

**DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING
MAY 8, 2023
6:30 PM**

Consent Agenda:

1. Approval of minutes of April 10, 2023 DRB Panel A meeting



**DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD PANEL A
MEETING MINUTES**

April 10, 2023 at 6:30 PM

Wilsonville City Hall & 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, April 10, 2023. Vice Chair Hildum called the meeting to order at 6:34 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: Clark Hildum, Rob Candrian, and Yara Alatawy. Jean Svadlenka and Jordan Herron were absent.

Staff present: Daniel Pauly, Amanda Guile-Hinman, Kimberly Rybold, Cindy Luxhoj, Zach Weigel, 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 March 13, 2023 DRB Panel A meeting

Rob Candrian moved to approve the March 13, 2023 DRB Panel A meeting minutes as presented. Yara Alatawy seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

2. **Resolution No. 413. Precision Countertops Project.** The applicant is requesting approval of a Stage 1 Preliminary Plan, Stage 2 Final Plan, Site Design Review, Waiver, Class 3 Sign Permit, and Type C Tree Removal Plan for development of a 66,000 square foot corporate headquarters and fabrication facility on property located at 25540 SW Garden Acres Road.

Case Files:

DB22-0011 Precision Countertops

- Stage 1 Preliminary Plan (STG122-0006)
- Stage 2 Final Plan (STG222-0007)
- Site Design Review (SDR22-0007)
- Waiver (WAIV22-0003)
- Class 3 Sign Permit (SIGN22-00011)
- Type C Tree Removal Plan (TPLN22-0006)

Vice Chair Hildum called the public hearing to order at 6:41 p.m. and read the conduct of hearing format into the record. Vice Chair Hildum 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.

Cindy Luxhoj, 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.

The following exhibit was entered into the record:

- Exhibit B7: Updated arborist report dated April 4, 2023 from Teragan & Associates, Inc.

Ms. Luxhoj presented the Staff report via PowerPoint, briefly reviewing the site's location and surrounding features, as well as the role of the DRB, the application review process, and the conduct of hearing process, with these additional comments:

- The Applicant's request for an annexation and Zone Map Amendment was concurrently reviewed and recently approved by City Council. The City adopted the Coffee Creek Industrial Form Based Code and Pattern Book in February 2018. The Coffee Creek Design Overlay District Master Plan Area and the Precision Countertops site were highlighted on Slide 3.
- The project had been reviewed using all the applicable standards of the Coffee Creek Form Based Code and Pattern Book and complied with the Coffee Creek Review Procedures. Consistent with review procedures of Coffee Creek, City Council had reviewed and held the first reading on the annexation and Zone Map Amendment on March 20, 2023 with the second reading on April 3, 2023. Both ordinances were unanimously approved by City Council. The appeal period for both ended on May 3, 2023.
- Proper noticing was followed for the subject 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 on the City's website. Public notice was mailed and posted on February 28, 2023, and again on March 21, 2023, in accordance with the revised review process for projects within Coffee Creek. No public comments were received during the comment period for the project.
- For the subject application from Precision Countertops, five of the six requests were objective in nature, as they involved verifying compliance with Code standards. The last request, which involved discretionary review, was for one waiver. (Slide 7)

- The Stage 1 Preliminary Plan proposed a corporate headquarters and countertop fabrication facility, 65,800 sq ft in size with a showroom, office space, storage, and fabrication spaces on roughly the western half of the property. The eastern portion of the site would remain undeveloped at present but with the possibility of future expansion. Operations would primarily include receiving, unloading, storing, cutting, and delivering kitchen countertops. (Slide 8)
- The Stage 2 Final Plan reviewed the function and design of the proposed project, including assuring the proposal met all performance standards of the PDI-RSIA Zone and the Coffee Creek Industrial Design Overlay District and Pattern Book. Based on the proposed use, 62 passenger vehicle parking spaces were required, and the project provided 71, including 15 at the front of the building facing SW Garden Acres Rd and 56 on the building's east side. The utility service and loading areas were located at the back of the building on its east side. (Slide 9)
- Roughly 26.9% of the project site was landscaped with plantings on all sides of the building, along all street frontages, around the perimeter of the parking areas, and in the wayside, required by the Coffee Creek Form Based Code along Garden Acres Rd. The eastern portion of the site was not proposed for development with the current application and would be maintained in its natural state. Landscaping occupied approximately 26.4 % of the west parking area and 18.8% of the east parking area.
- Proposed site improvements met or exceeded City standards for parking, circulation areas, pedestrian connections, landscaping, utilities, outdoor lighting, and other site features. The subject property was bounded on the west by addressing street SW Garden Acres Rd and on the north and east by required Supporting Streets as shown on the Coffee Creek Regulating Plan, Figure CC-1. The Applicant proposed the construction of half-street improvements for the required Supporting Street within a public access and utility easement along the north boundary of the site to the east extent of the site development area.
 - Initially, the Supporting Street would include an interim driveway access on Garden Acres Rd that would transition to a driveway off the Supporting Street when the property to the north was developed in the future. The proposed configuration met the minimum driveway spacing and curb-to-curb distance requirements on the primary frontage and created the planned intersection at SW Garden Acres Rd and the Supporting Street. The Supporting Street would be extended in the future to intersect with a second Supporting Street on the site's east boundary when that half of the property was developed. (Slide 10)
- The traffic study evaluated two intersections, including SW Garden Acres Rd/SW Ridder Rd/SW Clutter St, and SW Ridder Rd at SW 95th Ave. All intersections would remain at Level of Service (LOS) C or better, which exceeded the minimum standard of LOS D. The development would add an additional 43 PM Peak Hour trips, 13 into the site and 30 out, with a total of 294 daily trips. Of the additional trips, 19 new PM Peak Hour trips were estimated to pass through the I-5/Elligsen Rd interchange area, and two PM Peak Hour trips through the I-5/Wilsonville Rd interchange.
- With respect to Site Design Review, the Applicant used appropriate professional services to design structures and landscaped areas on site using quality materials. A metal building was proposed that would utilize several different profiles and textures of insulated exterior

panel in finish colors ranging from Teton and cool zinc gray to dark bronze. The variety of textures and colors would help break up the building planes and would define the base, body, and top of the structure. An 8-ft-high wrought iron fence with access-controlled gates was proposed to secure the loading and utility areas at the back of the building while allowing routine surveillance by police without requiring them to enter and circulate within the secure area of the site.

- The Applicant's landscaping plans complied with or exceeded the General Landscape or Low Screen Landscape Standard along SW Garden Acres Rd and the required Supporting Street. Loading berths would be screened with the High Screen Landscaping or, where located indoors, to the High Wall Standard. Landscaping along the Supporting Street also helped to soften the profile of the building along the street. No trees were proposed along the south side of the building, as numerous mature offsite trees would be retained in that area that reduced the likelihood of newly-planted trees growing or thriving in the understory.
- The proposed industrial wayside was located at the northwest corner of the building between SW Garden Acres Rd and the primary building entrance, providing 600 sq ft of passive recreation space. The site was landscaped on three sides, with the north side opening onto the pedestrian pathway from the sidewalk on SW Garden Acres Rd to the primary building entrance. Plantings were designed to visually define and enclose the wayside while allowing visual access for safety. (Slide 13)
- Class 3 Sign Permit. The Applicant proposed one building sign on the west front façade and two flag poles west of the main building entrance. Two flag poles to a maximum of 30-ft in height did not require a sign permit, and the proposed flag poles met the standard. No monument sign was proposed.
- With respect to the building sign, the Standards required that a sign constructed of individual elements be measured using the summed area of up to three geometric shapes drawn around all sign elements. The Applicant had measured the area of each individual letter rather than using shapes around the elements. Additionally, based on the length of the west façade, the allowed sign area was 120 sq ft; however, the proposed sign exceeded that by 5 sq ft.
- The proposed sign was also within a definable architectural feature; however, it was unclear whether there was a definable space between the sign and the top and bottom of that architectural feature. A condition of approval ensured that the sign would be measured and placed correctly and adjusted as needed to comply with the standards at the time of application for sign approval.
- Type C Tree Removal Plan. Of 22 inventoried onsite trees, 4 were stumps, 2 were dead, 9 in the west portion of the site were proposed for removal, and 7 would be retained on the east side of the site where development was expected to occur in the future. Trees proposed for removal were circled with red-dashed line on and trees to be retained were shown circled in green. (Slide 15)
- Of an additional 57 inventoried trees along the south property boundary, most were offsite, but some had not been determined to be onsite or offsite. All 57 trees were proposed to be retained and protected during construction. The Applicant's Tree Removal Plan included tree protection fencing around the root zone of the retained trees to protect them during

construction. The Applicant proposed planting in excess of 40 trees in landscaping throughout the site, which exceeded the one-for-one mitigation requirement.

- The application included a request for one waiver which involved discretionary review by the DRB. Per the Development Code, waivers must implement, or better implement, the purpose and objectives of the Planned Development Regulations. Further, in cases where the applicant elected to apply for the waiver track, instead of the clear and objective track within Coffee Creek, the Design Guidelines, including Intent Statements and other contents within the Pattern Book would guide approval of the project. The DRB may approve or deny the requested waiver based upon review of evidence submitted by the applicant. The requested waiver related to Table CC-3, Site Design Review, in the Development Standards Table in Section 4.134 (.11) of the Coffee Creek Industrial Design Overlay District Standards for parcel driveway width on a Supporting Street.
- The Applicant requested to waive the parcel driveway width standards for the east site access from the Supporting Street. The driveway was proposed to be 40-ft wide, which exceeded the maximum driveway width of 24 ft with the allowed 20% adjustment. Per the Applicant, the wider driveway was necessary to accommodate truck operations for turning requirements, movement, circulation, and safety considerations, and to provide access to the utility and loading area on the east side of the building. (Slide 16)
- With respect to the waiver criteria, the project was designed to conform to the Regulating Plan with addressing street SW Garden Acres Rd on the west and a Supporting Street on the north property boundary. As the Coffee Creek Design Overlay District Standards did not allow driveways on addressing streets, the site must take access from the Supporting Street. To accommodate truck traffic and turning movements at the east driveway, it must be wider than the allowed width. A narrower driveway would constrain truck-turning movements, leading to congestion on the Supporting Street from wide turns and/or queuing as trucks waited to enter the driveway. The Applicant specifically requested this waiver to allow flexibility in design that responded to site-specific features and conditions of the project.

Rob Candrian confirmed the waiver request was the one issue on which the DRB had latitude and asked what the original reasoning was to limit driveways to 24-ft wide.

Kimberly Rybold, Senior Planner, explained the Code Standards were developed in part to create a more connected, campus-like atmosphere as development occurred within Coffee Creek, so as they were devised, one of the considerations was to attempt to create a more connected area not only for vehicular traffic, but also for pedestrians, cyclists, and workers in the area. Subsequently, the intent behind the Clear and Objective Track and the Waiver Track was recognition that any development application that met all the Clear and Objective Standards could be evaluated administratively while waivers recognized that there might be some types of developments that had different needs and the waivers could allow for that. Development applications coming in for Coffee Creek were for industrial activities more so than they were for office or flex uses, which could also be considered for the area, and industrial activities had more truck traffic, which by nature had a greater turning radius. She believed the initial set of standards had not contemplated that.

Mr. Candrian asked if this type of waiver had been granted to other applicants previously.

Ms. Rybold replied it had been applied for with one other application in the past couple of years.

Vice Chair Hildum called for the Applicant's presentation.

Will Grimm, First Forty Feet, 412 NW Couch St, Portland, OR 97209 stated that he represented the client in the planning and regulatory process and thanked the Board and Ms. Luxhoj for the opportunity to speak on the project. They had been working on the project for approximately a year and a half, and it represented an exemplary model of what they were trying to develop in Coffee Creek while taking into account the progressive requirements and policies for transportation, being well-connected, and creating a network of streets that were walkable and bikeable. Vehicles also could be driven in the area, and there was industrial traffic, but they had paid attention to the area being well-connected. The Coffee Creek policies addressed that as well.

- This would not be a typical industrial area. It would be special, and they understood that through the Form Based Code, their team had addressed that very well. They had saved as many trees as they could and also created more areas of shade and canopy onsite. Landscape design was important, addressing climate action, and open spaces for employee respite was important in the design. Accessibility and circulation, safety, development connectivity and easy access, economic development and job growth, were all priorities for the project. Precision Countertops, as well as the design team, had paid attention to what the employees needed, not only in operations, but by keeping pedestrians away from traffic with clear, accessible, safe pathways and pedestrian spaces. Balancing those circulation systems was important, and it was also part of the Coffee Creek Overlay Objectives and Policies.
- They had worked very hard to get this project right, and one waiver seemed extraordinary, and it was only for the width of access. He believed the Applicant had done a great job, and concluded stating the team was ready to answer any questions Board members had.

Vice Chair Hildum asked if there were any plans for rain water mitigation.

Karl Koroach, TM Rippey Consulting Engineers, stated for stormwater mitigation, there was a large water quality treatment and detention pond located at the west side of the building. Additionally, three, smaller water quality treatment planters were located along the private road, and medium-sized planter located off the northwest corner of the building. Consequently, all the runoff from the site and the Supporting Street was mitigated per City and County standards both in terms of water quality and quantity, or flow rate.

Yara Alatawy asked if the south road was a dead end or connected to Garden Acres Rd.

Mr. Grimm replied that it was solely a fire access road.

Mr. Koroch added that the eastern portion was strictly for fire access coordinated with the fire marshal's office. There was a secondary portion gravel road that extended further west for maintenance of the water quality facility located west of the building. Neither road was connected to Garden Acres Rd.

Mr. Grimm stated that Garden Acres Rd access was restricted, so the southern portion was extended to protect the integrity of pedestrian walkability along Garden Acres Rd.

Vice Chair Hildum 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. Candrian confirmed Board members would be voting on the recommendations and approving them, as they were pro forma and complied with the Code, with the exception of the waiver.

Ms. Alatawy asked if mechanical, electrical, and plumbing was included in the present discussion.

Mr. Pauly explained that was reviewed by the building official afterwards. If there were concerns that impacted the two-dimensional site plan, that could be brought up. Staff would take note of anything else and pass it along to the building official.

Vice Chair Hildum confirmed there were no further questions or discussion and closed the public hearing at 7:19 pm.

Rob Candrian moved to approve the Staff report as written with the addition of Exhibit B7. Yara Alatawy seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Rob Candrian moved to adopt Resolution No. 413, including the approved Staff report. The motion was seconded by Yara Alatawy and passed unanimously.

Vice Chair Hildum read the rules of appeal into the record.

Vice Chair Hildum called for a brief recess and reconvened the meeting at 7:30 p.m.

3. **Resolution No. 415. Primary School in Frog Pond.** The applicant is requesting approval of a Stage 1 Preliminary Plan, Stage 2 Final Plan, Site Design Review, Class 3 Sign Permit and Waivers, and Type C Tree Removal Plan for construction of a new primary school on property located at 7151 SW Boeckman Road.

Case Files:

DB22-0012 Frog Pond Primary School

- Stage 1 Preliminary Plan (STG122-0008)
- Stage 2 Final Plan (STG222-0010)
- Site Design Review (SDR22-0011)
- Class 3 Sign Permit and Waivers (SIGN22-00012)
- Type C Tree Removal Plan (TPLN22-0009)

Vice Chair Hildum called the public hearing to order at 7:30 p.m. and read the conduct of hearing format into the record. Vice Chair Hildum 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.

Cindy Luxhoj, 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.

The following exhibit was entered into the record:

- Exhibit D7: Additional public comment received via email from John Harrel dated April 6, 2023.

Ms. Luxhoj presented the Staff report via PowerPoint, briefly reviewing the site's history and noting the project's location and surrounding features, with these key comments:

- The primary school site was annexed and rezoned concurrent with the Frog Pond Estates Subdivision, and the park site was annexed and rezoned concurrent with the Frog Pond Meadows Subdivision. The subject site was zoned Public Facility consistent with the Comprehensive Plan designation of public. The new primary school was proposed as envisioned in the Frog Pond West Master Plan. The 12.6-acre property was owned by the West Linn- Wilsonville School District, and the northeastern portion was proposed to be sold to the City for use as a neighborhood park.
- Proper noticing was followed for the application, with the public hearing notice mailed to property owners within 250 ft of the subject property, onsite posting, and publication in the Wilsonville Spokesman. Six public comments were received during the comment period for the project, and an additional seventh comment, entered into the record as Exhibit D7, was received following publication of the DRB Staff report.
 - The comments expressed concerns about building orientation, site access, vehicular and bus traffic on surrounding streets, pedestrian and bicycle safety, noise and light pollution affecting existing residents, disruption to surrounding neighborhoods during construction, operation of the school, and landscaping. Public comments were forwarded to the Applicant so that they may respond during their presentation tonight.
- She reviewed the role of the DRB and the nature of the hearing process to set expectations for everyone participating in the hearing. (Slide 5)
- Four of the six requests for tonight's application for a primary school in Frog Pond were objective in nature as they involved verifying compliance with Code standards. The Class 3

Sign Permit was primarily objective but did include two waiver requests that were discretionary.

- The Stage 1 Preliminary Plan proposed a new primary school and associated improvements on the west portion of the site, as shown outlined in blue on Slide 7, and sale of the eastern portion of the site to the City for a new neighborhood park, outlined in green.
- The Stage 1 Preliminary Plan reviewed the overall development and layout for consistency with the Frog Pond West Master Plan and requirements of the Public Facility Zone. The Phase 1 development would include core facilities such as the commons, gym, library, and food service designed to support 350 students and 35 staff, as well as the eventual total enrollment of 550 students and 45 staff. Phase 1 would result in an approximately 58,138-sq-ft, one-story building, with a future phase adding 11,500 sq ft for a total building size of 69,630 sq ft.
 - The Phase 1 parking lot was proposed on the west side of the building with access from SW Sherman Dr, with a second parking lot proposed to be added in Phase 2 in the northeastern portion of the school site. Bus access was proposed on the south side of the site from SW Boeckman Rd.
 - The Stage 1 Preliminary Plan was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan Designation of public, proposed uses allowed outright in the Public Facilities Zone, and met or exceeded lot dimension and setback standards.
- The Stage 2 Final Plan reviewed the function and design of the proposed project, including consistency with the Stage 1 Preliminary Plan for a primary school and future park site.
 - With respect to traffic and queuing, the Level of Service (LOS) D standard would continue to be met by existing street improvements at the studied intersections with existing, planned, and this proposed development with the exception of the SW Boeckman Rd/SW Canyon Creek Rd intersection (# 5, Slide 9)
 - As discussed in the Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA), the SW Boeckman Rd/SW Canyon Creek Rd intersection operated at over an LOS E. The Wilsonville Transportation System Plan (TSP) already specified intersection improvements as a high priority project as part of Project UU-01.14 for this intersection. As such, the developer's Transportation System Development Charge (SDC) would contribute to the City's fund to implement the improvements and no additional offsite mitigations or conditions of approval would be necessary.
 - The new primary school would add an additional 406 AM Peak Hour trips, including 220 in and 186 out, 247 afternoon Peak Hour trips, including 114 in and 133 out, and 87 PM Peak Hour trips, including 39 in and 48 out. The proposed development was expected to generate one new PM Peak Hour trip through the I-5/SW Wilsonville Rd interchange area, and one new PM Peak Hour trip through the I-5/SW Elligsen Rd interchange area.
 - Additionally, eight school buses were included in the analysis of the transportation system. The eight buses would add 16 trips, including eight in and eight out in the AM and afternoon Peak Hours at the bus access on SW Boeckman Rd.
 - As discussed in the TIA, the main entrance and parking lot provided a drive aisle loop, as shown with red arrows on Slide 10. The loop would feature a student drop-off and pick-up curb striped at approximately 300 ft long with the potential to

accommodate up to 12 vehicles at a time for student loading when considering 25-ft of space per vehicle.

- As described in the Applicant's narrative, queuing of vehicles for student drop-off and pick-up could vary greatly depending on site layout, efficiency of parking-aid staff, and length of queuing area versus length of actual curbside loading area. The long curbside loading area and availability of additional queuing space through the parking lot, which totaled over 750 ft, was designed to prevent vehicle queues from spilling out of the site onto SW Sherman Dr.
 - The bus access provided queuing and loading areas for school buses and separated parent pick-up and drop-off from school buses. There was approximately 275 ft of curb space for buses, which had the potential to accommodate up to five buses at a time when considering 50 ft of space per bus. The school had estimated a maximum of eight buses would be needed for the school. Therefore, the TIA recommended that bus arrival and departure times be coordinated to avoid having all buses in the loading area at the same time or additional curb space be provided to accommodate all eight buses at once. (Slide 11)
- The Street Demonstration Plan in Figure 18 of the Frog Pond West Master Plan was an illustrative layout of the desired level of connectivity in the Frog Pond West neighborhood and was intended to guide, not bind, and allowed for flexibility provided that overall connectivity goals were met.
 - As shown in the portion of Figure 18 on Slide 12, the block size and shape, access and connectivity of the proposed school site complied with the Street Demonstration Plan for SW Sherman Dr as established when the Morgan Farm Subdivision was constructed and for SW Brisband St. The Applicant proposed an alternative to the pedestrian connection between SW Brisband St and SW Boeckman Rd, as shown outlined with a red-dashed line.
 - The Applicant proposed an alternative pathway from the SW Boeckman Rd sidewalk that traveled north along the bus lane to a path that meandered north along the eastern side of the school building to southwest Brisband St. That path, as indicated by the red-dotted line at the bottom of the illustration, was mostly within the fenced portion of the school property. (Slide 13)
 - For security purposes, the gates and the perimeter fence would be locked during school hours but open to the public at other times to facilitate access to the path and school grounds. During school hours, the pedestrian route would continue along the bus lane outside the perimeter fence to the front of the building and then onto the northwest corner of the site along SW Sherman Dr, shown along the top of the illustration on Slide 13. It would connect to SW Brisband St, thus completing the intent of the Frog Pond West Master Plan while addressing school security.
 - Staff would like to note that an alternative path along SW Wehler Way and through the city park to the east, which would connect to the path on the school site, would also be available in the future when the park was completed.
- Fence. The school site had frontage on SW Boeckman Rd, and as a result the development standards specific to Frog Pond West that required a wall and landscaping applied. The Applicant's plan showed a brick wall, with a black metal top railing, as an

extension of the wall and fence to the east at the southeast corner of the site. The wall was proposed to stop at the east edge of the bus entry driveway to improve visibility to and from the school site and to emphasize the native plantings and storm water features at the southwest corner of the property. (Slide 14)

- Bicycle Parking. The TIA assumed 22 classrooms in a 60,000-sq-ft building at full build out of Phases 1 and 2 of the new primary school. That resulted in the need for 97 bicycle parking spaces; however, the Phase 1 floor plan included 58,103 sq ft and 16 classrooms, with an additional 11,500 sq ft of floor area and eight more classrooms at full build-out of Phase 2, which was 9,630 sq ft and two more classrooms than anticipated in the TIA. Thus, the Applicant's plans did not provide adequate bicycle parking to comply with the Code standard. To address the discrepancy, the Applicant provided 52 bicycle parking spaces in Phase 1, highlighted in blue on Slide 15, and a condition of approval required the Applicant to demonstrate compliance with the standard prior to temporary occupancy of the school building.
- The scope of Site Design Review included review of the design, architecture, location, and context of the building and site improvements such as landscaping, lighting, exterior colors and finishes, and signs for consistency with the Stage 2 Final Plan and Code standards.
 - Because the school building and other site improvements were well within the site with significant building setbacks on all sides, the General Landscape Standard was required. The exception to that standard was the parking area along SW Sherman Dr, outlined in red on the bottom image on Slide 16, which must meet the low screen standard to buffer and screen the parking from the adjacent residential area.
 - To meet the requirement, the Applicant proposed various height and opacity shrubs and ground cover along the west and south perimeters of the parking area. Additionally, trees would be planted in the parking area and as street trees as shown in the right-of-way section on Slide 16. The shrubs, in combination with the layers of trees and other landscaping between the street right-of-way, parking, and the school building, were designed to provide the required buffer between the site, residences to the west, and SW Boeckman Rd.
- Class 3 Sign Permit. The Applicant proposed one building-mounted sign, one freestanding monument sign, and three flagpoles on the school site. The building sign had the school name mounted on the front canopy of the west side of the building near the main entrance. The monument sign, with an electronic reader board, was proposed on the south side of the driveway on SW Sherman Dr. The three flag poles were proposed to be located near the main entrance on the west side of the building. (Slide 17)
 - The proposed signs were proportional to and compatible with development in the Public Facility Zone. The electronic reader board and the third flag pole required waivers, which would be discussed later in the presentation under discretionary items.
- The Type C Tree Removal Plan reviewed inventoried trees on the site which were proposed for removal or retention and replacement and mitigation. There were 63 trees inventoried for the proposed development on the Applicant's tree protection and removal plan. Inventoried trees did not include those on the future city park portion of the site that would not be impacted by development on the school site.

- The trees included a variety of fruit and ornamental trees, as well as a Cottonwood, Birch, and Douglas Fir planted around the existing house and out buildings and were not significant native-grown trees. Of the 63 trees, 47 were proposed for removal in Phase 1 construction, and 16 preserved. Of the 16 preserved trees, 13 were proposed for removal in Phase 2 during future construction. The Applicant proposed planting in excess of 90 trees on the site and as street trees, exceeding the required one-for-one mitigation requirement.
- The Applicant had included a request for two sign waivers, which involved discretionary review by the DRB. As stated, waivers must implement, or better implement, the purpose and objectives of the Plan Development Regulations. The Applicant requested two sign waivers, one to allow a third flag pole and one to allow an electronic reader board in the proposed monument sign.
 - With respect to the flag pole waiver, two flag poles up to a maximum of 30 ft in height on a site were exempt from sign permit requirements; however, the Applicant had proposed three flag poles to fly the required school district flags and had requested a waiver to the sign permit requirements for the third flag pole.
 - In response to the waiver criteria, the Applicant had stated that the proposed configuration would allow three flags to be displayed properly when half-mast protocol was in effect, and each pole would be adequately lit from above. The third flag pole was complementary in design and placement to the two allowed by the standard while meeting the state requirement for flag display. There was no evidence that the proposed flag pole would negatively impact traffic or general public safety.
 - Although changeable copy signs were listed as prohibited signs in Section 4.156, a waiver could be granted to allow an electronic reader board so long as specific criteria were met regarding automatic dimming technology, luminance of the sign, and copy hold time. The proposed electronic reader board design was complementary to the monument sign and school building and complied with waiver criteria with respect to display, illumination, copy hold time, and dimming technology.
- The Applicant requested a modification to two conditions of approval. The District had requested that Condition PFB 2 of the Engineering conditions be modified to address their concern that a development agreement or intergovernmental cooperative agreement may take longer to negotiate than the issuance of permits. As the primary driver of said condition being tied to permits was the Infrastructure Supplemental Fee and Boeckman Bridge Fee, the City's Development Engineering manager had proposed to revise the condition as shown on Slide 20.
 - The Applicant also requested a modification to Condition of Approval PFB 10 of the Engineering conditions to allow bus and service vehicle use of the driveway off SW Boeckman Rd that was limited by the condition for use only by school buses. As explained by the District, the modification would ensure access to the school building and landscaping areas for maintenance. Such maintenance activity occurred periodically, was low in volume, and coordinated by the District to avoid conflict with buses and high traffic times, including arrival and dismissal. As shown on Slide 21, the requested revision allowed the requested maintenance and was accepted by the City's Development Engineering Manager.

Vice Chair Hildum asked if Sherman Rd was built well enough to handle the additional traffic.

Amy Pepper, Development Engineering Manager, replied yes, it was designed as a local street, and as part of the traffic study, they analyzed future traffic flow on Sherman Dr. Scott Mansur with DKS was present to provide additional information about the Traffic Analysis or access off Sherman Dr/Boeckman Rd if needed.

Chair Hildum asked about traffic signaling at Sherman Dr and Boeckman Rd.

Ms. Pepper replied that the Traffic Analysis did not indicate that. Additionally, the Frog Pond West Master Plan analyzed intersections throughout the Frog Pond West as the area developed and thus far no traffic signal or roundabout was anticipated at that intersection.

Rob Candrian asked why the bus area was designed to accommodate only five buses when eight would be in service.

Ms. Luxhoj deferred the answer to the Applicant.

Vice Chair Hildum called for the Applicant's presentation.

Remo Douglas, Capital Construction Program Manager, West Linn-Wilsonville School District, stated that he oversaw all construction undertaken by the District. He thanked City Staff and the DRB for taking the time this evening to hear the presentation and acknowledged their responsibility to uphold the City Code. He was confident that with the conditions of approval issued by Staff that the subject development complied with Code and would benefit the community for many years. He thanked the community for their participation in the Applicant's outreach over the last year. Two community meetings were held at a local school where many questions and concerns were addressed. Online surveys were taken afterwards, and he had personally read every single survey response. Additionally, he engaged directly with folks who had called or emailed and conducted site visits to speak with people in the neighborhood. He presented the Applicant's presentation via PowerPoint with these comments:

- Staff had done an excellent job speaking to the design of the project, but there were a few details specific to how the Applicant had addressed the feedback and concerns received from neighbors over the last year, and he wanted to emphasize those points.
 - Slide 2 provided an illustration of how the Applicant would buffer the neighborhood to the west from the school site. The square footage was deliberately over the required amount due to a conversation with some neighbors at the site who stated that was their primary concern. Consequently, the parking lot was set back a bit more than necessary and the plantings went well above and beyond the required amount.
 - The Elevation View in the lower right corner of Slide 2 showed a vertical view of what the screening would look like from the street. There were shrubs and trees of varying heights to mask headlights and to provide visual interest. In addition to the required

street trees, two different types and sizes of trees were staggered as indicated by the bluer circles along with the larger green balloons.

- Per community feedback, the view of a parking lot and/or commercial facility across the street, regardless of being allowed as a public facility zone, being typical for a school, being set back more than requirements, the Applicant wanted to go above and beyond for the neighborhood and contemplate how they could do things that were practical and effective, did not detract from the use of the school, and benefitted those neighbors.
- They were going to be neighbors for a long time, and the District sought to be good neighbors from the start. There were a number of different plantings of differing types and sizes between the parking lot and neighboring residences and even more so between the school facility and neighboring residences.
- The traffic engineers on projects with the City of Wilsonville worked for the City. The District paid a fee, and they provided feedback and reports. The District had complied with every request made by both Engineering Staff and the traffic engineers hired by the City to perform that analysis.
 - He was confident the buses used by the District and the spacing provided for them, was adequate to fit all eight buses on the site. The assumption in the report was one of longer buses than used by the District and longer spacing in between them. The District had a bus service company that they had been contracted with for a long time that understood very well the type and size of buses the District used. Although bus types and sizes differed for various sectors of the student base, he was absolutely confident that all buses could arrive at a single time. Regardless, there were a number of schools in the District that required multiple shifts of buses, and that was coordinated smoothly with their bus company.
 - Each blue dash on Slide 5 indicated a vehicle, and each vehicle was assumed to be large so as to give a clear understanding of the minimum efficiency a parking lot could have. The combination of over 300 ft of an active pick-up/drop-off zone with a total of 700 ft of queuing would move the vehicles through very efficiently. Additionally, when the school was completed, there would be multiple access routes to the driveway via Brisband St. from the north and Boeckman Rd from the south.
- As conditioned under the project, the Applicant would be completing the Brisband St connection to the east and the rest of the neighborhood, so the neighborhood would no longer be landlocked.
 - The Applicant had worked hard over the last year and half to contemplate what sort of facility would be most appropriate for the location and the neighborhood it was being nestled into. They had quickly settled on a single-story school as they had the property to accommodate that. Although that used more of the property for the building, it dramatically changed the impression of the facility from the neighboring properties.
 - As Staff had noted, the proposed school could not take all of its parking off of Boeckman Rd due to traffic concerns, and they needed to split the traffic across the different frontages of the site. The City's traffic consultant could address that further if necessary. It was most effective and practical for Phase 1 of the school to include the passenger vehicle parking and drop-off area off of Sherman, and as noted by Staff during their

presentation, the additional parking for Phase 2 would be located in the northeast corner of the site and was expected to be staff parking with footpaths available from the parking lot into school. That would be constructed at a much later date.

- Bicycle parking had initially been shy a few spaces, but the Applicant had engaged with Staff in the interim and since incorporated additional spaces into the design. The project was up for bids tomorrow, and the contractors would be bidding it with the appropriate Code-compliant count. During the building permit process, that count would be evaluated and confirmed by Staff.
- Student and staff safety was also one of the community's main concerns. The enclosed area with fencing was a deliberate design feature with the north/south path specifically addressed. They had contemplated whether or not the school should be locked for the school day or not, and felt that particularly during out-of-school hours the meandering path through the meadow-like area along the eastern part of the property would be a much more pleasant experience for community members as they traversed it.
- The front entry plaza was a stark contrast from what might have been seen in the past of large asphalt areas with no plantings. The proposed school would feature several large, planted areas with trees and shrubs. The storm water from the building would be able to cascade through a water feature that meandered through the front plaza entry. The building itself was low and a single story with a modest brick and wood-like fiber cement siding for a complementary design to the neighborhood.
 - Slide 8 featured the view going into the entry canopy from the parent drop-off space. That entryway would help guide folks to the correct front door. The entry plaza area featured a number of trees. The gymnasium was to the left of the entry plaza, and the doors could be opened up during events to allow for congregating and mingling in the outdoor plaza prior to entering.
 - The classrooms wings featured simple, residential-style gabled roofs with very modest and tasteful materials complementary to the surrounding neighborhood. Many of the surrounding homes were two-story and would be taller than the vast majority of the school.
 - The covered play area to the north side of the building was also as low as possible and featured tables for students who did not want to play games such as wall ball and basketball but were interested in less kinetic activity. To the right of that was the playground area.

Rob Candrian asked why the bus area was built to accommodate five buses and not the eight that would be utilizing it.

Mr. Douglas replied that it would accommodate all eight buses. He noted that the traffic study contemplated standard-sized buses well above the size the District actually used and included a greater distancing between the buses when parked. It contemplated parking all the buses simultaneously, as that was the most efficient manner of handling that, although some existing schools used two shifts.

Vice Chair Hildum understood the school would accommodate 550 students when fully built out, but he did not see a whole lot of places for outdoor recreation other than two basketball courts and a small meeting area. He asked if there was any place else.

Mr. Douglas displayed the Site Key Plan (Slide 6) noting there was a large, typical playground. They had worked with a landscape architecture firm and their civil engineers on a lot of the outdoor design and had a starter version of the play equipment in the current Plan. In the northwest portion of the site, top left of Slide 6, there were a number of white circles in a shaded, irregular shape that represented the play equipment for a starter school of approximately 350 students. The shaded area to the right was additional hard surface area. Some of that area would remain dedicated to sports such as hopscotch, four square, and basketball as well as some additional play equipment.

- Additionally, this would be the first of the District schools in Wilsonville to have fully accessible surfacing, and they had coordinated with the City Parks Department about their experience with different materials in lieu of wood chips. The Applicant had also met with students many times over the last year, and they had very particular descriptions of their experience with the wood chips during playtime. Consequently, the Applicant would be utilizing a synthetic turf product that was approved for playground use with padding underneath to ensure that all students had access to the space.
- The large blank area in the upper right of Slide 6, the northeast portion of the property, was lawn for playfield. Generally speaking, the District deliberately did not demarcate specific sports fields at primary schools because they wanted the community and younger families to be able to utilize the large, open field with regularity. The District tucked the neighborhood primary schools in there with the hope of drawing the community. Additionally, the City was contemplating a park just to the east of the school, and rather than inviting regular, scheduled, competitive sporting events at the primary schools, the District preferred to keep them open and less formal so that families with young children were able to use them for free play. There was a significant area there, and it was consistent with many of the District's primary schools.
- In recent years, the District had found that more and more ball sports were not as popular as they had been in the past and a lower percentage of students liked to play them. Presently, there was more interest in taking a walk through the trees or sitting as a small group and hanging out. As such, the District was looking to do more of a savannah-type space along the eastern side of the school that featured native grasses and oak trees, that was aesthetically pleasing when looking in from the neighboring properties, and useful to students who were less interested in playing ball games.
- Off the southeast corner, there was a school garden with a number of garden beds. The District had worked closely with Crest Environmental Center in Wilsonville on designing the garden. It was the best and most effective primary school garden in the District and would serve as the standard for future programs that would be revitalized and expanded. It also had much-improved accessibility. Additionally, there was a gymnasium in the northern part of the school, so the Applicant believed recreation was well accounted for in the current design.

Mr. Hildum asked Mr. Douglas if he could speak further about onsite security precautions.

Mr. Douglas explained that as a part of the previous bond program in 2014 the Board [47:10] had dedicated an initial investment on security to enter the modern era on school security. With those funds, the District had hired an internationally recognized security firm who had done an assessment of all the schools in the District and provided a number of recommendations. The District had implemented a number of those recommendations through that first program at two new schools and two additional schools. The Board saw the great work the District was doing and allotted additional funds to secure two more schools.

- Working with a citizen committee in the leadup to the current 2019 bond program, the District ascertained the four things that were most important to citizens for improving school safety. Those items included intrusion-limiting, aka "bulletproof," glass, a type of specialty glass product that was very resistant to intrusion. For security purposes, the exact locations and performance of said glass was not something the District discussed, but it was fairly comprehensive at the newly built schools.
- The next layer of the system was the secure entry vestibule, which allowed folks to enter inside from the outdoors but prevented them from progressing further into the school without being buzzed in first by the administrative staff in the front office to sign in, be photographed, and receive a name tag. Once that process was complete, the visitor would be allowed entry into the rest of the school.
- The third element was security lockdown hardware. Following this upcoming summer, all schools in the District would have the same classroom lockdown hardware. All staff members would receive a fob with a keypad. Within 15-20 seconds of entering a code into the fob, all classrooms in the building were secured with an audible tone going out into each classroom prior to the doors automatically locking. Teachers were encouraged to open their classroom doors during the day as the flow of children from the open areas was central to several classrooms, but everyone in the school was notified simultaneously. Staff was trained to usher all students into a classroom, regardless of whether or not it was their student, and to shut the door.
- The fourth security measure was classroom lockdown curtains, simple light gray curtains on a hospital-curtain-style track that were easy to grab and sweep across multiple windows quickly and much easier to operate than individual blinds or curtains with pull-cords. When not in use, they remained to the side of the room and out of the way, but if a lockdown was triggered, staff could usher children into the classroom, slam the door, and quickly pull the curtain aside. That program was being finished this year for all schools in the District.
- Additionally, in the last year, there had been a lot of conversation about the playgrounds and securing those, so the superintendent and many others were currently talking to the schools about the next step of securing the perimeter of the playgrounds. The subject primary school was the first school to be designed with that in mind. There were a lot of gates around the school. They wanted the community to come, and they were most welcome. The community paid for these things and should be able to use them outside of school hours, but every day when the school bell rang, custodial staff would secure every one of the gates and then unlock them when the afternoon bell rang. The District wanted to

see lots of pedestrian and bicycle access. When a school was surrounded by homes on all sides in a local neighborhood, a lot of that activity usually occurred.

Mr. Candrian noted that a lot of the comments that had come in via email talked about the traffic that would affect the neighborhood. He understood the main drop-off and pick-up would share one entrance on Sherman Dr and be funneled to the same place. He asked why the decision was made to have both pick-up and drop-off traffic on one street and using the same driveway.

Mr. Douglas replied that the decision had been made after a conversation with the City's Traffic Engineering Consultant. In addition to the pick-up/drop-off area, there were a lot of marked crossings to ensure safe pedestrian access when crossing Sherman as well as additional crosswalks on other streets. Many times, congestion stemmed from driver confusion or vehicles coming from different directions, particularly in parking lots. The simple linear design of the subject school's pick-up/drop-off area maximized queue distance and prevented vehicles from being able to jump the queue, which could happen if another driveway accessed the area, causing a traffic jam in the parking lot and a backup onto Boeckman as vehicles were coming from two different directions. Under guidance from the City's Traffic Engineering Consultant, the Applicant agreed that the current design made a lot of sense.

- The primary source of congestion at any school in the District was a pick-up/drop-off location shared by buses and family vehicles. Consequently, on day one of meeting with designers, he advised them to separate bus and vehicle zones as sites did not flow well when they were together as evidenced by a long history of seeing that and having projects come in requesting to fix that where it had been designed in the past.
- The Applicant was confident, based on information from the City's Traffic Engineering Consultant, that the queuing distance was long enough to accommodate the anticipated vehicles. He explained that regardless of queuing distance, if only two cars at a time could exit passengers, that created the bottleneck. Consequently, the City had conservatively estimated 12 vehicles exiting passengers, which was plenty. In reality, there would be many more at a time, but the combination of that and the queuing before that would lead to a successful pick-up and drop-off without straggling out into the neighborhood.
- The Applicant had also worked closely with City Engineering and the Traffic Engineering Consultant to address bicycle and pedestrian traffic and had included marked crossings everywhere they had asked for. The Applicant believed they had done everything that the Code, Staff, and consultants had asked of them.

Mr. Candrian asked if there had been any discussion regarding limiting left turns heading south onto Sherman into the pick-up/drop-off area in the morning to limit congestion backing up onto other neighborhood streets. He believed a time-limited traffic restriction that would force all pick-up/drop-off traffic to head in the same direction could smooth the flow of traffic.

Mr. Douglas replied that he was unable to recall every specific conversation that occurred, but ultimately the requirements were guided by analysis of nearby intersections, and the consultants were very confident that the Applicant was well within the requirements related to

the pick-up/drop-off area. They did not have a final version yet of what the attendance boundary would be for the school, but the idea was to draw as many people from right near it as possible. As such, vehicles would be coming from different directions and they would, by the nature of where they were trying to go, disperse in different directions. He believed the traffic engineering reflected that notion.

Vice Chair Hildum 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.

Becky Fromhart stated she had supplied her address on the card. Her main concern, as had also been expressed by Mr. Condrian, was the location where traffic would enter the school. She asked why that was not flipped so that the entrance was on a different street and understood the City's Traffic Engineers would have the answer to that. The main draw to the proposed school would be from the east, yet the entrance was on the west side of the school. She mentioned the limited turn concept for accessing the pick-up/drop-off zone and noted that vehicles would be coming from Brisband during the construction of the building. She thanked the Applicant for the trees on the west side and asked if they were all deciduous and would lose their leaves for half the year and asked if the proposed signage met the necessary requirements. She reiterated that her main concern was why the building orientation had not been flipped so that vehicles entered from the opposite direction since the main draw would be from the east side.

John Boyle stated that he lived in Morgan Farm, adjacent to the school property. He also thanked Mr. Douglas for adding the trees. He understood that every City standard was met for traffic flow, but 550 kids and 8 buses meant a couple hundred parents at 7:30 in the morning and 3:00 in the afternoon traveling down Sherman Dr., which was already difficult for residents and there were only 80 homes in Morgan Farm. Sherman Dr. was the only primary street into and out of their neighborhood presently, and a couple of hundred cars twice a day, plus other vehicles that already used the street, would basically shut off the neighborhood and make it extremely difficult for residents to get in and out.

- The residents wanted to be good neighbors also, and loved the design of the school, but felt that if the school was flipped to face east, it would give access off of Willow Creek Rd and Brisband St. Willow Creek was already a great road with trees down the middle, could easily accommodate the traffic, and did not go through a neighborhood the way Sherman Dr. did. He noted that if the main entrance did ultimately remain on Sherman, now was the time to move the school further east and widen Sherman Dr. If that was not done right now, the school would be built, widening Sherman Dr. would be impossible, and residents would always have to deal with the problem of traffic on Sherman entering the school parking lot. There was one chance to build this school, and there was one entrance into it, and he wanted all points to be taken into consideration.
- He questioned the need for an LED sign for an elementary school from an energy standpoint and noted that the proposal to place the sign on Sherman Dr. confirmed that that was

where most of the traffic was anticipated to be. He asked that the sign be moved to Boeckman Rd in the event the DRB approved the waiver.

John Harrel stated that he lived in Morgan Farm and his address was on the card. He appreciated all the work that had gone into the school. It was absolutely beautiful and stunning architecturally. It was fantastic and would outlive everyone in the room. However, he agreed with Mr. Boyle that this was the one chance to make any changes. He understood there was a lot of engineering that went into the construction of the school, but it felt like a lot of it was done by City Planning high-level stuff and not so much consideration given to the residents who would live across the street from it. He doubted the school orientation would be flipped, but widening Sherman Dr. would be fantastic.

- The LED sign on the corner of Sherman Rd. made no sense but fully explained why Morgan Farm did not get a neighborhood sign at its entrance. He had wondered why it did not, and it all made sense to him now, as he had lived in nice neighborhoods before.
- He had not heard anything previously about outside events, and understood that schools were always looking to money-making events to fill the coffers, but those sounded like the kinds of activities that had not been discussed. He appreciated that the school had no sports fields so close to so many homes. He felt like there needed to be some parameters put in place for outside events, not so much the type of event but the regularity in which they occurred because he was concerned about traffic.
- With 550 students and only 8 buses, a whole lot of vehicles would be coming through the neighborhood. He asked if the safety of the children who actually lived in the neighborhood, as people came en masse from outside of it to the school, had been taken into consideration. He believed it was a little bit ironic. He noted the Sherman Dr. entrance was stuck in his craw, but he appreciated everybody's time.

John Ciepiela stated he lived in Morgan Farm and his address was on the card. He agreed with many of Mr. Boyle's and Mr. Harrel's concerns. He believed the size of the entryway was short-sighted when looking at the future expansion north of Boeckman Rd. Many residents in the neighborhood had traffic concerns. They all went for walks, crossed Boeckman Rd, and thought about their children as it related not only to the speed at which most people drove on Boeckman, but also the multiple intersections within close proximity to Sherman Dr such as Laurel Glen St. and Willow Creek Dr., all with current or planned heavy residential traffic and no traffic lights or high-visibility crosswalks in place. The claim that there were multiple access points from Brisband St. was not reality. The majority of traffic would come from Boeckman Rd. regardless of what the traffic study stated.

- His two and three-year-old children would be the first class to commute on foot from their home. The current upgrade to Sherman Dr. did not give him or other parents with young children confidence regarding their daily commutes. If the school entrance must face Sherman Dr., he believed that future considerations of fundings on STC that were alluded to earlier should be taken now. Wider boulevard construction with increased radiuses off of Boeckman should be considered to accommodate the safer car and pedestrian movements from and adjacent to the streets within the neighborhood and off Boeckman Rd. similar to Willow Creek Dr.

Kathy Wiebe stated she lived on Chestnut Ln, right in the middle of Morgan Farm, and her address was on the card. She was concerned about parking as there were already no parking signs on every other street. In front of her home, there was parking available, but not in front of Mr. Boyle's home. Half of each street was a no parking zone. One night, she had to drive around the corner to Bunco and walk in the rain as there was no parking for Bunco. There was also no parking on Woodbury Lp.

- She was also concerned about fire. Her daughter's brand new home in Happy Valley had burned down to the ground a few years ago. It only took the fire department four minutes to respond, but the home burned down in that time because of difficulty getting into and out of that neighborhood. She was concerned for her own neighborhood in that regard as that could happen to anybody.
- Boeckman Rd was already a busy street. Many people in the neighborhood went for walks and crossed Boeckman Rd. She asked if there would be a stop light or crosswalks to allow children to cross Boeckman Rd.

Kameron Beeks asked where the primary laydown area would be for the development of Brisband St and where the primary point of entry would be for construction the traffic.

Duane Fromhart, Jennifer Harrel, and Cort Maleike had signed up for public testimony, but stated their comments had been addressed. Brianna Gelow was not available via Zoom.

Vice Chair Hildum called for the Applicant's rebuttal.

Mr. Douglas thanked the community members who testified and complimented them on conducting themselves politely and professionally. There could be tension and passion in regard to these types of things. He was a homeowner himself and was empathetic. For most people their home was their largest investment, where they had their families, and they cared deeply about it. The Wilsonville community showed repeatedly with these processes that they could conduct themselves extremely professionally and engage in meaningful conversation. It did not matter how folks approached it, it did not change how they responded, but it did make it a great deal more pleasant to go through the process, and he would try to hit on all of the points that had been brought up.

- As he understood it, per City Code and the applicable traffic requirements, there could not be a driveway off Boeckman Rd, and that precluded concentrating the parking lot efficiently down in the south or east of the property. Furthermore, per the Site Plan, while the parking lot was buffered, it was in relative proximity to homes to the west. It was across a lit public street as opposed to the homes on the east side of the property which shared a fence line with their side and backyards. Additionally, it would create a lot more asphalt impervious surface attempting to get a driveway all the way from Brisband along the east side of the property, and it would divide the school and park property from each other with a traffic lane that would need to be kept open at all times, hampering the ability to secure the site. Consequently, there was a concurrence of many factors that drove the decision to push the parking lot to the west side of the street.

- Partially in response to the community feedback, the Phase 2 parking that would be built when the school expanded to a larger capacity would be in the northeast corner. The Applicant hoped that outside of school hours it would be useful to park visitors and folks coming to use the playground and to reduce the amount of parking within the neighborhood due to activities associated with the school and the park. It would also help to balance the parking at the site even though the emphasis on the parking and drive access was on the west side. The Applicant believed the current parking configuration was the most correct in terms of use of the facility, efficient use of the space, and compliance with the City's traffic requirements.
- He was unaware whether or not each individual tree was deciduous, but there was a very short list of species allowed by the City for street trees, and he believed they might just be. He noted Landscape Architect Ann could provide more information. He understood that the larger of the different-colored balloons on Slide 4 were public street trees, and they were very limited by Code what types of trees those could be. The smaller, darker green trees were trees on the District site, and he had explicitly directed that they all be broad-leafed, year-round trees to maximize the coverage. If it provided comfort to the Board and the community, the District would happily accept an additional Condition of Approval to ensure that that happened.
- There were a number of comments related to Willow Creek Dr. While it could be accessed by extension off of Brisband St., there was not a significant difference in distance from the site, whether from the east or the west, according to the Traffic Analysis that was performed. Everything traffic-related surrounding the site was fully compliant with Code as verified by the City's Traffic Engineer, who he believed was present to answer any technical detail questions about that. To his knowledge, there were no issues with potential discrepancies with Code related to traffic or access to the site.
- Earlier, a single driveway was mentioned and it was explained that that was efficient for maximizing queuing and processing of vehicles through the site.
- He noted that in 2023 LED signs were a common part of everyday life and the District was trying to move beyond the change-out signs with large plastic letters. It was less about the energy efficiency, although that was an added benefit, but more about the ability to update the sign remotely from inside the school, which was especially convenient during inclement weather. Should the City reject the waiver request, they could revert back to the change copy sign, although it would not change the illumination level experienced by the neighborhood so he did not know how that would address that concern. However, if that was a decision the City wanted to make, it was, of course, well within their purview to do so.

Mr. Candrian asked Mr. Douglas to clarify where on Sherman the sign would be located.

Mr. Douglas replied that Meridian Creek Middle School, Wood Middle School, and Wilsonville High School all had the exact same display panel, and he believed he would be putting a package together soon to request one at Boeckman Primary School. These signs were the future; however, the City, rightfully, had stringent requirements around their use including nighttime dimming and only allowing the copy to change every 15 minutes. School staff was

always confused that the sign could not have a clock, but the minute hand changed 15 times too frequently for the City Code. He believed there should be a daily or weekly message that was consistent for the community.

- He indicated where the sign was located on Slide 5 and noted that it was set back onto the property. It was typical, and most appropriate, to locate the reader sign at the entrance because parent vehicles would pass the sign regardless of which direction they came from and the sign's express purpose was to convey its message to the users of the site. Again, it was fully within the purview of the DRB and the City to make a determination on that waiver but noted that three or four had been approved so far elsewhere.
- He reiterated that all access points were Code compliant and noted that they had gone above and beyond in terms of vegetation and other buffering as well as maximizing the queuing in order to mitigate the changing experience for neighboring residents.
- Sherman Dr. was going to be widened beyond what it was presently to the standard the City had set for it. It would have parking along the east side which would increase parking for both the school and residents. Phase 1 included slightly above the Code minimum amount of parking. It was unusual for him to attend one of these hearings without a request to reduce parking below Code, but generally the District struck a balance between folks who wanted less parking and those who wanted more by doing the Code minimum on the number of parking spaces.
- He clarified that the School District did not make money on events. In good years, they covered the cost of the staff that managed and organized events to prevent overbooking of their sites. Primary schools were the least-booked venues as they did not have the big auditorium-type facilities that larger events and other groups wanted. Occasionally religious organizations might use them on a Sunday, but they were limited as to their attendance within the bounds of the parking allowed on the site. There had been a number of those events that had achieved success and grown in attendance, and they had been relocated to larger schools because their compliance with Code was contingent upon managing that use, so they did not allow that to become an issue. They would simply relocate an organization to a facility that could better accommodate their parking needs.
- Evening event use for a primary school was lower than for the high school and middle schools. There were simply fewer events and fewer after-school clubs. There were no sports teams or sports fields. The AV capacity in primary schools was deliberately less and only appropriate for events such as a school assembly in the morning or a 4th grade music night. Additionally, in the primary school gyms, a rubber poured urethane floor was used in lieu of a wood floor because those floors wore better and there was a lot less maintenance. They were well suited to 300-500 children sitting on them each morning; however, they had an adverse effect on interest from evening sports groups who believed a wood floor provided a better volleyball or basketball performance, which reduced the amount of evening usage by athletic groups in the winter.
- He noted 550 students was the standard population of a primary school at buildout in the District. There were some smaller sites in West Linn at a half or a quarter of the subject school's size, and those were smaller schools as appropriate to the size of the campus. The subject school was typical, standard, and had the space it needed to perform all the functions and accommodate that number of staff and students.

- The proximity of residents on all sides was a huge factor. Schools that were surrounded by homes had more students who walked or biked to school. There were a large number of crossings marked with the white, thick borders. The curbs were brought closer together on the side streets to limit how far little legs had to travel to go from safe curb to safe curb. That was all part of the City standards that had been put together and everything being provided at the subject school was in compliance with that Code. He believed there were two marked crossings with flashing beacons in which a button was pushed and the lights turned on to alert drivers to pedestrians. There was one at the southwest corner of the subject lot and one to the east. They were being constructed by the Boeckman Rd project, and as noted in the Staff presentation, the Applicant was paying over \$1.1 million in development charges above the standard in order to accommodate all of the improvements that the City needed to do in the Frog Pond West development.
- The project included additional hydrants for fire service, and those plans had been reviewed explicitly by Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue (TVF&R). He did not know that they had any changes proposed to the initial design. The District had worked with them closely ahead of time, and they had provided a letter as part of the record noting that TVF&R had reviewed and approved the plans. They were firmly aware of what the District had proposed to do and were confident in their ability to address fire in the event that the school was built.
- He reiterated that the District was getting construction bids at 5:00 the following day and they would then have a strong sense of who would be building the school. The District would work with that firm to determine how they planned to access the site. There were five prequalified general contractors who had gone through a proposal process and verified to the District's satisfaction that they were a partner worthy of engaging on the project. One of the factors in that decision was their ability to demonstrate their experience and ability to interact with neighboring residences. Even though the north side was vacant, he believed most of that land had been annexed into the City and had planning permits in place or were seeking them now, so it was reasonable to expect that by the time the school opened, it would be surrounded by homes.
- Each of the five contractors that made the mark and were allowed to bid on the project had expressed an ability to engage appropriately with neighboring residences, and while he did not have the exact logistics plan, they were required to develop that plan before being permitted to begin work on the project. Additionally, the District would share and discuss the plan with City Staff before it was implemented so everyone knew what was happening. The goal always was to minimize impact to neighboring residences.
- He acknowledged that there were concerns from a number of folks, particularly from the west of the site. The District had endeavored to work to mitigate those concerns and to address them proactively well in excess of Code. It would be easy under the Public Facility Code to do much less, but that was not how the District liked to operate, and it was not how he as an individual liked to operate. They had worked very hard to try to accommodate that and balance the needs and interests.
- There were neighbors from the southeast corner that had not spoken tonight, but he had spoken to them personally before tonight and they were all pleased that there was not a parking lot next to their home. There was a side lot with a 6-ft fence 8-10 ft from their homes that could potentially become a parking lot, and weighing all the logistics and

practicalities of the engineering of it, in addition to the notion of inefficiently placing a large parking lot next to the side yard of a home, the layout of the site seemed most appropriate.

- There were standard conditions of approval that contemplated not changing the Landscape Plan, which overall was appropriate, and the District knew how to go through Staff and the DRB process, if necessary, for any changes. He looked to engage with neighbors, especially ones over the fence, and talk about additional plantings and make those happen. Generally, the District had seen that favorably received by City Staff, but the District was looking to continue that engagement with neighbors over the course of construction to ensure that benefit to them was maximized.

Mr. Pauly added that generally it was okay to add landscaping, but not take any away.

Mr. Douglas noted that the conditions of approval strongly prohibited that.

Mr. Candrian asked how the traffic survey incorporated all of the potential future development with Frog Pond East and Frog Pond North. He also asked how people using surface streets to avoid interstate tolls was factored into the current traffic study.

Scott Mansur, DKS, replied that the proposed school and subdivision was part of the Frog Pond West Master Plan, which had looked at the full build-out of Frog Pond West, East, and South. At that time, they developed an infrastructure plan that looked at access and all internal streets to provide service. That was the long-range plan that projected 20 years into the future from when that study was done to look at long-term traffic.

- In the traffic study that was prepared for the school, any developments with Stage 2 approval were included in their analysis. Anything in the future was covered with the MP that had looked at full buildout.
- He advised everyone that primary schools typically had a peak of 15-20 minutes of people coming in and dropping off or picking up their children, and during that time, it was very constrained. As such, the Brisband St. connection was very important because it would allow neighbors to use Brisband to go over to Willow Creek Dr as a secondary access.
- DKS worked with the City Engineer during the master planning process to provide safe streets, and the wider a street was, the faster traffic went. That was a concern to consider when debating whether to widen Sherman Dr. A balance needed to be struck to ensure a street was big enough to provide adequate capacity for everyone who used the school but not so big as to encourage faster driving. It also needed to be multimodal so children could easily cross.
- There would be a push-button-activated, rectangular rapid-flashing beacon on Boeckman Rd on the east leg of the Boeckman Rd/Sherman Dr intersection to help stop traffic and allow schoolchildren to cross at that location. That would be constructed as part of the City's Boeckman Rd. project.
- It was helpful to keep in mind that often there were growing pains in Master Plan developments as phases of the development occurred. Currently Sherman Dr. was the only access in and out, but in the future Brisband St. would be connected to Willow Creek Dr. which would provide a secondary outlet in the event Sherman Dr. was too congested during

that 15-minute drop-off/pick-up period. There were also plans to connect Brisband St to the west and up and around as well as to connect Frog Pond Ln to Stafford Rd, and Brisband would turn in and connect to Kahle Rd. As development occurred, there would be a lot of additional access and internal circulation that would provide options to residents. Currently, however, the neighborhood was in the awkward phase of building a school in a subdivision that did not yet have its full infrastructure in place.

- He reminded everyone that the school would only have approximately 350 students on opening day. At max buildout, it would accommodate 550 but it could take 15-20 years to hit that level as more houses were built, but it would be a walkable, bikeable school for children, and the more comfortable parents felt with letting their children walk and bike to school, the less traffic there would be. Building a walkable/bikeable school was part of the design, and the School District had worked very hard to make the school safe for children to do so.
- The first step in student safety was separating buses from parent traffic, and the school had been designed that way. Buses would access the school via Boeckman Rd, eliminating a child getting hit by a bus after exiting their vehicle.
- He had completed over 100 school-related traffic studies and dealt with a lot of these issues, and the Site Plan that the School District was providing really checked all the boxes when it came to safety. The Traffic Analysis showed that the traffic being generated from the school met all the City's Code requirements. From a safety standpoint, he felt comfortable with the street that was being designed. Although he understood that during that 15-20-minute time period in the morning and afternoon there would be congestion on Sherman Dr, it met all City standards for intersection operation and it would operate in a safe manner for how it needed to deliver the traffic.

Vice Chair Hildum called for any additional Board member discussion to ensure they had gathered all the information they needed to make a decision.

Mr. Candrian asked how much latitude for discussion there was regarding an item that met all Code standards and did not have a waiver request.

Mr. Pauly explained that the question was whether or not it met Code.

Amanda Guile-Hinman, City Attorney, explained that if there was a criteria that the DRB believed was not met, they could discuss making a finding to that effect, but if the criteria was met, the decision ended there.

Mr. Candrian asked if the all the street improvements in the surrounding area, including development to the north, would be in place before the school opened.

Mr. Pauly replied that north of Brisband St there was land that had not yet gone through Land Use, so he did not know the exact timing, but confirmed that Brisband St would be completed prior to the school opening.

Mr. Candrian asked if Staff knew if Brisband St to Frog Pond was scheduled to be completed before the school opened.

Ms. Pepper responded that based on current timelines, it would not be complete. She believed the school was set to open fall of 2025, but they were at the mercy of developers and their timing. There was one subdivision at the end of Frog Pond that did not quite connect to Frog Pond. There was a vacant lot next to it that had not yet come in for Land Use Review.

Mr. Candrian asked when Willow Creek Dr was scheduled to be connected to Frog Pond.

Ms. Pepper replied that it was already connected. The project just north of Brisband St, Frog Pond Estates, had gone through DRB approval, Engineering Plan Review approval, and Staff was waiting for the developer to hire a contractor to get started. That project would complete one component of Brisband St before it connected to the School District's portion of the street improvements. She confirmed that it was likely that by the time the school opened, Brisband St would connect through, giving residents on that side options to access Boeckman Rd without having to use Sherman Dr.

Mr. Candrian stated that most other school signs were located off of busy roads, and asked why the sign for the proposed school was not going to be located at the corner of Sherman Dr/Boeckman Rd where more people would see it and it would be less inside the neighborhood.

Mr. Douglas responded that although there had been feedback tonight that traffic would come from Boeckman Rd, Stafford Rd, or Brisband Rd, that was factually incorrect. The projections, based on the traffic study, showed that it come equally from the two directions. The critical criteria for sign location was that everyone who entered the school site saw it. Locating the sign at the driveway ensured that people coming from either direction would see it. The District would not oppose a Condition of Approval to force the relocation of the sign if that made the DRB comfortable with approving the school, but he believed it would be a disservice to the school to do so.

Mr. Pauly added that over a decade ago, he was involved in crafting the standards around electronic signs. As those standards around hold time and luminance were put in, they had assumed these types of signs would be put by schools in residential areas so they were mindful of the sort of standards that would make them compatible with residential areas and would need to be met to grant a waiver for this type of sign.

Mr. Candrian understood that they wanted parents to see it, but there would also be a large contingent of the school arriving on bus. With the sign placement at the car entrance, no one on the bus would see it. He wondered if moving the sign outside of the direct neighborhood would make everyone somewhat happy, although he understood that no one would ever be entirely happy.

Mr. Douglas reiterated that if the DRB felt that was appropriate to allow that waiver to move forward, the District would not oppose it or appeal such a decision. As a practical matter, the people on the bus were students, and they generally did not retain any information on the sign to tell their parents, so the idea was to catch drivers who would recall it.

Vice Chair Hildum confirmed there were no further questions or discussion and closed the public hearing at 9:19 pm.

Rob Candrian moved to approve the Staff report, modifying Conditions of Approval PFB 2 and PFB 10, as read into the record by Staff, and adding Exhibit D7 and a Condition of Approval requiring the LED freestanding monument sign to be relocated to the southwest corner of the school site.

(Note: additional language shown in italicized bold text; deleted language struck through)

- PFB 2: ~~Prior to~~ ***At the Issuance of Any Building Permits:*** The applicant shall ~~enter into a~~ Development Agreement or Intergovernmental Cooperative Agreement with the City ***pay an Infrastructure Supplemental Fee of \$24,465.00 per equivalent dwelling unit, as adjusted pursuant to City Resolution No. 2649. The applicant shall also pay the Boeckman Bridge fee of \$1,393.00 per equivalent dwelling unit as adjusted pursuant to City Resolution No. 2649, for the construction of Boeckman Bridge. Per the Frog Pond West Infrastructure Funding Plan, the project site equates to 43 equivalent dwelling units.***
- PFB 10. Access to SW Boeckman Road, classified as a minor arterial, shall be limited to school buses ***and service vehicles*** only. With the Public Works Permit: The construction drawings shall show the location of signage to prohibit all non-bus/***service vehicle*** traffic from using this access. Prior to Final Building Certificate of Occupancy: All necessary signage shall be installed, inspected and approved by the City.

Vice Chair Hildum seconded the motion.

Mr. Candrian stated he appreciated the comments from the community. He did not know if the DRB had latitude to redirect the traffic flow plan, and since was not a traffic flow expert, he would not make any recommendations, but he thought it was a valid concern, especially as the area would grow, and stated they would rely on the judgement of the experts as to how everything would be affected.

The motion passed unanimously.

Rob Candrian moved to adopt Resolution No. 415 with the amended Staff report. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Hildum and passed unanimously.

Vice Chair Hildum read the rules of appeal into the record.

BOARD MEMBER COMMUNICATIONS:

4. Results of the March 27, 2023 DRB Panel B meeting
5. Recent City Council Action Minutes

Mr. Pauly noted that that DRB meeting addressed a street name change, a unique request and the only time an application like that had been considered.

There were no comments.

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

There were none.

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 9:28 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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