

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING
FEBRUARY 13, 2023
6:30 PM

Consent Agenda:

3. Approval of minutes of January 9, 2023 DRB Panel A meeting



**DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD PANEL A
MEETING MINUTES**

January 9, 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, January 9, 2023. Chair Jean Svadlenka called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m.

CHAIR'S REMARKS

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

ROLL CALL

Present for roll call were: Jean Svadlenka, Rachelle Barrett, John Andrews.

Staff present: Daniel Pauly, Ryan Adams, Kimberly Rybold, Amy Pepper, Georgia McAlister, 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 November 14, 2022 DRB Panel A meeting

The November 14, 2022 DRB Panel A meeting minutes were unanimously accepted as written.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

2. **Resolution No. 410. ESS Parking Lot Expansion Project.** The applicant is requesting approval of a Stage 2 Final Plan Modification and Site Design Review for a parking lot expansion for the ESS building located at 26440 SW Parkway Avenue.

Case Files:

DB22-0008 ESS Parking Lot Expansion Project

- Stage 2 Final Plan Modification (STG222-0008)
- Site Design Review (SDR22-0008)

Chair Svadlenka called the public hearing to order at 6:36 p.m. and read the conduct of hearing format into the record. All Board members declared for the record that they had visited the site. No board member, however, declared a conflict of interest, ex parte contact, bias, or conclusion from a site visit. No board member participation was challenged by any member of the audience.

Georgia McAlister, Associate Planner, announced that the criteria applicable to the application were stated starting on page 2 of the Staff report, which was entered into the record. Copies of the report were made available to the side of the room and on the City's website.

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

- Proper noticing was followed for the application with notice of public hearing mailed to all property owners within 250 ft of the subject property and published in the newspaper; additional posting was placed on the site and on the City's website. The notice included clarifying background information about the project and information about the hearing process and providing testimony. No public comments were received for the subject project.
- The requests under review before the DRB tonight were the Stage 2 Final Plan Modification and Site Design Review for 83 parking spaces to the north of the ESS building. No requests in the current application required discretionary review.
- Prior to the partition in 2018, the ESS building was part of a larger industrial park. Historically, the building shared parking with the property to the south but with the partition, the ESS site's parking spaces fell below the minimum requirement for a warehouse building. The addition of 83 spaces, as well as the restriping of 18 existing spaces, would result in a total of 263 parking spaces, bringing the site into compliance with Minimum Parking Standards. (Slide 5)
- Because the parking lot expansion was greater than 10 spaces, it required DRB review of the Site Design Review and Stage 2 Final Plan Modification applications. The parking expansion would include the addition of 83 spaces, including four ADA spaces. Additionally, the Applicant would restripe 18 parking spaces that were part of a previous Site Plan approval and make minor improvements to the loading dock area, creating an at-grade door for the transfer of materials.
- The Significant Resource Overlay Zone (SROZ) to the north for the parking area would act as a natural buffer between the parking area and offsite views. Landscaping was included within the storm swales and along the parking spaces, totaling 19% of the parking area. As required, one tree was proposed to be planted for every 8 parking spaces for a total of 11 trees. (Slide 7)

- A condition of approval would ensure safe access from the parking area to the north entrance of the building by requiring the installation of a walkway to provide safe and efficient access from all spaces.

There were no questions of Staff at this time.

Chair Svadlenka called for the Applicant's presentation.

Robert Léger, DCI Engineers, noted asked Staff to clarify Condition of Approval PDA 2 which addressed the proposed walkway and could be interpreted different ways. Was that request anything different from what was currently shown on the plans?

Ms. McAlister replied yes, noting the condition required a connection along all the parking spaces. The Applicant currently had a crosswalk from the parking spaces to the building, but 83 spaces was a long distance and there was no clear direct path for those parked at the far west of the lot to get to the proposed crosswalk to the building. The walkway did not have to be concrete, but must be a safe, separate place for people to travel from the farthest parking spaces without interacting with vehicles traveling in the parking area.

Mr. Léger understood that adding the walkway would increase the amount of impervious area or a walkway could be striped along the roadway.

Ms. McAlister noted there were a few ways it could be accomplished.

Mr. Léger replied it could be striped the way the ADA path went up to the building, either behind the stalls or on the other side of the street. Alternatively, putting a sidewalk in front of the parking stalls would impact the stormwater facilities and require a lot more grading.

Kimberly Rybold, Senior Planner, clarified the standard for pedestrian connectivity was found in Code Section 4.154 which was where the condition originated. The Applicant could implement either vertical or horizontal separation from the vehicular travel lane. If the Applicant decided to restripe a portion of the paved area, a physical, horizontal separation would be needed, such as a row of bollards, and that detail would be included in the Applicant's construction plans.

Mr. Léger asked if that applied to onsite or only driveway entrances into a site.

Ms. Rybold replied the standard was under the safe, direct, and convenient part of the onsite pedestrian access and circulation, and essentially, it required that pedestrian walkways provided access from the parking area to the building entrance. Due to the truck traffic in that area, Staff needed to see that there was a delineated walkway for people to get to the building entrance from all areas of the parking lot. Any questions on the impacts of the impervious surface and any potential implications to the stormwater could be addressed by Ms. McAlister, who had talked with Development Engineering Manager Amy Pepper.

Mr. Léger asked for the minimum width of the drive aisle.

Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager replied there was no minimum width per se, as long as it was functional.

Mr. Léger confirmed with Staff that placing bollards on the south side of the driveway with stripes to make a designated, separated area for pedestrians would be acceptable, adding the Applicant would look at that option.

- He noted the last sentence of Condition B24 noted that the Landscape Plan provided an irrigation system, but that was not in the Applicant's plans, as they assumed the property owner would ensure survival of the plantings by other means. He asked if it was possible to delete the last line of Condition B24.

Ms. Rybold clarified the reference was to Code Finding B24, not a condition of approval. Typically, whatever irrigation system that would be present was identified. This situation was unique because it was a stormwater facility. As long as it was clear that the plantings on the Final Stormwater Plan were serving in a stormwater capacity, then any notes on irrigation, even if it was not needed because it was a stormwater facility, had to be clear as that was a standard City condition.

Mr. Pauly added it did not clarify if it was permanent or temporary, so even if the Applicant did not water the plantings long-term, they would temporarily. Staff just needed to understand how they would be kept alive.

Mr. Léger replied he believed ESS intended to hand-water the plantings.

John Andrews asked if some of the plantings that separated the parking area from the road would be removed and replaced or would any additional trees or shrubs be added.

Mr. Léger replied the area where parking would be added was currently grass. The road sheds off, there was small ditch, some catch basins, and a 4 ft to 6 ft high berm on the north side of the property where all the trees were. On the low side of that, the Applicant would be filling part of the ditch and replacing it with some stormwater swales to convey stormwater to the smaller facilities, and those would be planted densely with water quality-type vegetation. On the north side 11 trees would be planted, which he confirmed would be hand watered.

James Handley, ESS, Facilities Manager, explained due to the abundant rain in Oregon, hand-watering would only be necessary during the hot summer months. ESS had a paid service to do that.

Ms. Barrett asked if the requirements for stormwater drainage could be met.

Mr. Handley replied a lot of the stormwater swales and the drainage already existed. ESS was restructuring the drain-off and leaching of the runoff from the parking spots appropriately through the trees and shrubs that would be added. The infrastructure had already been put in place.

Mr. Léger added the new swales would have topsoil plantings per the manual to meet the specifications.

Ms. Barrett asked if any sidewalk would be added.

Mr. Handley replied there were spacing issues. They had hoped to put in a designated line for pedestrian parking, but the question last April regarded clearance for ADA/wheelchair access through the rear of the facility and straight to the ADA parking that would be added to the existing parking area. Even the doorways and the blacktop were flush, so it would be a straight shot out the door to those designated parking spots. Other people needed to access parking from multiple building exits, so they would be coming from many different areas over the berm to their parking spot, not just from the back door. An extra sidewalk would be wasted space and could create a hazard with the trailers coming down the north frontage road. As long as the lines were appropriate, including the ADA lineage, there should not be any problems.

Chair Svadlenka understood there was no draft of the Pedestrian Walkway and Circulation Plan.

Mr. Handley confirmed that was correct, noting the Applicant did not know that would be requested, but would add it per the conditions.

Chair Svadlenka asked if that was something the DRB could get a copy of once it was submitted.

Ms. Rybold replied that once the Applicant submitted construction plans, Staff would review those internally. If the Board wanted to see a copy of those plans once they were finalized, Staff could forward them.

Chair Svadlenka noted the report stated no extra lighting was needed because there was already sufficient lighting for the new parking spaces.

Mr. Handley replied ESS had invested heavily in state-of-the-art, LED lighting, internal and external to the facility at a great expense. The entire facility lit up like a football field and could be seen while driving down I-5. There was plenty of nighttime lighting. He confirmed the lights were on the building and positioned to shine out to the perimeter of the yard.

Mr. Léger confirmed all of the trees would be Little-Leaf Linden.

Staff confirmed for the record the earlier referenced Condition A21 was Finding A21.

Ms. Barrett asked if Staff was satisfied with the conditions as presented and that no additional conditions were needed for the pedestrian walkway discussed during the hearing.

Ms. McAlister believed the report was clear about what was being asked and that piece would be finalized when Staff got to the construction plans.

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

John Andrews asked if there were plans to modify the frontage road in any way.

Ms. Rybold replied that was correct, the application was just a proposal to add parking spaces. Typically, frontage improvements were triggered with more significant development that went beyond simply adding parking spaces to an already existing site.

Chair Svadlenka confirmed there were no further questions or discussion and closed the public hearing at 7:02 pm.

Rachelle Barrett moved to approve the Staff report as presented. Chair Svadlenka seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

John Andrews moved to adopt Resolution No. 410 including the approved Staff report. The motion was seconded by Rachelle Barrett and passed unanimously.

Chair Svadlenka read the rules of appeal into the record.

Board Member Communications:

3. Recent City Council Action Minutes

Chair Svadlenka noted on November 7th, City Council approved the City's application to Metro for the acquisition of Frog Pond West neighborhood park property; she had believed the City had already acquired it.

Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager, replied the School District owned property, so it was simply an authorization to use money from Metro to pay the District for the park.

Amy Pepper, Development Engineering Manager, confirmed the City was using Metro funds to purchase the park property from the School District. She clarified the park was adjacent to what would be Frog Pond Primary where CREST was formerly located.

Mr. Pauly explained the property was L-shaped with the upper L portion that veered east, approximately 3 acres, was being sold to the City. He confirmed it would be a public park as shown on the Frog Pond West Master Plan.

Chair Svadlenka noted on November 21st, Council approved sending a letter to comment on protecting it the French Prairie Rural Preserve and asked where it was located.

Mr. Pauly replied the preserve was around/near Charbonneau.

Chair Svadlenka asked if the idea of the roundabout at the Canyon Creek Rd/Boeckman Rd intersection was something new.

Ms. Pepper responded no, it was always a design option and a safer design option than a traffic signal. Staff typically looked at roundabouts or traffic signals at all intersections now.

Rachelle Barrett added a roundabout was being considered for the 65th Ave intersection as well. She was looking forward to the Frog Pond roundabouts because she understood that as the roundabouts were approved, money was received to build them.

Mr. Pauly replied that was not the case for the 65th Ave roundabout which would be County funding.

Ms. Pepper stated a long-term temporary signal would be installed this summer at the Stafford Rd/65th Ave intersection as part of the Boeckman improvements.

Mr. Pauly explained that was an expensive roundabout due to the grading and multiple roads coming in, so it would likely be some time before the County found funding for it.

Ms. Pepper confirmed the City was installing the temporary signal at 65th Ave, which was required due to Boeckman Rd being closed off to traffic for approximately 18 months. It was anticipated that people would use 65th Ave and Stafford Rd, and the temporary signal was to help mitigate additional traffic. A bridge would be installed where the dip was on Boeckman Rd, which accounted for the long construction timeline.

Ms. Barrett asked if there were plans to install a sidewalk between OIT and Target.

Mr. Pauly replied that was development-driven.

Ms. Barrett confirmed explained the property in tonight's hearing was near that area, so she had looked forward to hearing about a sidewalk on the Sysco property. She had tried to ride her bike to Target, and it was not safe.

Chair Svadlenka asked if the property was owned by Sysco, adding she believed the property was owned by the State or PGE due to the power lines.

Ms. Pepper replied there were large easements over the property, but the large vacant parcel was owned by Sysco. As those parcels along SW Parkway develop, sidewalks and bike facilities would be installed.

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

4. New DRB Member Training

Staff and Board members introduced themselves, briefly sharing their favorite built environments within the city.

Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager, described the role of the Development Review Board (DRB) in reviewing proposed development against the City's Development Code, highlighting the review process, different criteria that impact DRB decisions, including discretionary and non-discretionary review standards, and how to address unclear and subjective criteria. Ex parte contact, conflict of interest, and bias were also defined, and examples presented for further clarification. He addressed clarifying questions from Board members.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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