design similar to the subject proposal. They had simply been trying to work through Staff's concerns.
- He understood the Applicant was possibly at odds with Staff's desires due to a very subjective standard and Staff having their own opinion about that standard, but the Applicant had relied heavily on their architects' vision of what the building needed to be. At the end of the day, the building was industrial, and he believed the Applicant had designed a very handsome building that met the standards.

Mr. Candrian understood the trees at the northwest corner were deciduous and would be barren for part of the year, which defeated the purpose of screening.

Mr. Craney stated that although he could not recall which ones, some of the trees were coniferous, not deciduous, which he could verify with the drawings. He believed the information was included in the submitted package.

Ms. Mohr added the goal was that the trees along that corner would have leaves year-round.

Ms. White clarified that the leaves of deciduous trees fell off in the fall, but evergreen trees kept their leaves year-round.

Chair Svadlenka stated that was important to confirm because it would make a big difference. She understood that in the 10 to 15 years it took the trees to mature, the only articulation on the northwest corner was the gray paint.

Ms. Mohr replied that was correct, adding there were windows higher up to allow light into the space for the employees within the building, but the design intent was to create a flow and rhythm utilizing paint. The Applicant was very adamant in their design to not take away from the tenant entry. In studying the building from many different angles, it was apparent that anything they added very much took away from the tenant entries, which were located farther from the northwest corner. Visitors needed to wayfind and properly locate themselves. The Applicant did not want anything to distract behind the welcomeness component of the corner and the future signage.

Chair Svadlenka understood signage would assist people in finding the building entrances, so that would not necessarily matter.

Ms. Mohr agreed; however, the Applicant did not want the northwest corner to be layered with a lot of different elements that would be cumbersome to those visiting the site. With the variety of landscaping, including trees, shrubs, and grass, as well as the signage component, the Applicant did not want to add another layer behind that which would be covered up in 10 years like it was in the Target space.

Mr. Candrian noted if one of the theoretical designs were used, the Applicant would not have proposed so many trees there because they would cover any architectural element; however, the trees were only going there because the Applicant had decided against an architectural element.

Ms. White agreed the two options were alternatives of each other. She noted if the landscaping option was something the DRB would entertain, there were two other issues to discuss.

- Certain kinds of elements, such as the metal treatments on a corner with an electrical room behind it were a financial investment that was something of a concern for the subject project.
- Evergreen plantings were often preferred if a certain building element was of concern. If the Applicant was addressing the drab and dreary standard, then landscaping would add a green infrastructure layer to the northwest corner.
- Should the DRB go in the direction of landscaping, parameters should be enacted to ensure evergreen, not deciduous, plantings were used and covered a certain percentage of the corner in different layers at the outset, and then continued to grow and cover more of the corner over time.

Mr. Candrian asked if the cost difference between installing screening and extra foliage had been investigated.

Mr. Olivier noted that street trees were also being installed, adding that metal screening panels would cost approximately \$250,000 to \$400,000, depending upon the size of the screen and the materials used. The Applicant had spent a lot of time working through the metal panels on the two building entries and had elected to spend good money on the façade and the areas with the highest degree of visibility, such as the south entry, which was closest to I-5 northbound. The landscaping was a much more cost-effective solution for the area as it was back-of-house.

Ms. White added that to give the metal screening any kind of oomph and visibility from drivers on I-5 southbound traveling 60 mph, given the height of the building and to clear the entrance doors to the utilities, the screening panels would have to be 20-ft to 25-ft tall and wrap around the corner by about 30 ft on either side, resulting in the extreme cost.

- She confirmed the building would also be visible from the frontage road, not just the freeway, as well as to pedestrians.

Chair Svadlenka asked if the cost of the metal paneling on the southwest and northeast corners was \$400,000 each.

Mr. Olivier replied he did not recall the specific breakout for each of the corners, but confirmed they were within that order of magnitude because of the nature of the treatment.

Chair Svadlenka stated her concern was that there were still building standards for using various materials and colors on such a prominent and public corner, and even more so if deciduous trees were chosen or a tree needed replaced, which would make the northwest corner more visible for another 10 to 15 years. The application currently had a condition of approval that required the northwest corner to have a variation of materials and color. She asked if the Applicant had considered that condition of approval and how to work within it.

Ms. White replied yes, noting the discussion was how to work with that condition of approval in terms of the ultimate treatment of the northwest corner, which would be more intimately visible at slower speeds from the frontage road or by a pedestrian. Passers-by at ground level would have a more intimate view looking up at trees rather than a metal panel on the corner of a building. With a building so large, she was unsure a metal panel would change a pedestrian's experience with the architecture, more than a tiered and layered evergreen, not deciduous, planting plan that was robust at introduction and then grows further. Personally, she would rather walk by and see multi-layered street trees going into evergreen trees and shrubbery, rather than a metal panel.

- In terms of cost, softening, wayfinding, the whole collaboration of the proposed building in relation to other buildings, and how people would be experiencing it, evergreens did not seem like a bad call and would certainly respond to something being drab or dreary.

Mr. Candrian believed that was the issue, drab and dreary was subjective. Continuous gray, even if different shades of gray, combined with the often-gray Oregon sky, could be somewhat drab.

Clark Hildum understood the building was basically a giant concrete tilt-up. He asked if it could be built elsewhere on the property and some smaller, less offensive buildings built along the frontage.

Ms. White replied that with regard to Staff's approval of the building, tonight's conversation was focused on the northwest corner. The process was beyond discussions about building something else. The proposed project met the Industrial zoning, and the users needed this type of building in an industrial zone in Wilsonville, not smaller, broken-up buildings.

Mr. Hildum responded it was a spec building, so no users were demanding it. The Applicant was building it to rent it out and make a lot of money, while Wilsonville was stuck with an ugly building.

Ms. White explained the building was the required footprint for a manufacturing and production use. Although developers sometimes built on spec, the Applicant would not build without first identifying tenants in the queue to ensure this building could be utilized in this footprint; otherwise it would be a wasted effort for everyone.

Mr. Olivier elaborated that the Applicant had purchased the Xerox campus in 2015. At the time, it had approximately 350,000 sq ft of office and call center space. The Applicant had specifically tried to lease that out for almost three years to no avail. Once the space was converted to work with industrial and flex use, consistent with the current zoning, they were able to land Twist Bioscience. There was definitely a need for this type of product, and the Applicant was developing a project consistent with the zoning and that catered to the most desired elements of the industrial user community to ensure success on leasing out the building.

Ms. White stated that was a long response to Chair Svadlenka's question about what the Applicant was going to do about the condition of approval. The Applicant was giving the DRB their best pitch on what they wanted to do with the northwest corner, but because Staff had a different view, they had collectively decided to bring it to the Board to make a decision on how to go forward with the northwest corner of the building.

Mr. Olivier stated the Applicant had proposed a condition, but it had never gotten into the packet.

Chair Svadlenka confirmed with the Applicant that the proposed design was the only design they were proposing, and there were no alternates.

Chair Svadlenka called for public testimony regarding the application and confirmed with Staff that no one was present at City Hall to testify and no one on Zoom indicated they wanted to testify.

Mr. Hildum asked the length of the west wall, as well as the size of the building's footprint.

Ms. Mohr responded the footprint was 90,000 sq ft.

Mr. Candrian asked for an estimated cost of the project.

Mr. Olivier replied the total cost of the project was about \$30 million.

Ms. Mohr stated she could follow up with the building's dimensions, noting confirmed it did meet the development standards for the length and height of an industrial building.

Mr. Olivier believed the height was approximately 28 ft to 30 ft, but he was unsure of the parapet height.

Ms. Mohr clarified the building was 35 ft tall.

Mr. Candrian asked if Staff's recommendation for approval was to have something physically on the northwest corner of the building itself as opposed to assorted foliage obscuring it.

Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager, clarified Condition of Approval PDC 7 addressed the matter and was at the top of Page 11 of 52 of the Staff report, which would be amended since the condition had not been numbered.

Kimberly Rybold, Senior Planner, noted Condition PDC 7 had been modified due to concern about a lack of specificity. With conditions regarding building design, Staff did not want to condition another land use review on an issue that should be part of the subject land use decision, so the specificity added to the condition looked at using a similar design element of the metal panels used in the entry areas in areas that were painted the Dark Marmalade color shown on the elevations previously included in Exhibit B2, not the revised Exhibit B7 that would be in the plan set.

Mr. Pauly explained if an Applicant wanted to change a condition of approval that came into effect, the City had a specific process and fee for an Applicant to request the modification of a condition of approval and only that specific condition would come before the Board for approval, not the entire project.

Mr. Candrian stated he was concerned with approving the modified condition of approval as worded. He did not believe anyone would want a couple of corrugated metal panels that were painted marmalade thrown up. He believed more specificity would be useful for both the City and the Applicant.

Ms. Rybold understood it might be hard to visualize what the elevation would look like, but essentially the panels could be anything painted that color on the general dimension of that corner, and that the panels would be used as an alternate to the area painted that color on the plans.

Mr. Candrian understood the metal panels should not be flush with the building as their intent was to break up the look.

Ms. Rybold replied that was right, inherently the panels added that dimensionality to the northwest corner. She noted if the Board wanted to add further specificity, there could be some discussion about what to include in the motion.

Mr. Pauly asked if further specificity meant referencing the other corners more clearly.

Mr. Candrian explained if the City required something that was metal and orange, the Applicant might slap something up that was metal and orange to comply. While the Applicant would not want their building to be ugly, they would also pursue the most cost-effective route which might not satisfy what the City was looking for without the condition being more specific.

Ms. Rybold noted the Materials Legend was on Sheet A501 on Page 3 of Exhibit B2, which might help to visualize the northwest corner. Referencing the Applicant's proposed design for the building's northwest corner, she noted the area painted in a color that mimicked the metal panels located at the entrance. The intent was that the metal panels installed on the northwest corner would match the metal panels used elsewhere on the building. When reviewing building plans, Staff would check the specifications included for that paneling to ensure that it matched.

- Staff had pulled the modified language for Condition PDC 7 from Sheet A501. If the Board wanted to get more specific about the northwest corner or its description in the condition of approval, Staff could work on some language for that as well.

Mr. Pauly displayed Sheet A501, which included the Materials Legend.

Mr. Candrian believed everyone agreed on the framework of what the northwest corner would include, if not exactly what it would look like.

Mr. Pauly asked if it would be helpful to reference the Materials Legend in the condition of approval to prevent future confusion.

Ms. Rybold believed it would provide abundant clarity in the record.

Mr. Candrian asked if that meant stating something in Condition PDC 7 about being consistent with the Materials Legend and the design outlined in Exhibit B2.

Mr. Pauly suggested adding "*as referenced on Sheet A501 of Exhibit B2*" to the additional language in the parentheses referencing MP-1 and PT-7 of the modified Condition PDC 7.

Mr. Candrian confirmed the LID was acceptable to everyone, noting the Applicant's team provided positive head nods from the audience.

Chair Svadlenka confirmed there were no further questions or discussion and closed the public hearing at 7:37 pm.

Rob Candrian moved to approve the Staff report with the amendments discussed by the Board and read into the record by Staff. Clark Hildum seconded the motion.

The following correction and amendment were made to Page 11 of 52 of the Staff report:

- Number Condition of Approval PDC 7.
- Add the following additional language to Condition PDC 7, “....metal panels used at the entrances of the building (MP-1 *as referenced on Sheet A501 of Exhibit B2*) applied in place of the areas painted Dark Marmalade (PT-7 *as referenced on Sheet A501 of Exhibit B2*), breaking up the façade....”

The motion passed 3 to 1 with Clark Hildum opposed.

Rob Candrian moved to adopt Resolution No. 422 with the Staff report as amended.

The motion was seconded by Jordan Herron and passed 3 to 1 with Clark Hildum opposed.

Chair Svadlenka read the rules of appeal into the record.

3. **Resolution No. 430. Boeckman Creek Primary School Readerboard.** The applicant is requesting approval of a Class 3 Sign Permit and Waiver for a new electronic reader board sign at Boeckman Creek Primary School.

Case Files:

DB23-0009 Boeckman Creek Primary School Reader Board

-Class 3 Sign Permit (SIGN23-0009)

-Waiver (WAIV23-0002)

Chair Svadlenka called the public hearing to order at 7:44 p.m. and read the conduct of hearing format into the record. Chair Svadlenka, Jordan Herron, and Rob Candrian declared for the record that they had visited the site. No board member, however, declared a conflict of interest, ex parte contact, bias, or conclusion from a site visit. No board member participation was challenged by any member of the audience.

Sarah Pearlman, Assistant Planner, announced that the criteria applicable to the application were stated starting 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 and on the City’s website.

Ms. Pearlman presented the Staff report via PowerPoint, briefly noting the site’s location and providing the following comments:

- The proposed cabinet and reader board sign would replace the existing cabinet and manual reader board at the northwest corner of the property.
- The site was zoned Public Facility (PF), and surrounding uses include residential, zoned Planned Development Residential Zone 2 (PDR-2), PDR-4, and PDR-5 to the northwest and south, and County agricultural uses zoned Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) to the west.
- The existing sign was approved in 2005 with an area of 32 sq ft and 6 ft in height. The current application proposed to update the cabinet portion of the sign with new copy and logo and to

replace the manual reader board with an electronic reader board similar to electronic reader board signs at other schools throughout Wilsonville, including Wilsonville High School, Meridian Creek Middle School, and Wood Middle School. (Slide 2)

- Proper noticing was followed for the application. Notice was mailed to all property owners within 250 ft of the subject property and published in the newspaper. Additional postings were placed on the site and the City's website. (Slide 3)
 - No public comments were received during the comment period.
- One of the two requests before the DRB tonight was objective in nature, as it involved verifying compliance with Code Standards. The other involved discretionary review, as it was a waiver for the changeable copy sign.
- The requests for the Class 3 Sign Permit and Waiver applied to the monument sign for Boeckman Creek Primary School at the northwest corner of the property and would allow replacement of the existing cabinet and manual reader board with a new cabinet and electronic reader board of the same size. The existing manual reader board was shown hatched in red, and the Applicant planned to use the existing supports for the new sign. (Slide 6)
 - The existing previously-approved monument sign conformed to standards set forth by the Code; however, the electronic message board was not permitted without an approved waiver.
- Changeable copy signs were listed as prohibited signs in Subsection 4.156.06 (.01) D of the Development Code with language added that allowed the granting of a waiver as long as specific criteria were ensured or conditions were met. (Slide 7)
 - The criteria included that the sign be equipped with automatic dimming technology to adjust the sign's brightness in direct correlation with ambient light conditions, and the sign owner assured appropriate functioning of the dimming technology for the life of the sign.
 - Additionally, the luminance of the sign could not exceed 5,000 candelas per square meter between sunrise and sunset and 500 candelas per square meter between sunset and sunrise. By definition, changeable copy signs must maintain a copy hold time of at least 15 minutes.
 - While these signs were grouped under prohibited signs, the intention of the Code was to make the signs conditionally permitted, but because no conditionally permitted sign section existed currently, these signs were grouped in the prohibited sign section as that was where language regarding these signs previously existed in the Code.
- The Applicant had provided response findings to the waiver criteria addressing why the conversion to an electronic reader board conformed to the waiver requirements. Additionally, conditions of approval were included in the Staff report to ensure those criteria were met.

Chair Svadlenka called for the Applicant's presentation.

Tony Montoya, Project Manager, Meyer Sign Co., 15250 SW 74th Ave, Tigard, OR, 97224 stated the company was the Applicant applying for the Class 3 Sign Permit and Waiver on behalf of Boeckman Creek Elementary School PTA.

- The project itself was pretty simple. The sign was just being swapped out to give an overall update to the school's capabilities. Advantages of the new electronic message unit included communication with parents and increasing safety standards; given in climate weather and even active shooters, staff would not have to physically go out to change messages on the sign, which could be done via cell phone with the new unit.

- The Applicant had also done the sign at Wood Middle School, so the company had experience with these projects.

Mr. Montoya confirmed that the upper portion of the sign would be static and contain the new logo for the school, and the bottom portion only would contain the electronic messaging.

Chair Svadlenka called for public testimony regarding the application and confirmed with Staff that no one was present at City Hall to testify and no one on Zoom indicated they wanted to testify.

Clark Hildum understood the new sign would be roughly the same size as the old sign and match the one at Wilsonville High School.

Mr. Montoya stated he could not speak to the sign at the high school, but the subject sign was consistent with the sign it was replacing.

Chair Svadlenka confirmed there were no further questions or discussion and closed the public hearing at 7:58 pm.

Rob Candrian moved to approve the Staff report as presented. **Jordan Herron** seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Rob Candrian moved to adopt Resolution No. 430 including the approved Staff report. The motion was seconded by **Clark Hildum** and passed unanimously.

Chair Svadlenka read the rules of appeal into the record.

BOARD MEMBER COMMUNICATIONS:

4. Results of the February 26, 2024 DRB Panel B meeting
5. Recent City Council Action Minutes

There were no comments.

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager, stated that Panel B had only three members for the March 25th meeting, which should be fine, but he would appreciate having someone in the queue in case the Board ultimately lacked a quorum that evening.

Clark Hildum stated he should be available.

Mr. Pauly confirmed only one application was on the agenda a new office building on Wilsonville Rd.

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 8:01 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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

DRAFT