

**DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING**

**MONDAY, JANUARY 27, 2025**

**6:30 PM**

---

Consent Agenda:

3. Approval of minutes of the September 23, 2024 DRB Panel B meeting



**Development Review Board-Panel B  
Regular Meeting Minutes  
September 23, 2024**

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

**CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL**

**Chair Barrett** called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm.

**CHAIR'S REMARKS**

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

**ROLL CALL**

Present for roll call were: Rachelle Barrett, Alice Galloway, John Andrews, Megan Chuinard, and Kamran Mesbah

Staff present: Daniel Pauly, Stephanie Davidson, Amy Pepper, Kimberly Rybold, Cindy Luxhoj, and Shelley White, Georgia McAlister,

**CITIZEN INPUT**

There was none.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

1. Approval of the August 26, 2024 DRB Panel B Minutes  
**Megan Chuinard moved to approve the August 26, 2024 DRB Panel B meeting minutes as presented. John Andrews seconded the motion, which passed 5 to 0.**

**PUBLIC HEARING**

2. **Resolution No. 437. SMART Yard Expansion.** The applicant is requesting approval of a Stage 2 Final Plan Modification, Site Design Review, and Type C Tree Removal Plan for development of a 30,730 square foot yard expansion at the SMART Facility located at 28879 SW Boberg Road.

Case Files:

- DB24-0007 SMART Yard Expansion
- Stage 2 Final Plan Modification (STG224-0003)
- Site Design Review (SDR24-0004)
- Type C Tree Removal Plan (TPLN24-0004)

**Chair Barrett** called the public hearing to order at 6:35 p.m. and read the conduct of hearing format into the record. Alice Galloway and Kamran Mesbah declared for the record that they

had visited the site. No board member, however, declared a conflict of interest, bias, or conclusion from a site visit. No board member participation was challenged by any member of the audience.

**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 noting the site's location, and describing and reviewing the three applications requested. Details were also provided about a compliance issue regarding the removal and replacement of trees, which was discussed with the Applicant and resulted in a condition of approval requiring 69 trees to be planted on the subject property as well as payment into the City Tree Fund.

Questions from the Board were addressed by Staff as follows:

- Purchasing and planting one tree costs approximately \$300, making the Applicant's total \$5,400 for the 18 trees being removed.
- The Tree Fund was managed by the Community Development Department and a brief description was given on how the Tree Fund was used for mitigation and other tree related projects in the city.
- The Development Code's default mitigation was one tree for one tree (1:1). Per Code, other circumstances could trigger a caliper inch-per-inch mitigation to disincentivize the removal of a mature tree or a Valuable Tree, such as a White Oak, Ponderosa, or Madrone. It was unclear what happened with the trees on the subject property, so the inches were unknown.
- As far as safeguards for the replanting of trees, the City always conditioned that all plantings must be kept healthy and viable for one year after planting, with inspections done at 6 and 12 months. Generally, anything approved as part of a Landscape Plan that was subsequently removed prior to one year after planting would need to be replanted or otherwise mitigated.
- While the Applicant already had one incident of trees being removed, City Staff had more attention on the issue and was in communication with SMART staff to ensure and trigger continued follow-up. Current SMART Staff were unaware of the past issues. There was no clear Code standard to be able to objectively apply an additional warranty period.
- The 2011 tree inventory was from the original development application for the SMART facility. The City did not conduct tree inventories except on specific occasions. Generally, the City became aware of a tree removal due to it being reported or Staff because happened to see it.
- Staff occasionally looks at historic aerial photos to ascertain changes or determine illegal tree removal.

**Chair Barrett** called for the Applicant's presentation.

**Burke Wardle, PIVOT Architecture**, presented the Applicant's proposal, noting a brief history and the design background of the site, and describing key elements of the proposal as follows:

- The entry driveway would be widened to accommodate two-way traffic.
- Seven to eight electric chargers would be added on the north side of the site and some of the existing chargers would be relocated there as well.
- A gray concrete block, bus washing building would replace the open-canopy wash system, enabling all buses to be washed indoors and more efficiently.
- Site circulation operated in a counterclockwise circle, enabling all buses to be contained on the site.
- When getting oriented with the project, he realized the original project plantings had not survived being planted as not a lot of development surrounding the SMART site at the time. The general consensus was that a family of deer living on site ate the majority of trees.
  - The trees would be replanted back to the original 2011 standard. The Applicant tried to replace on site the 18 trees being removed, but due to limited site conditions, a deposit would be made into the Tree Mitigation Fund.

Questions from the Board were addressed as follows:

- **Mr. Wardle** confirmed the project consisted primarily of the addition of a small bus wash building, underground utility work for the electrical charging systems, planting trees and other landscaping, and a lot of concrete for parking and circulation. He noted the stormwater planter was designed in 2011 to account for the additional concrete but would not be expanded as it was oversized originally.
  - The site was well-fenced now and any deer would likely only be migrating past the site.
- **Kelsey Lewis, Grants and Programs Manager, SMART**, added that the deer family had moved on and lived elsewhere.

**Chair Barrett** confirmed no one at City Hall or on Zoom wanted to provide public testimony.

**Mr. Wardle** confirmed the construction period for the project was approximately 8 to 9 months.

**Ms. Lewis** added the project would be completed by next summer.

**Chair Barrett** confirmed there was no additional questions or discussion and closed the public hearing at 6:59 pm.

**John Andrews moved to approve the Staff report as presented. Megan Chuinard seconded the motion, which passed 5 to 0.**

**Alice Galloway moved to adopt Resolution No. 437. Kamran Mesbah seconded the motion, which passed 5 to 0.**

**Chair Barrett** read the rules of appeal into the record.

**BOARD MEMBER COMMUNICATIONS**

- 3. Results of the September 9, 2024 DRB Panel A meeting
- 4. Recent City Council Action Minutes

There were no comments.

**STAFF COMMUNICATIONS**

**Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager**, informed any Board members interested in reappointment to see Staff after the meeting.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:02 p.m.

ABC Transcription DRAFT