

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING
MONDAY, AUGUST 10, 2026
6:30 PM

Consent Agenda:

1. Approval of minutes from the July 13, 2026 DRB Panel A meeting



**Development Review Board Panel A
Regular Meeting Minutes
July 13, 2026**

Wilsonville City Hall & Remote Video Conferencing
<https://www.ci.wilsonville.or.us/meetings/DRB-A>

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Galloway called the meeting to order at 6:31 pm.

CHAIR'S REMARKS

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

ROLL CALL

Present: Alice Galloway, Jordan Herron, Mitch Cooper, and Janis Sanford

Excused: None.

Staff Present: Kimberly Rybold, Alie Cloo, Amy Maag, Chris Myers, Hannah Tuia, Miranda Bateschell, and Shelley White

CITIZEN INPUT

There was none.

CONSENT AGENDA

1. Approval of minutes of the June 8, 2026 DRB Panel A meeting

Jordan Herron moved to approve the June 8, 2026 DRB Panel A meeting minutes as presented. Mitch Cooper seconded the motion, which passed 4 to 0. (Ayes: Herron, Sanford, Cooper, Galloway. Nays: None.)

PUBLIC HEARING

2. **Resolution No. 447. Spring Terrace Tract A Open Space.** The applicant is requesting approval of a site design review for site improvements in the Tract A Open Space in the Spring Terrace Subdivision

Case Files:

DB26-0002 Spring Terrace Tract A Open Space
-Site Design Review (SDR26-0001)

Chair Galloway called the public hearing to order at 6:37 p.m. and read the conduct of hearing format into the record. All Board members declared for the record that they had visited the site. No board member, however, declared a conflict of interest, bias, or conclusion from a site visit. No board member participation was challenged by any member of the audience.

Associate Planner Tuia 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.

Associate Planner Tuia presented the Staff report via PowerPoint, briefly noting the site's location and reviewing its background and the requested applications as follows:

- During the subdivision's DB20-0039 approval process in 2020, in response to public comment, the open space was relocated from its initial location in the northern portion of the site to its current location along the southern border of the site. The approval required the Applicant to return to the DRB with a Site Design Review application at a later point, which they did in 2023 and received approval. (Slide 3)
 - Since the 2023 DRB approval, the Applicant entered into a compliance agreement, and platted the property as required by that approval, but ran into constructability issues that required a redesign of the open space. The compliance agreement required taking that redesign before the DRB again, which was the proposal before the Board tonight.
- Proper noticing was followed for the application with the public hearing notice mailed to property owners within 250 ft of the subject property, as well as onsite posting and publication in The Review. Three public comments were received and entered into the record as Exhibits D1-D3. (Slide 4)
- A Site Design Review was the only request before the DRB tonight. A discussion of key, clear and objective development standards that applied to the proposed application was included in the findings contained in the Staff report. The role of the DRB was to verify compliance of the proposed application with previous development approvals and the clear and objective standards of the current Code. No requests in the current application required discretionary review. (Slides 6-7)
 - The originally approved design included a ramped pathway from the public right-of-way that provided access to the Tract A Open Space, but that design conflicted with a stormwater easement, which prompted the redesign of the open space.
 - The new design proposed an ADA compliant walkway that extended to a small, raised deck with benches. The walkway was in lieu of the ramped pathway that extended over the stormwater easement.
 - A soft surface path in the new design extended in a looped configuration farther into the open space area with additional benches. No changes to pedestrian circulation and access outside of the open space were proposed with the current application.
 - The open space had been professionally designed by a credentialed professional, met all applicable landscape and Site Design Standards, and conformed with the Site Design Review Criteria for open space in residential subdivisions.
 - Design submissions from the Applicant showing the proposed benches, as well as a rendering of the deck, were displayed. Pedestrian access would come from the right of the pedestrian bridge elevation shown, and access would be mostly level for ADA accessibility.

Mitch Cooper thanked Staff for the outstanding detail in the Staff report. He noted that the neighboring property owner on the southern border of Tract A, Tax Lot 1100, was concerned about people being able to see into their yard and understood some original large trees would remain and a 6-ft-tall fence and plantings would be put in place. He asked what the height of the deck was compared to the ground before it sloped down toward the creek.

Associate Planner Tuia deferred to the Applicant, who could better address questions about the grading and deck configuration.

Chair Galloway called for the Applicant's presentation.

Jennifer Arnold, Project Manager, Emerio Design, LLC, stated she had nothing prepared that was not discussed in the Staff report but was available for questions, noting that the deck was approximately 8 feet from finished grade to the top of the platform and in line with the driveway of Lot 1. The path went down, around, and underneath the platform at approximately the existing grade.

Janis Sanford stated it was difficult to discern from the rendering any screening trees or plantings that would be grown between the platform and the neighboring property owners' row of homes and asked why a viewing bridge was placed at that location versus farther down the hill overlooking Boeckman Creek.

Ms. Arnold responded that the design team had wanted to create a gathering space but like the first design, it had to be ADA compliant, so the raised deck spanning the easement was the solution they arrived at; the proposed bench on the deck would face the open space to the east and not the neighbors to the south to provide as much privacy as possible. The homes in that area would be much more intrusive than the platform, which was farther up, much farther back, and would have new plantings in front of it along with existing trees that would be preserved.

Chair Galloway asked what the platform was overlooking.

Ms. Arnold responded that the platform overlooked the landscaped area, which included a play area and picnic area. Parents could stay up on the platform and still have a close eye on young children playing and running around the path below.

Chair Galloway asked if the proposed site was the original site for the gathering space.

Ms. Arnold responded that the initial design placed the gathering space slightly over from the current location, but farther down on the ground and closer to grade. Grading and placing structures, while also trying to achieve ADA-compliant access down to the area created a conflict, and the current raised deck design was the compromise.

Chair Galloway noted the gathering space itself was ADA-compliant but accessing the platform area from the street was not.

Ms. Arnold confirmed that regrading the site to achieve ADA access to the platform as well as all the way down into the Tract A area was incredibly costly and challenging.

Chair Galloway responded that as a result, she did not expect a lot of ADA traffic in that area.

Ms. Arnold replied that the open space was intended for the whole community, but given how tucked away it was, the residents in the immediate area would likely use it the most, and while she did not know what their accessibility needs would be, the design team had wanted to provide some sort of recreational activity or opportunity. She confirmed ongoing maintenance of the open space would be the HOA's responsibility and that a composite decking material was being considered to keep maintenance costs and needs low.

Ms. Sanford stated that she did not have a specific question, but was hoping for more information, as she wanted neighbors to retain as much privacy as possible while still providing the recreational opportunity. She had visited the location, which was quite hilly and she recognized the challenge that presented but Tract A would also be backed up against the homes' 20-ft setbacks. She asked if any other versions of the design had been considered.

Ms. Arnold explained that the design team went through several rounds with the landscape architect to ensure adequate screening was provided as much as possible with trees, knowing that an 8-foot vertical distance had to be covered with widespread canopy in order to block the view, which was the goal, so they kept moving tree planting locations around while not planting new trees in the existing canopy that would also interfere with existing tree roots.

Ms. Sanford asked Ms. Arnold to identify which plantings on the Site Design Review were the larger trees that might provide screening.

Ms. Arnold replied that the two bigger trees south of the viewing platform were the largest canopy trees for that particular spot. Additionally, there were smaller trees and shrubs and another large, existing tree they did not want to get too close to.

Chair Galloway asked how many steps it would take to complete the walking trail.

Ms. Arnold replied she had not personally walked it to know the step count. She confirmed it was a meandering trail primarily meant to enjoy nature, but people could also use it as part of their running route, for example.

Chair Galloway called for public testimony regarding the application.

Brenda Troupe stated she had lived in the same house for 32 years and the proposed development ran the entire length of her backyard. After the developer cut down the trees and shrubbery along the property line, her entire backyard was exposed to the vacant property.

- Over the years, there had been numerous changes to the original plan, including building five, high-end houses. The current plan to build four duplexes and a 4-plex required an ADA compliant pathway to the open space. The first pathway design did not pass Code, and the proposed redesign included a pedestrian bridge and viewing deck that ran from the top of the street, straight down the hill, and ending with a view of her backyard.
- The proposed height of the viewing deck was 8 feet over the steepest part of the slope, approximately 10 feet in elevation from the ground. She questioned how high the structure would actually be, noting the proposed pedestrian bridge and viewing deck sounded like something that would be found in a wildlife viewing area, not something found in a new development. She questioned what people would be able to view besides her backyard, patio, and bedroom windows.
 - She believed the developer already knew how ludicrous the platform would look because she understood he had proposed screening plantings between her property and the platform; however, a small grove of mature trees over 10-feet tall would be necessary just to reach the platform height and screen her property from view.
- At past City Council meetings, the City maintained that it wanted to see a development that fit into the existing neighborhood. Four duplexes and a 4-plex with a footbridge and towering 10-foot platform did not meet that criteria.
- Because this was a public green space accessible by anyone, including children from other neighborhoods, she was concerned whether a platform 10 ft off the ground with only a 3-ft railing was safe for children who could climb. While the design was ADA compliant, it appeared unsafe for children.
- Repositioning the platform at a 45-degree diagonal towards Boeckman Creek made more sense, as it would centrally-locate the platform within Tract A and provide a better viewing experience of the natural environment instead of viewing her backyard.

Joan Carlson stated her neighborhood on Vlahos Drive had been dealing with this development for over five and a half years, and none of the neighbors were new to the goings-on, which included numerous changes and frustrations over the years.

- In the past, her backyard had been dug up right next to her chicken coop to facilitate a storm drain easement, resulting in huge piles of dirt on her property. Now, neighbors were being asked to accept a viewing platform that seemed unnecessary, noting there should be a different option for ADA compliance that did not result in the platform looking into their backyards.
- Her backyard was finally fenced off two summers ago, but in the original plan, the fence was supposed to extend all the way up behind the other neighbors' homes, which did not happen.
 - Additionally, Page 16 of the Staff report stated that the last 25 feet of the proposed fence was to be located within the SROZ buffer area, which also did not happen, so

people in the open space could come right around the corner and be in her backyard. She would like the fencing continued.

- She also noted that the existing fencing had required multiple repairs, by her, because boards had fallen off or gone sideways, creating an ongoing issue.
- She expressed appreciation for Hanna Tuia, Amy Maag, and all the people the neighbors had been working with over the years, adding she hoped the City would continue to stay on top of the developer because she and her neighbors have been through a lot and were tired of the mess and the promises made that were not kept.

Helena Lulay stated as a 30-year resident of Wilsonville, she believed it was important to share some background information with the Development Review Board (DRB). Her home of 30 years backed up to the proposed Spring Terrace development and the neighborhood has been uncomfortably dealing with this property behind their homes for the past six years.

- Historically, the 2.2-acre property consisted of a modest single-family home with a garden and a horse. In 2020, the developer's vision to change the zoning occurred, with the plan spreading across two plots and then changing to one plot.
 - In April of 2021, there was a plan to have eight homes on the lot. Due to incorrect density calculations, that was changed to five lots in May of 2021. The plan then changed again to place four duplexes and one 4-plex on the lot, resulting in basically 12 homes sandwiched between the four homes that backed up to it and a \$2 million home on the other side.
- The neighbors had lived with and watched the infrastructure being built, as well as the property going up for sale for \$2 million in November of 2025 and back up for sale again for \$2.5 million in June of 2026.
 - Only two things had changed during that time. The property owner was now Jamestown Construction, and the DRB was comprised of different people than the Board the neighbors had dealt with in the past.
 - The Applicant and previous owner, Scott Miller, now worked for Jamestown Construction, the current owner. Unfortunately for Mr. Miller, he had been dealing with the property since the beginning, as well as with the concerned residents impacted by the development, including herself.
- The neighbors understood that the development was happening, but wanted the development to mirror the neighborhood, for the trees in the SROZ to be truly protected, for the agreements that were discussed and made in countless meetings with the City and the Applicant to be honored, including placing fencing the length of the total property and not just along Tract A, for the arborvitae to be protected along with the trees, for quality buildings that were within Code, and for a viewing deck eight feet off the ground to not be facing their homes.
- Neighbors' homes, and what they had all worked so hard to protect and preserve in their neighborhood and community, should not lose value because of a developer's desire to profit. The neighbors were asking the Board to make decisions to the benefit of everyone and to consider what would have the least impact on the long-term residents who were vested in the community.

- The developer was already benefiting because the site was labeled an Opportunity Zone, and he reaped many financial benefits from that designation. The residents, however, were there for the long haul. While they understood that change and development happened, that should come with accountability. She thanked the Board members for their time.

Chair Galloway confirmed there was no further public testimony and called for the Applicant's rebuttal.

Ms. Arnold clarified that the fence would be built as conditioned during construction and that the team would ensure the trees were protected and that all planting in the SROZ conformed to the compliance agreement.

Chair Galloway asked why the platform was proposed in the subject location when clearly the neighbors were very unhappy with that. She inquired about other planning options, noting the Applicant was part of a neighborhood.

Ms. Arnold replied that the Applicant understood they were part of a neighborhood. While they could forego the platform, without it, the park would not be ADA compliant. The only way to achieve ADA-compliant access to the area in general was either through the current proposed platform or the previous proposal with the bridge over the stormwater easement.

Chair Galloway asked if a few homes could be removed from the plan to allow the Tract A open space to be moved to a flat area.

Ms. Arnold replied unfortunately, no.

Senior Planner Rybold explained that the lots were already approved and not subject to the application at hand. She confirmed that the scope of what the DRB could approve was limited to the open space Site Design Review.

Ms. Sanford asked if there was a requirement for the amount of ADA compliance that must be provided for the tract.

Senior Planner Rybold understood the ADA requirement was triggered as part of the Public Works standard.

Development Engineering Manager Maag responded that she did not know the specific ADA requirement, but typically, the City did not allow any kind of structure over its easement areas to prevent the City from having to reconstruct anything if City workers need to access City facilities. The condition of approval required the stormwater easement agreement to be modified to make it clear that the facility will need to be constructed so that it was easy to take

apart and be rebuilt by the HOA, and that it would not be the City's responsibility going forward. [Condition PFA2]

Ms. Sanford asked to see where the easement areas were located on the property, noting she hoped to see a more suitable area for the open space to be located.

Development Engineering Manager Maag explained that the easement was located on the northern part of the site along the property line and then went down by the creek. The tract itself was not connected to the street, so the 15 ft easement had to be crossed no matter what and the grade changed significantly when crossing the easement.

Mr. Cooper asked if the planned space and height of the platform was already at the minimum required for ADA compliance or could it be reduced or made less intrusive for the neighbors.

Development Engineering Manager Maag replied the Applicant could address whether the platform itself could be shrunk down, she understood the Applicant likely wanted to ensure a wheelchair had turning space as well as space for seating. She confirmed that ADA required a pretty flat surface, a 2% grade did not give much grade difference, especially when there were steep slopes like along the bank.

Chair Galloway asked if there was a requirement for railing height, noting the concern a neighbor had voiced regarding child safety and children potentially climbing over the railing.

Development Engineering Manager Maag responded that the railing height was a Building Code standard, the minimum of which was 4 ft to ensure children did not climb over. The railing height would be confirmed before issuance of the required building permit.

Associate Planner Tuia displayed the Tract 'A' Path & ADA Ramp Grading Plan & Profile as requested. (Meeting Packet, Page 65)

Ms. Sanford noted the location of the currently proposed boardwalk going over the easement at the northwest corner of Tract A, and the stormwater pipeline easement extending south on the east side of the site. She said it was unfortunate that the easement location necessitated the current platform placement, as the east side of the site had the least dramatic grade change. She asked whether it was appropriate for Board members to brainstorm ideas for changes or if the Board should simply ask the Applicant to come up with a different design.

Senior Planner Rybold responded that Board members could ask the Applicant questions or about ideas; however, the Board could not ask for a redesign on anything that met the Site Design Review standards but could suggest and discuss conditions of approval that the Applicant might be agreeable to help satisfy some of the concerns that had been raised.

- She clarified that the Building Code would dictate the railing height, and that the Building Division would review and address the Applicant's plan if it only showed a 36-inch railing.

The DRB could add a condition to ensure the railing was at least 4 ft, but if the Building Code specified 4 ft that was what the Building Division would require.

Chair Galloway stated it was strange that ADA compliance was required on the open space tract when there was no ADA-accessible walkway to get from the street to the park.

Development Engineering Manager Maag clarified that a concrete path that met ADA requirements ran from the sidewalk at the street to the decking, crossing Lot 1. She confirmed the ADA sidewalk at the street was shown as Item 4 on the Tract 'A' Grading Plan & Profile. (Meeting Packet, Page 65)

Jordan Herron asked if there was room to accommodate an increase in tree density between the viewing deck and the backyards of the homes, noting it was unclear from the mapping.

Senior Planner Rybold noted there were approximately five existing trees in the area, and it appeared the existing tree canopy was taken into account when the Landscape Plan for new trees was developed. Increasing tree density might not be technically possible because too many trees eventually compete with one another and none do well long term. She deferred to the Applicant in terms of how that was approached but noted the idea was to ensure that any trees reviewed and approved in the Landscaping Plan would be able to fill in and mature.

Chair Galloway stated it would have been helpful to see a more visualized version of what the design looked like with trees, the platform, and the walking path.

Ms. Sanford asked if the Applicant could be asked to add an artistic screen on the southwest point of the viewing deck to block the view directly into the backyards while still giving users the full vision eastward down the rest of the tract.

Senior Planner Rybold responded that the Board could inquire about that; however, the added condition would need to have enough specificity about the extent and design of the screen. While the language could be worked out, load had to be taken into consideration with structures like the platform, and she suggested seeking input from the Applicant on whether it was technically feasible for the deck to support such a screen.

Mr. Cooper asked if the homes to be built on the five lots were two-story homes.

Senior Planner Rybold replied that the Applicant had submitted building plans for some of the lots and while building permits had not yet been issued, she believed the homes were two stories high.

Mr. Cooper asked if the windows on the upper floors of the proposed homes would have the same visibility into the neighboring yards as the platform.

Senior Planner Rybold responded that although the homes would be located in a slightly different location, it was possible the second-story windows would be higher than the platform.

Ms. Sanford noted the windows on Lots 2 through 5 would face the apartment complex, not the SW Vlahos Drive cul-de-sac.

Chair Galloway asked how a condition of approval could be added, such as for the screen.

Senior Planner Rybold replied the Board could discuss that now, noting that any other questions of the Applicant should be asked before the public hearing was closed and before motions were entertained. All information pertaining to any additional conditions of approval or modifications to the Staff report the Board was contemplating should be gathered while the hearing was still open.

Chair Galloway asked Ms. Sanford to provide more detail on her idea of a screen.

Ms. Sanford asked the Applicant to come forward and address the feasibility of adding a privacy screen to the platform and any experience the Applicant had with such art installations.

Ms. Arnold replied that although she did not have personal experience with art installations, it would be a cool project; however, the Applicant's team had not looked into that option on the subject project. The Applicant had asked the landscape architect to maximize the plantings on the south side of the platform to mature up and be a screen and that the trees planned in that location be tall enough at planting to provide some initial screening. The railing would meet Building Code at a minimum, but if it needed to be taller, the Applicant would make it taller.

Chair Galloway confirmed there were no questions or discussion and closed the public hearing at 7:24 pm.

Jordan Herron moved to approve the Staff report as presented. Mitch Cooper seconded the motion.

Ms. Sanford stated she did not believe the Board was ready to approve the application with no changes based on the Board's questions.

Senior Planner Rybold confirmed the motion would approve the Staff report as presented, including all the findings and conditions contained within it as well as what was presented by Staff.

The motion passed 3 to 1. (Ayes: Herron, Cooper, Galloway. Nays: Sanford.)

Jordan Herron moved to adopt Resolution No. 447. Mitch Cooper seconded the motion, which passed 3 to 1. (Ayes: Herron, Cooper, Galloway. Nays: Sanford.)

Chair Galloway read the rules of appeal into the record.

BOARD MEMBER COMMUNICATIONS

3. Results of the June 22, 2026 DRB Panel B Meeting
4. Recent City Council Action Minutes

Staff noted the June 22, 2026 DRB Panel B meeting regarded an application to rezone 33 undeveloped acres on the Sysco property and to develop an additional 380,000 square foot refrigerated warehouse facility, as well as EV trucking spaces, a buildout of SW Parkway Avenue to include bike lanes, a pedestrian walkway, and a much wider street. The finished road would be approximately 1,400 linear feet short of a full connection on SW Parkway Avenue. Additionally, two-thirds of the Wiedemann Trail between SW Parkway Avenue and SW Canyon Creek Road would be constructed as part of the project.

Chair Galloway asked if there was any new information about combining DRB Panels A and B.

Senior Planner Rybold responded that at the June 15th City Council meeting, Ordinance 903 was adopted to go into effect on July 1, 2026 and included the Development Code changes regarding the updated Residential Review requirements discussed with both DRB Panels earlier in the year. Additionally, the Ordinance updated City Code language about transitioning the DRB Panels to a single panel of seven members beginning in 2027. City Council would reconvene at a later date, tentatively in August, to discuss and provide feedback on the reappointment process for the consolidated Panel. She confirmed that Panel B had five members, Panel A had four, and no one on Panel A was scheduled to term out prior to consolidation. Staff would follow up with Board members at the next DRB meeting about any initial direction received.

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

Senior Planner Rybold stated DRB Panel A would convene in August.

ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 7:32 p.m.