

Wilsonville City Hall  
29799 SW Town Center Loop East  
Wilsonville, Oregon

**Approved**  
August 11, 2014

**Development Review Board – Panel A**  
**Minutes–June 9, 2014 6:30 PM**

**I. Call to Order**

Chair Mary Fierros Bower called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

**II. Chair’s Remarks**

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

**III. Roll Call**

Present for roll call were: Mary Fierros Bower, Ken Ruud, Simon Springall, Kristin Akervall, and Councilor Liaison Julie Fitzgerald. Lenka Keith was absent.

Staff present: Blaise Edmonds, Chris Neamtzu, Barbara Jacobson, Steve Adams, Michael Wheeler, Daniel Pauly, and City Planning Consultant Keith Liden.

**VI. Citizens’ Input** This is an opportunity for visitors to address the Development Review Board on items not on the agenda. There were no comments.

**IV. City Council Liaison Report**

**Councilor Fitzgerald** provided no report at this time.

**VI. Consent Agenda:**

**A.** Approval of minutes of May 12, 2014 DRB Panel A meeting

The May 12, 2014 DRB Panel A meeting minutes were deferred due to the lack of a voting quorum.

**B. Resolution No. 280 Charbonneau Village Center Condominium Replat: SFA Design Group, LLC for Charbonneau Village Center Condominium – owner/applicant.** The applicant is requesting approval of a Tentative Condominium Replat for Charbonneau Village Center Condominium. The site includes Tax Lots 8000-80009, 8000B and 8000C and 8010A-8010F in Section 24CD, T3S-R1W, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Michael Wheeler

Case Files: DB13-0058 – Tentative Condominium Re-Plat

**Simon Springall moved to approve Resolution No. 280. Ken Ruud seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.**

**VII. Public Hearing:**

**A. Resolution No. 281. Artistic Auto Body Building Expansion: SFA Design Group, LLC- applicant for Terry Mostul – owner.** The applicant is requesting approval of an amendment to a Stage I Preliminary Plan, Stage II Final Plan, Waiver to reduce building setbacks and Site Design Review for approximately 4,995 square foot building expansion to the Artistic Auto Body building, including related site improvements. The site is located at 27975 SW Parkway Avenue on Tax Lots 701, 702 and 703 of Section 11, T3S, R1W, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Blaise Edmonds

Case Files: DB14-0017 – Revised Stage I Preliminary Plan

DB14-0018 – Stage II Final Plan  
DB14-0019 – Setback Waiver  
DB14-0020 – Site Design Review

**Chair Fierros Bower** called the public hearing to order at 6:35 pm and read the conduct of hearing format into the record. All Board members declared for the record that they had visited the site. No board member, however, declared a conflict of interest, bias, or conclusion from a site visit. No board member participation was challenged by any member of the audience.

**Simon Springall** declared he worked at Mentor Graphics, almost immediately adjacent to the Artistic Auto Body property, and did not think that affected his judgment or impacted this review.

**Blaise Edmonds, Manager of Current Planning**, announced that the criteria applicable to the application were stated on pages 2 and 3 of the Staff report, which was entered into the record. Copies of the report were made available to the side of the room.

**Mr. Edmonds** stated that his memorandum, dated June 9, 2014 and entered into the record as Exhibit A3, was emailed to the Board and Applicant, and was also made available at the meeting. He noted the site's location and features, as well as the various business components and proposed improvements on the site. He presented the Staff report via PowerPoint with these key additional comments:

- He displayed the Approved Stage I Preliminary Plan in 1997, noting the Applicant would still like to expand his auto body operation into the RV storage lot in the future. Only one access drive existed which was located off of SW Parkway Ave. No access existed off Boeckman Rd due to the steep slopes.
- Revised Stage I Preliminary Plan/Stage II Final Plan.
  - The 1997 approval had a waiver from the minimum Parking Code requirement. The Applicant initially requested another waiver for the proposed addition, but that would not work because more parking needed to be provided to meet the minimum Parking Code. The Applicant proposed adding 30 overflow parking spaces on the RV storage lot in the event that parking was needed. This enabled them to meet the minimum Code. He agreed with the Applicant that on any particular day they would not have a such a large parking demand and need overflow parking, so this was more of a test to show the Applicant could provide the parking needed to meet the minimum Code requirement and stripe for additional parking overflow parking if needed.
    - He indicated where the Enterprise car rental company parked its fleet with car pick up being on the east side of the site.
  - He reviewed Exhibit A3 with these comments:
    - A Building Division condition of approval in 1997 required an accessible handicap route from SW Parkway Ave to Artistic Auto Body's main building. He discovered from the building official this morning that if a single driveway existed, that route was no longer a requirement under the Oregon Structural Specialty Building Code. Apparently, the State was regulating more stringent requirements for ADA accessibility than the federal guidelines, which was why there was a softening of that requirement.
      - He read his proposed Condition PDB4 on Page 2 of the memorandum requiring the path to be on the north side of the drive because not enough room existed on the south side and pedestrians should not be walking behind cars backing out of the head-in parking.
    - The Applicant was right at 15% landscape coverage for the entire master planned area and in order to build a full sidewalk improvement, the shade trees and landscaping on the slope area required to shade the parking spaces would need to be removed, violating the landscaping Code required for the parking areas. The only option was to stripe a lane and have it drop down to Artistic Auto Body.

- Exhibit A3 discussed concerns about Condition 30 of the previous approval because widening Boeckman Rd would remove all the landscaping and arborvitae the Applicant had planted offsite at his cost, which was a City Code requirement back then and would not be required now. Now, all landscaping and improvements were always on site and development practices were not required offsite unless a development agreement existed.
  - The property was under a Portland General Electric (PGE) power line easement, so the Applicant planted all the landscape materials along that slope and within the past 10 years, PGE chemically treated and killed all of the plantings. As a result, the Applicant was not too inclined to replant additional landscaping only to have it destroyed after the fact when he had no control over it, so the Applicant believed he had done his landscape treatment.
  - He believed Condition 30 should be reaffirmed in this application and renumbered to Condition PDB3. If the road were widened, the arborvitae removed and the road came closer to the subject property that the Applicant would be responsible to plant more obscuring landscaping, such as taller cedar trees or material, along the south side of the property to screen Artistic's activities between the proposed addition and Boeckman Rd.
    - He indicated areas where planting or landscaping could be added, such as a 6-ft high solid wall or durable fence, to help screen the view of the project. He noted that the site was at least 10-ft to 15-ft lower in elevation than the road, so no matter what type of landscaping the Applicant planted, it would not be completely effective in screening the site. However, this did not relieve the Applicant from planting some kind of screening in the future if Boeckman Rd was widened.
- Setback Waiver. The requested 5-ft setback waiver from the 30-ft Planned Development Industrial (PDI) Zone minimum setback requirement regarded the efficiency inside the existing auto body shop, as employees were basically stepping over each other, over car parts and moving cars out of the way to survey for accident damage. An auto body shop had many more requirements to comply with insurance regulations and collision accidents, which demanded more space within their building. The Applicant needed the overflow to create more space to make their operation more efficient. It did not appear that any more employees would be hired; possibly one or two over time. Approving the waiver would provide the Applicant and his employees with more elbow space to make their business work.
  - An existing Development Code criterion stated that any building needed to be at least 55 ft away from the centerline of any collector/arterial street. After further evaluation it was determined that the building would be 57.5 feet away, meeting the 55-ft requirement setback from the centerline of the arterial/collector street.
- Site Design Review.
  - Landscape Plan. Staff requested that more landscaping be added, so the Applicant submitted an updated Landscape Plan to improve the interior of the site with most of the additional landscaping on the east of the new building and along the south side of the proposed 30 new parking spaces.
  - The building itself was a simple steel frame construction with very little fenestration. The site had high security as very expensive cars were being repaired there, so they did not want people gawking through windows and needed a tight envelope.
    - A regal blue color was proposed to match the blue color of the existing building against metal siding.
- Many interesting issues were involved with the small building application, especially the waiver and parking requirements in an effort to bring the site more in line with the Development Code. He believed the Applicant and Staff had worked out the issues so the Board could move forward with a decision of approval.

**Mr. Springall** asked if the proposed painted sidewalk along the north side of the driveway was to extend to the eastern or western edge of the Artistic Auto Body's main building. Enterprise's customer entrance was on the western edge and he suggested the path should extend to the western side of the building as it would cross both of the parking entrances and the driveway to the RV entrance as well.

**Mr. Edmonds** replied that could be deliberated with the other Board members.

**Mr. Springall** said it probably depended on the intended purpose of the sidewalk, whether it was for customers or strictly for employees because he imagined employees would not go around to the front of the building.

**Mr. Edmonds** said he saw an employee walking from Artistic Auto down the driveway this morning so he knew it happened.

**Mr. Springall** noted he had walked up there to rent a car from Enterprise and the walk was not very pleasant.

**Mr. Edmonds** replied it was an automotive center and most people had their cars towed in so they were not walking in; however, someone renting a car might.

- He believed pedestrian traffic to the project site would be very low from SW Boeckman Road and that connection was too steep to build a pathway. The more logical pathway connection is at SW Parkway. He had not specified whether the painted path was a single white line or something a bit more, but he believed the walkway should have white lines on each side. The condition stated the walkway should be 5-ft wide, but the building official said only a 4-ft wide path was required for an ADA accessible route, so the Board could change his condition to 4 ft if desired.

**Mr. Springall** believed 4-ft wide would probably be fine for such a narrow road.

**Ms. Akervall** understood the sidewalk would conflict with the trees, but asked if there would be a benefit to having bumps or something on the painted white lines.

**Mr. Edmonds** replied the City had removed such domes out of pathways and they were no longer encouraged because people tripped over them.

**Ms. Akervall** understood the sidewalk would be ideal, but did not work because of the trees. She asked if the sidewalk was ideal because of the curb.

**Mr. Edmonds** answered yes, but the aisle width was insufficient for two-lane traffic and a raised sidewalk. As a result of the slope, all landscaping would have to be removed and he believed there was no point in going to that extent based on the amount of pedestrian traffic in the area.

**Ms. Akervall** agreed.

**Mr. Edmonds** reiterated that the building official indicated that the Code no longer required an accessible handicap route for a single driveway. The Board could lean on Code Section 4.154 which discussed connectivity, but that was not a full sidewalk improvement that City Code would like to have.

**Chair Fierros Bower** stated if it were required per Code and the route was heavily traveled by pedestrians she would want to see something more permanent, but for this application, she believed it might be acceptable to have a striped walkway versus a sidewalk. She confirmed more landscaping was proposed for the area, adding she tended to lean more towards landscaping and greenery if minimal

pedestrian traffic would be traveling through the area.

**Mr. Springall** noted proposed Condition PDB3 and asked if conventional landscaping would do any good for screening because of the vertical separation of the site.

**Mr. Edmonds** replied the Applicant had planted arborvitae along the north right-of-way line with the idea of bringing the landscaping up to the road. The arborvitae had grown over time and a few dead ones existed in between, but it had created a pretty solid hedge. The issue was if future improvements were made to Boeckman Rd, the arborvitae would have to be removed to provide space for a sidewalk and bike path. That slope was also under the PGE power line easement, so restrictions existed regarding the height of landscaping that could be planted there, and any landscaping located on ODOT property would often be removed without notification to the City.

**Mr. Springall** expressed concern about the Applicant planting landscaping within their own site, immediately to the south of the building, and within the 5-ft setback between the addition and property line. He asked if enough space existed within the 5-ft setback.

**Mr. Edmonds** explained the area was 5 ft at one end, but fanned out and became bigger at the other side.

**Mr. Springall** asked if the rest of the triangle was dead space.

**Mr. Edmonds** replied gravel had been proposed for that space, but he was concerned that the space might become a refuge for car parts, tires and other things, as had already been the case in different locations around the site.

**Mr. Springall** inquired why landscaping should not be proposed there anyway.

**Mr. Edmonds** replied that was something that could be considered.

**Mr. Springall** asked if it would be appropriate to require taller landscaping or would it interfere with the PGE easement.

**Mr. Edmonds** replied he was unsure where the easement was, so it could be an issue and was something the Board could ask the Applicant.

**Mr. Springall** asked if the Board could propose that the Applicant landscape using evergreen trees.

**Mr. Edmonds** replied now that the city was maturing, he had seen numerous applications in which individuals planted evergreen trees and 20 years later they needed to be cut because they were placed too close to buildings and grew too big. He added the Applicant needed to be careful about the type of landscaping they put in because it could eventually be the wrong species for the location.

**Mr. Springall** said the only problem he had with the 5-ft setback waiver was the landscaping issue.

**Mr. Edmonds** responded a waiver was not just a free handout, but the burden of proof was on the Applicant to give something in return to gain the waiver and not just answer that they need to have more efficiency inside their building space. A site design criteria required the Applicant to demonstrate to the Board that they could give something back in return in terms of some kind of site improvement.

**Chair Fierros Bower** asked about the exterior color proposed for the building. She noted regal blue was mentioned, but there was also a circle around regal white. She asked if the white was proposed on the building as well for the trim.

**Mr. Edmonds** believed the trim was going to be white and that the Applicant was trying to match the blue of the existing Artistic Auto Body building to the best of their ability. As for the exterior metal siding, they had a pretty limited and straightforward pallet.

**Chair Fierros Bower** called for the Applicant's presentation.

**Ben Altman, SFA Design Group, 9020 SW Washington Square Rd, Suite #505, Portland, OR 97223,** indicated the owner of Artistic Auto Body, Terry Mostul, was also present at tonight's meeting.

- He clarified the building would be white with blue trim to match the existing buildings.
- He believed Staff had done a very good job of summarizing what the Applicant was working on, including the long-range future plan to ultimately build on the north site where the RVs were stored. However, the Applicant was not ready to do so at this point but was just trying to maximize the efficient use of the space they had, while sharing the cost of land and everything up to that point where they were ready to really fully utilize the property.
- The Applicant had no problems with the pathway issue of striping something there, and agreed that the landscaping probably added more than a sidewalk given the low volume of pedestrian traffic. They did anticipate that the striped pathway would extend to the west end.
  - He noted the two main doors and a man door to the shop that was located in the corner, adding the Applicant could stripe along the north line to provide that connection.
- The Applicant's only issue with the conditions involved more of a clarification on the screening. Given the fact that there was elevation throughout that section, it was really a question of functionality. He indicated on the Landscape Plan how and where areas of the site and the road noting that the western corner of the site was about 20 ft lower than the bridge height.
  - The triangle area was intended to be used for temporary storage or recycled products and the Applicant collected plastic and things of the sort and hauled them off on a regular basis, but only when they had a load to haul off. So, that area would have random parts stored in it, but it was actually considerably below grade.
  - As far as functional screening went, he believed it would be more appropriate in the area south of the RV maintenance shop. If any screening was to be done near the lower grade separation of the road from the property, anything from that line west would require a 30-ft screen to reach the height of the road and be functional. The existing arborvitae did a good job of screening the bank and he believed it would be more functional to do something there if and when there was a time to do that.
  - He indicated where the centerline of Boeckman Rd was projected, noting another factor to consider was when the overpass was built the road was shifted to the north side. He assumed that was because there was not enough right-of-way on the south side because Thunderbird Mobile Club was there at the time, so they moved the road to the north to get the elevation through and stayed within the existing right-of-way. At this point, no specific design existed for widening Boeckman Rd, but it would likely be widened eventually.
    - His assumed that when ODOT eventually widened Boeckman Rd, they would recenter the road, which would necessarily move the pavement away from the building, but it would not eliminate the elevation difference because the road would not get any lower than it was now and would always be elevated.
- The question involved clarifying what would be functional screening, and his sensed that the only functional screening would be located in the southeast corner of the site. If the road was widened and the arborvitae removed, effective screening could be provided throughout the area so as people approach the elevation change, no one would be able to see into the site. He added anything down on

the grade would have to be very tall to be functional and there was not enough room for that.

- The Applicant's only concern was what would be expected until that happened and it might be an issue that could be worked out when the road was actually widened so more was known about what was actually happening there. They understood the normal screening requirements, but the site was vertically separated so the screening needed to be functional in order to work.

**Mr. Springall** asked if the area behind the proposed addition was currently used for storage or parts external to the building and if there should be concern about any pollution or runoff from rain.

**Mr. Altman** stated they were recyclable parts that were typically plastic and there might be some metals, but most of it was reused or hauled off. He explained that plastic bumpers and things of the sort were stored there until the Applicant had enough to make a truckload. Similar product was currently being stored to the south of the canopy area where the car wash was located. He added, given the current planting by the road, that area was probably the least visible of all areas on the site.

- He noted that the east side of the proposed addition would be part of the retaining wall, which would continue south, and that about a 4-ft elevation difference existed between the east and west areas. Plantings would be installed on top of the retaining wall to screen the area, although the area was well screened now because of the arborvitae.

**Chair Fierros Bower** said no future sidewalk was proposed along Boeckman Rd, so no potential existed for pedestrians to walk through and look in the site.

**Mr. Altman** responded people did walk across there and he had done so himself, but he did not tend to ponder looking down to see what was happening. He assumed if Boeckman Rd was ever widened there would be sidewalk.

**Mr. Springall** said he walked over to the site today and the arborvitae provided a very effective screen. There were a few gaps in the arborvitae where a few trees had not grown or were cut down, but it was generally an almost complete screen. He believed the screening really depended on what happened when the road was eventually built out or expanded.

**Mr. Altman** said it was very possible that the arborvitae would not be removed when Boeckman Rd was eventually widened because the road would be centered to the south and it was entirely possible that the north part of the site would be developed before a build out of the road ever happened.

**Mr. Springall** asked Mr. Adams to offer his opinion about which direction the road would likely be built out.

**Steve Adams, Development Engineering Manager**, said the City acquired the right-of-way from Brenchley Estates when they built their apartments and now had a full half right-of-way south of the centerline at 50.5 ft and the road would be centered. He doubted the edge of asphalt would move any because the design would be a 4-lane road and the center turn lane would probably be narrowed to a 4-ft width or so to provide a bit of a gap to opposing traffic. The road was not designed yet, but it would have bike lanes and sidewalks. Staff was unsure how wide the sidewalk would be or if the road would fit the regular slope embankment going to the north or south or whether a retaining wall of some sort would have to be built. As a result of other projects, he suspected that some sort of retaining wall would eventually need to be built to hold a road of that width. He reiterated absolutely zero design existed for the road now.

**Ms. Akervall** asked for clarification about the proposed 5-ft setback waiver. She noted it indicated approximately 48 ft from what looked like the green area to the red, but she wondered if the 57.5 ft that Mr. Edmonds mentioned earlier was a result of the recentering.

**Mr. Adams** replied the 48 ft did not go to the centerline, which was further down on the slide, so he was unsure what the 48 ft represented. The right-of-way width on record was wide because at some point in the past ODOT thought there would be an intersection and they took a lot of extra land beyond what would normally be an arterial width right-of-way. He noted a 52.5 ft minimum right-of-way existed from the centerline to the edge of the Applicant's property and if they had a 5-ft setback right on that corner, it would be a minimum of 57.5 ft, but likely be much more because the right-of-way angled where the building was so it was not right on the edge of the east property line.

**Mr. Altman** clarified the east property line was farther over. The line showing 55 ft was actually 55 ft from the projected centerline and not the center of pavement. It was the center of the right-of-way, so the building was actually probably about 90 ft from the centerline.

**Mr. Adams** confirmed that included the 5-ft setback yes, reiterating that was a very wide for an arterial and that he believed ODOT was thinking of an interchange when they first got that right-of-way.

**Mr. Altman** said the 48 ft looked to be close to the top of the bank, right about where the arborvitae were located.

**Mr. Springall** asked where the easement for PGE was located.

**Mr. Altman** replied PGE's easement was shared with ODOT and went right over the top of the ODOT right-of-way.

**Mr. Springall** explained he was interested because if some landscaping was required on the south side of the property line, he wondered if it would be killed off immediately by PGE.

**Mr. Altman** replied no, PGE would not do anything on site; they had sprayed the bank and killed some trees to keep the vertical clearance from the property. A large amount of vegetation still grew on the bank and the power lines could barely be seen running through there. He confirmed the nice landscaping that the Applicant planted previously had overgrown and not all the vegetation was what had been planted originally.

- He encouraged that the conditions address functional screening as opposed to just an arbitrary property line screening. The red line on Slide 5 indicated the property line and a retaining wall was on ODOT's property that encroached on the Applicant's site. From a functional standpoint, the only real screening would be provided through there along with the retaining wall and the landscaping to the east.

**Ms. Akervall** asked if there were any regulations about having large car bumpers outside of a building.

**Mr. Edmonds** replied screening was required and the concern was that if Boeckman Rd was widened the bumpers would be in plain view of the sidewalk. He was curious how the Applicant planned to address the Code criteria through screening of outdoor storage, adding it was not the Board's responsibility to tell the Applicant what to do, but he needed to demonstrate to the Board how that would be accomplished.

**Mr. Altman** replied at this point the Applicant did not know how they would address that because they did not know what the road design would be; they did not have a problem with the condition that there needed to be screening, it was a question of where the screening needed to go.



**Mr. Edmonds** said this very same discussion occurred in 1996, and he was certain this was not the first time it had come across in front of a public hearing. He believed the Board imposed Condition 30 back then to both safeguard and put some kind of obligation on the Applicant because if they did not have that condition it would be very difficult to go back on the Applicant and require screening.

**Chair Fierros Bower** believed the way the condition was written seemed a bit general, which was good because no one knew what the road would do. She noted Mr. Altman mentioned that perhaps more functional screening could occur on the southeast portion of the property, but no one knew what would happen with the road. She believed it was up to Staff to work with the Applicant to determine the best solution for screening.

**Barbara Jacobson, Assistant City Attorney**, asked whether Ms. Akervall was talking about screening the car bumpers later when the road changed or if there was a condition for screening them now.

**Ms. Akervall** replied the arborvitae were there now, but no one had control over whether they stayed or were removed, and if the road was widened, they would most certainly change in some way. The site was screened by the arborvitae now, but she wondered what City regulations existed regarding storing car bumpers out in the open.

**Daniel Pauly, Associate Planner**, noted junk vehicle regulations existed and confirmed junk vehicles or parts could not be stored in the open.

**Ms. Akervall** confirmed storing the car bumpers was probably okay if they were behind the arborvitae, but if the arborvitae were no longer there something else would need to be done.

**Mr. Edmonds** noted Mr. Adams explained to him that typically the City took care of the landscaping along a street when doing a street improvement. If that were true, he wondered how future Staff would know there was a maintenance responsibility, unless a finding or something acknowledging that there was an issue existed.

**Mr. Altman** said he understood the screening, but was asking for a qualifier within the condition that described what the Applicant needed to screen. Screening outdoor storage was a different issue than screening the top of the building and one was much more doable than the other. The arborvitae screened the entire site now, but if Boeckman Rd changed, they did not know what that edge would look like. They knew it would still be 20 ft in the air and a situation where people could still look down onto the top of the site. Screening the outdoor storage that was one thing, but if the Board wanted the Applicant to screen the entire site like they did now, he was unsure that could be delivered.

**Chair Fierros Bower** asked if a condition or something could be added stating that the City would be responsible for landscaping that area.

**Mr. Edmonds** said Mr. Adams implied that, but it would depend on the budget, the right-of-way and the type of landscaping. He noted the Applicant was asking for details about what was expected of him and Staff was unsure what the City expected from the Applicant if they might not be able to deliver. He believed some important evidence had been heard. He noted Mr. Pauly said automotive parts could not be stored outside as it was a nuisance and against Code. If that was the Applicant's intent, that was a Code violation and that might help in the Board's decision about whether to require screening next to the building. He noted Boeckman Rd was a major arterial street and the Applicant was asking for a waiver to a setback. He still had not heard from the Applicant about how they planned to meet the design criteria to make the waiver more approvable. He heard that the Applicant intended to store bumpers on the south

side of the building and in his opinion that did not meet the test.

**Mr. Springall** said it seemed that the issue could be resolved with a slight change to the landscape condition in Exhibit A3, and asked if that should be left until the hearing was closed.

**Ms. Jacobson** recommended asking what Mr. Edmonds he might suggest given the new testimony that the idea was to store parts outside of the building, and what he would suggest in terms of the waiver and whether that should be allowed, disallowed or screened.

**Mr. Springall** believed Mr. Altman made a good case that the Board could not require 30-ft high screening, as that would not be feasible. He noted the Board was interested in functional screening at the low level; perhaps 5-ft to 6-ft high landscaping on the Applicant's site.

**Mr. Edmonds** replied the Board could state that the Applicant consider screening to the high screen landscape standard in the event that the arborvitae were removed when future road widening of SW Boeckman Rd occurred. The high screen landscape standard was a Development Code standard and could be a 6-ft wall or a vegetative screen with trees every 30 ft.

**Mr. Springall** said that reminded him of the Toyota dealer on the west side of the I-5 junction at Boeckman Rd where vehicles could be seen in the lot at a higher elevation, but at a lower elevation the site was completely screened.

**Mr. Edmonds** agreed, adding Toyota built a 6-ft high wall around the site with a tree every 30 ft and that would be appropriate in this case.

**Mr. Springall** said the wording could be changed quite easily by replacing "obscuring planting" with "high screen landscape standard screening should be installed on site along the south side of the property line" or something like that.

**Mr. Ruud** asked if the Board could propose a condition that would require a receptacle on site given the expressed intent to store recyclable parts.

**Mr. Edmonds** believed that could be possible, but he was sure all of the parts were different shapes and sizes. He added it could be hard to get a dumpster in that location due to the retaining wall on the east side and only a 5-ft opening on the other side.

**Mr. Ruud** responded the space would already have to be accessible for a large vehicle to pick up loads of parts periodically.

**Mr. Edmonds** responded he did not know how that would work.

**Mr. Altman** explained the intent was to park the truck on the east side of the new addition and carry the parts out to load them onto the truck. He indicated where the truck would enter and exit to pick up loads.

**Chair Fierros Bower** agreed it was a good idea to reword the condition with the high screen landscape standard screening.

**Mr. Altman** noted he was only seeking a bit of clarity about what the Board was requesting.

**Mr. Ruud** asked if the screening would prevent the public eye from viewing storage and materials outside that should not be there anyway. He believed Mr. Pauly noted that parts should not be stored outside and he asked if that was accurate.

**Mr. Altman** said he disagreed with that statement, noting the Industrial Code had provisions for outdoor storage and the whole south lot was originally approved for outdoor storage of vehicles and parts that were being worked on. He believed Mr. Pauly was referring to abandoned or junk vehicles, noting the vehicles, or parts related to them, were being worked on in the body shop and the parts were just being stored. He did not see a Code prohibiting outdoor storage. The Code required appropriate screening for outdoor storage and the Applicant did not object to that. The issue was the clarity of what that screening should be; the Applicant had no problem with the high screen landscape standard, as long as they knew what the Board was requesting.

**Mr. Ruud** understood the recyclables were not valuable parts to be reused by the business, but rather the business was storing them and eventually hauling them off site.

**Mr. Altman** responded that was correct, adding the parts came from the vehicles and needed to be stored somewhere until they were hauled off, so the Applicant accumulated them until they had enough for a truck load.

**Mr. Edmonds** cited Code Chapter 6.214 Nuisances Open Storage of Junk, stating, “A person violates this section if the owner/tenant/person in possession or person in charge of or having the care of real property who deposits, stores, maintains or keeps on real property within the City outside and site obscuring enclosure, building or garbage receptacle any of the following: inoperable, unusable, partially dismantled automobiles, cars, trucks and trailers, other vehicle equipment or parts thereof in a state of despair for more than 10 days as to one automobile, car, truck, trailer or piece of vehicle equipment be used or dismantled household appliances, furniture and parts thereof discards garbage, debris, rubbish, junk, trash or refuge for more than five days.”

- He then described how a waiver was judged, quoting Site Design Review Section 4.400, stating, “A. Assure that site development plans are designed in a manner that ensures proper functioning of the site and maintains a high quality visual environment. B. Encourage originality, flexibility, innovation and site planning, development of clean architecture, landscaping and graphic design of said development. C. Discourage monotonous drab, unsightly jury and inharmonious developments. D. Conserve the City’s natural beauty and visual character and charm by ensuring the structure and signs of other improvements are properly related to the sites and surrounding sites and structures that do regard to aesthetic qualities of the natural terrain and landscaping and that proper attention is given to exterior appearances of structure, signs and other improvements. E. Protect and enhance the City’s appeal and thus support and stimulate businesses, industry and promote the desirability of investment and occupancy in businesses of commercial and industrial purposes. F, stabilize and improve property values to prevent blighted areas and thus increase tax revenues.” He noted there was a lot of emphasis on what the site and its surroundings looked like.

**Mr. Pauly** clarified that the Applicant’s business offered vehicle repair service, so the nuisance section did not apply, but the waiver and screening of storage did.

- He confirmed the part about hauling things away every 10 days did not apply because an exemption was written into the Code for this type of business.

**Ms. Jacobson** stated the Board needed to look at the waiver criteria, because it was a waiver provision.

**Mr. Ruud** asked if the Applicant specifically cited repair because he heard the Applicant’s business was a wrecking yard.

**Mr. Edmonds** clarified that the Applicant was repairing.

**Mr. Pauly** noted the Code stated, “duly licensed junkyard, an automobile dealership or a repair shop.”

**Mr. Edmonds** said he was looking a high screen landscape standard because he believed the Applicant was leaning that way.

**Mr. Altman** confirmed that the high screen landscape standard applied to outdoor storage and the Applicant would not be required to screen the entire site, visibility of a building or anything else. He noted that clarification helped the Applicant understand the function of the screening.

**Mr. Edmonds** said the section of the site just south of the proposed addition could be the high screen landscape standard. He noted the existing arborvitae provided sufficient screening. He explained Condition 30 was meant for the future because he wanted the City to be able to come back to the Applicant after the road had been widened with some leverage for the Applicant to work with the City to build to a high screen landscape standard. He did not think that was a difficult and demanding condition. He confirmed Condition 30, renumbered to PDB3, regarded the future and not now.

**Chair Fierros Bower** called for public testimony in favor of, opposed and neutral to the application. Seeing none, she called for any rebuttal from the Applicant.

**Terry Mostul, Artistic Auto Body**, said he appreciated Mr. Ruud’s comments about the recycle storage and its appearance. In his opinion, the area identified for the expansion was lacking in appearance because it was too large of an area and things were spread out. One thing Artistic wanted to try to do in the small triangle behind the building was to condense the recycling to a smaller area, clean it up and actually put in containers to keep it in small piles. He added recycling was something that was important to his company and they recycled cardboard, plastic, bumpers and sheet metal. Items that they planned to store included plastic, bumpers and sheet metal, such as fenders and hoods. He noted Artistic had people that came and picked the piles up about every week or two at the most, so the piles never got large.

**Chair Fierros Bower** closed the public hearing at 7:49 pm.

**Simon Springall moved to accept the Staff report with the addition of Exhibit A3, amending the following conditions presented in the exhibit as follows:**

- Condition PDB3: “If future widening of Boeckman Road eliminates the off-site landscape buffering, obscuring planting *screening to the high screen standard* shall be replaced on site along the south property line *in the area of the new building addition.*”
- Condition PDB4: “The Applicant/Owner shall delineate with paint a 5 4 foot wide pathway along the north side of the existing driveway between the sidewalk at SW Parkway Avenue and the **western side of** the Artistic Auto Body building and including one painted crosswalk at its’ westerly terminus to the Artistic Auto Body building. The Applicant/Owner shall maintain the painted path and not let it deteriorate over time.”

**Ken Ruud seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.**

**Simon Springall moved to approve Resolution No. 281. Ken Ruud seconded the motion.**

**Ms. Akervall** believed the addition seemed very reasonable and she was glad that it was added today. She asked if the Board believed the proposal was making things better.

**Mr. Ruud** believed the pathway made things safer for the Applicant and that good conditions were included. He had passed by the site many times and had not noticed the business on that side of the road at all. He believed the Applicant had done a good job of obscuring the site and he felt pretty good that the conditions that the Board made were appropriate for the future as well. He liked the pathway for safety and in terms of being an improvement. He noted at the end of the day, the Board was allowing a business owner, who had been a good citizen of the city for 20 years, to continue their operations and expand, which was great. He believed everyone would love to own a business that continued expanding.

**Mr. Springall** believed the Board should consider Artistic Auto Body a valuable business and encourage them to stay in Wilsonville, as few auto body shops existed around the City so the business was essential. The City had car dealerships that sold new cars that would crash into each other now and then.

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Chair Fierros Bower** read the rules of appeal into the record.

The Board took a brief recess and reconvened at 8:05 pm.

- B. Resolution No. 282. Chrysler, Dodge, Jeep and Ram Dealership: Findlay Automotive Group – applicant.** The applicant is requesting approval of a Modified Stage I Preliminary Plan, Stage II Final Plan, Site Design Review, Type C Tree Plan and Master Sign Plan Revision for a Chrysler Dodge Jeep Ram Dealership within an existing building including related site improvements. The site is located at 25600 SW Parkway Center Drive on Tax Lots 1507 and 1508 of Section 1, T3S, R1W, Washington County, Oregon. Staff: Blaise Edmonds

Case Files: DB14-0036 – Revised Stage I Preliminary Plan  
DB14-0037 – Stage II Final Plan  
DB14-0038 – Site Design Review  
DB14-0039 – Master Sign Plan Revision  
DB14-0040 – Type C Tree Plan

**Chair Fierros Bower** declared that her firm, LRS Architects, was involved with the design of this project, so she recused herself from the public hearing and stepped down from the dais.

**Vice-Chair Ruud** called the public hearing to order at 8:06 pm and read the conduct of hearing format into the record. All Board members declared for the record that they had visited the site. No board member, however, declared a conflict of interest, bias, or conclusion from a site visit. No board member participation was challenged by any member of the audience.

**Blaise Edmonds, Manager of Current Planning,** announced that the criteria applicable to the application were stated on page 3 and 4 of the Staff report, which was entered into the record. Copies of the report were made available to the side of the room.

**Mr. Edmonds** noted Keith Liden was retained to help City Staff with this application, adding he had worked together on it, but Mr. Liden did the bulk of the work. Mr. Liden would present the Staff report and they were both available to answer questions.

**Keith Liden, City Planning Consultant,** presented the Staff report via PowerPoint, describing the site, its location and key details about the site improvements using multiple photos of the site and with these key comments:

- The street trees along SW Parkway Center Dr would remain. The Tenant A building on the north side of the drive was where the proposed dealership would be located and the Tenant B building on the south side was for a future industrial/office use, which would remain vacant until some future application proposed development of the space.
- One key improvement along SW Elligsen Rd was that the retaining wall would be removed and replaced with landscaping. The Applicant also proposed replacing the truck loading bays with storefront windows and entrances into the dealership.
  - Some previous improvements would also be removed to make way for a new driveway to connect the parking lot on the SW Parkway Center Dr side of the site with the parking lot and circulation area on the Elligsen Rd side of the site.
  - Some landscaping and street improvements were also proposed along SW Elligsen Rd.
- Much of the mature landscaping would remain along SW Parkway Center Dr frontage near the southwest corner of the building, though some changes were proposed for the dealership portion.
  - One of the proposed improvements would connect the sidewalk on site with the existing crosswalk at the southwest driveway on Parkway Center Dr. The driveway was proposed to be widened somewhat to meet current City standards.
  - A driveway was also proposed to connect the west and north sides of the site.
- To enhance visibility, the Applicant proposed removing the trees at the corner of SW Parkway Center Dr and SW Elligsen Rd.
  - The Landscape Plan proposed the replacement of the 24 trees being removed with trees 6” DBH or larger as defined by Code, and replacing them at least at a 1:1 ratio. The Landscape Plan showed that the majority of the trees on site would be retained. New landscaping primarily consisted of the screen buffer and some new trees along the parking lots and some new landscaping in front of the dealership.
- The proposed Site Plan was relatively complicated as it showed grading related to the widening of the southwest driveway. The existing driveway on SW Elligsen Rd was also proposed to be widened somewhat to meet City standards. The shaded area in the northwest corner of the site was where new pervious paving would be installed to connect the two parking lots.
- The proposed Building Uses & Areas diagram showed how the different uses on the site would be placed. The orange color indicated industrial warehouse, the green was office, and the beige color was retail. The industrial warehouse area was for the storage of cars and material, the retail area was primarily for the sale and leasing of automobiles, and the office area was for administration.
- He displayed the proposed changes to the west façade of the building, noting the changes were only for Tenant A and not Tenant B. The Applicant proposed changes to the frontage with some signage and some changes in the windows, as well as a new feature for highlighting the center of the dealership.
- The color board materials showing the building’s proposed paint color, aluminum storefront color and glass color were displayed.
- A new trash enclosure was proposed for the site that would be located to the east of the building in the existing parking lot and would occupy what were now several parking stalls.
- The site lighting was proposed to remain same around most of the site, except for some new light fixtures and lighting proposed along the front. These had been evaluated by Staff and found to meet the City’s lighting requirements.
- He noted a sign area of limitation existed due to the previous Sign Master Plan approval and the Applicant proposed only two freestanding signs and two monument signs. The monument sign stating “Mopar Service” would be located on the east side of the SW Elligsen Rd driveway and the “Chrysler Dodge Jeep Ram” monument sign would be located near the northern driveway on SW Parkway Center Dr. As noted in the Staff report, the signs were well below the allowable Code maximums.

**Mr. Edmonds** circulated the color materials for the Board to review, noting the architect was present to explain the proposal in more detail.

- He noted at one time the middle part of the Hollywood Video warehouse building had a mountainscape with big Hollywood letters that was more than 1,000 sq ft of signage. The Applicant's proposal was more like what could be seen in the Argyle Square Master Plan area and was more compatible. He believed the Master Sign Plan was very well done compared to what existed previously.

**Mr. Liden** added that some wall signs were also proposed with the graphics shown on Slide 20 that would go along the front of the building.

**Mr. Edmonds** added the building had been vacant for five to six years and City Council encouraged that vacant buildings be filled. He believed this was a very good use for the space, noting historically a provision existed for the building to have a commercial component as part of the prior Master Plan approval. He believed the Applicant had successfully compared their proposed commercial, office and storage areas to be the same percentages approved in the original Master Plan. He was excited about the project and believed it would be a great asset to the city.

**Vice-Chair Ruud** asked if there would be a corresponding vacancy of another building that Dodge Chrysler Jeep currently occupied in the city.

**Mr. Edmonds** replied the prior use was the Ralph Martinez Dodge Chrysler Jeep, but that building sold about a year or so ago. He was not sure what the specific reasons were for the sale, but noted the World of Speed now occupied that building.

**Vice-Chair Ruud** confirmed the business would be coming back into town with a new owner, as Dodge Chrysler Jeep, and net/net, there would be one less vacancy in town.

**Mr. Liden** noted a comparison of the previous approval and what was proposed now was shown in a table on Page 17 of the Staff report, adding the uses proposed now and what existed before were very similar.

**Mr. Edmonds** said inventory of cars at all of the other dealerships on the west side of the freeway in the Industrial Zone were typically treated as industrial storage. The only difference for this application was that the inventory was under a roof as opposed to being outside. He believed this dealership had a better handle on offsite viewing than the others because all of the inventory would be stored inside the building.

**Mr. Springall** expressed concern about the stormwater drain shown in Slide 4 and the line intended to direct bicyclists from a 6-ft bike lane to a 2-ft or 3-ft spot toward the main flow of traffic. He believed this was quite a hazardous situation for bicyclists and asked if the driveway was being redeveloped or left alone.

**Mr. Liden** replied Staff was recommending that the driveway be changed to a right-in and a right-out only, as opposed to being able to go any direction, but no physical change would be made to the driveway itself.

**Mr. Springall** understood part of that recommendation was a proposal to put a concrete island in the middle of SW Parkway Center Dr. He noted the drain could use some reconfiguring to ensure that bicycle tires did not get stuck in it causing other bicyclists to be directed out into the street.

**Mr. Edmonds** believed the City had designed the grates so no bicycle tires could get stuck in them. He agreed that the grate looked scary, but he had ridden his bike over them with no problem.

**Mr. Springall** noted the diagonal striping tended to be in front of grates that were potentially hazardous, otherwise he was not sure what the purpose was of the diagonal striping. He asked what the situation was with the grates and whether they were the City's or the Applicant's responsibility.

**Steve Adams, Development Engineering Manager**, said the grates were installed 30 years ago and current standards no longer included area drains. He noted complaints had been made about the drains on Boones Ferry Rd north of Wilsonville Rd and the last time street improvements were made, a year and a half ago, the drains were extended back and curb inlets were installed at the curb to eliminate them. He explained that sort of improvement would be impossible for this application due to the driveway's location. Making such an improvement would take a fairly major modification that would involve installing a new storm line on the north or south side of the driveway. Since a driveway modification was not proposed and no construction work was to be done at the driveway, he did not see an opportunity to require the Applicant to relocate or move the storm drain.

**Mr. Edmonds** asked if the grate was hazardous.

**Mr. Adams** replied no, explaining Staff had placed the flat steel plates on top of the grate and it now met current requirements. He agreed the grate was not ideal and he would not ride his bike over it. He agreed to mention it to Nancy Kraushaar, Community Development Director, to see if it could be put on the Street Maintenance Program for the summer of 2015.

**Vice-Chair Ruud** understood no modification was proposed for the driveway, but asked if the fact that an application existed for the property opened up the opportunity to bring the grate up to current standards

**Mr. Adams** replied he did not see it that way because it was an existing building where the Applicant planned on doing some very slight modifications. If the driveway was being widened or modified, he could see a connection to say the storm drain was outdated and one that worked should be installed. He noted the storm drain had to be such that the driveway did not direct any water into the public right-of-way. He explained the storm drain should be located back on the lower right side of the driveway or behind the sidewalk, catching any stormwater flow before it passed the curb, which was the way current designs were. He added the grate was an unusual outdated item, but he did not see the nexus to compel the Applicant to modify it.

**Mr. Springall** noted the photograph also showed the curb cut and the concrete between the driveway and SW Parkway Center Dr was damaged. He asked if the Applicant planned on fixing that.

**Mr. Adams** replied he had seen no changes to this driveway in the plans, but the two other driveways were being widened and modified. He added the Applicant could respond, but that was his understanding from the plans he had seen.

**Ms. Akervall** asked if test drives were taken into account for the car dealership when the traffic survey was done or if that made a difference.

**Mr. Adams** replied he assumed so, but would have to read exactly what was stated in the ITE manual because the Applicant said cars were coming and going from 4:00 pm to 6:00 pm.

**Ms. Akervall** asked if it had been an issue in the past with other dealerships in Wilsonville.

**Mr. Adams** replied no; the only issue with other dealerships in the past was the direction the test drivers went. In areas close to a subdivision, if test drivers tended to go into the subdivision, Staff had gotten



strong resistance from neighbors who stated they wanted test drives to occur on certain streets. Based on the location of this dealership, he did not believe that would be problem.

**Ms. Akervall** asked how that was addressed or resolved in the past, adding if she were test driving a car she would want to take it onto SW Stafford Rd because it was a pretty drive and would allow her to test the speed of a car.

**Mr. Adams** responded SW Stafford Rd was far enough out that it would never be a concern. When the Honda dealership went in on SW Parkway Center Dr, many neighbors south or directly east of the property were concerned that test drives would occur there and that car delivery trucks would travel through the area. In that situation, existing conditions were written that restricted delivery trucks from driving in certain directions and spelled out how they must access a site.

**Mr. Edmonds** added that the tenant improvement for an auto dealership had fewer trips than the prior use

**Mr. Adams** agreed, noting that this particular building reached a peak when Hollywood Video was there and by the ITE standards, which considered how much of the building was being occupied per square footage, it had a decrease in projected PM peak hour trips compared to when Hollywood Video occupied the site. He confirmed it provided a 25% buffer for test-drives.

**Mr. Edmonds** stated it was arterial streets, collector streets and in terms of location, it was a better location compared to the Honda dealership.

**Mr. Springall** noted Section B26 on Page 32 of the Staff report that talked about pedestrian connectivity and the ADA path. He read the section and indicated that no PDB 8 condition was listed. He was not sure if it was misnumbered or just missing.

**Mr. Adams** said language was probably left out.

**Mr. Springall** noted a question that was unresolved in Section B26. He read the last bullet point of the section and recommended that the Board consider changing the configuration of the crosswalk to flashing beacons.

**Mr. Adams** replied that would have to be a capital project because the crosswalk was constructed with the Costco/Argyle Square development and he could not draw a nexus to make the Chrysler dealership responsible for changing the crosswalk. He added the crosswalk would change with the proposed driveway improvements, but the improvements would not solve the fact that it was difficult to see. The only thing that could be done to make the crosswalk more visible was to install some kind of an overhead pole or sign, but he reiterated that would need to become a project within the City of Wilsonville.

**Mr. Liden** responded moving the crosswalk to the north might help a little because it became visible at the top of the rise where things flattened out, so it might be a bit better that way.

**Mr. Springall** added no center island existed in that crosswalk, so one had to run across the entire street without getting mowed down by cars traveling at 45 miles per hour or more.

**Mr. Adams** said this application did not lend itself to a center island because the left turn lane came in and out of the driveway of the new dealership and he did not believe the street was wide enough to narrow the lanes down to put a center turn lane in. It could have been designed a bit wider back in 2002 when it was approved, but it was not and there was no way to add a pedestrian refuge island now because

of the width of the street.

- He confirmed left hand turn lanes northbound for Costco and southbound for the entrance into Argyle Square existed, but no unused asphalt was available for a median. He indicated the double yellow line was the width between northbound and southbound.
- He confirmed he could talk with Ms. Kraushaar and suggest better signage. Ideally, he believed an overhead lighted sign would be best, but they were very expensive and had not been identified as a need on the capital project so they were not even on Staff's radar.

**Vice-Chair Ruud** asked if this was the entrance that was designated right-in/right-out only.

**Mr. Adams** replied no, this was the full access entrance that was further south and he believed the Applicant chose to widen it to allow three lanes, so one lane would come in and two would go out. He reiterated the Applicant did not explain exactly what they had planned.

**Mr. Edmonds** believed the safest access across SW Parkway Center Dr was at the controlled and lighted intersection with walk signs at SW Elligsen Rd and SW Parkway Center Dr.

**Mr. Springall** agreed that was the safest access, but the ADA pathway would lead to this intersection.

**Mr. Adams** said the one thing he could say was that this crosswalk had been there for 11 years. Staff had received complaints from citizens and SMART drivers about certain crosswalks in town, but this one had generated no comments whatsoever. Mr. Liden's comment was the first he had heard of a possible problem there. He knew it had not generated from a complaint from any citizen or anyone using it and that was the best he could offer. He added Staff was looking at other crosswalks that had generated complaints and they were working to resolve them.

**Mr. Springall** said he could see that there probably was not a lot of pedestrian traffic around there. He added he had walked across it once when he had a flat battery and parked in Costco.

**Mr. Edmonds** confirmed that the last sentence of Section B26 on page 32 should be struck.

**Vice-Chair Ruud** called for the Applicant's presentation.

**John Costello, 3716 N Longview Ave, Portland, OR, 97227**, stated he was the local coordinator and communicator with Staff on this project. He encouraged the Board to ask questions at any point in time, adding Findlay Automotive Group was present to provide an overview and answer the Board's questions. He admitted they were very excited about this building, its present condition and its location and they believed it was a real asset. It was a shame that the building had sat vacant for so long, but they were attempting to do something about that.

**Tyler Corder, Chief Financial Officer, Findlay Automotive Group, 310 N Gibson Rd, Henderson, NV, 89014**, provided a brief background of the business, noting Findlay had been in the car business for 53 years, operated 27 automobile dealerships in the western U.S. and was based in Henderson, Nevada. He explained Findlay got to Wilsonville because the prior Chrysler Dodge Jeep dealer closed last October and Chrysler conducted a selection process to find a replacement dealer. They were very fortunate that they were selected as Chrysler's preferred dealer to reestablish representation in Wilsonville. He added this was very important to Chrysler because, as a result of there having been a prior dealership in Wilsonville, thousands of Chrysler Dodge Jeep owners no longer had a dealership to go to for factory authorized service. He said Findlay was anxious to be involved in the Wilsonville community as they were very involved in the communities they operated in.

**Richard Youngblood, Executive Architect, 610 W Hubbard Ave, Ste 119, Coeur d'Alene, ID, 83814,** said he was very excited about this project, noting his firm, Youngblood Architecture, specialized in car dealerships and had done about 46 to date, many of which had been in existing buildings that were not in as good of condition as this one. He added their goal was to enhance the beauty of the building and make it a safer place for the community, customers, employees and vendors on the property.

**Mr. Costello** added the project's Landscape Designer, Mike O'Brien, who coordinated arborist's report was also present and available to answer questions as well.

**Mr. Springall** asked if the Applicant had any thoughts about the crossing and entrance to SW Parkway Center Dr. He noted his questions for Staff earlier, adding he did not really get complete satisfaction in their answers and he believed the Applicant might have something to add. He also had another question about the northern edge of the building regarding the architecture and design.

**Mr. Costello** understood Mr. Springall was concerned about the present location of the grate and the function for bicycle traffic. He explained that because the grate was in a City street and the driveway was not being modified, that issue had never been part of the Applicant's consideration. He noted the southwest driveway was being widened because it did not meet present standards and the Applicant felt it was a safety situation for incoming 18-wheelers delivering automobiles. A similar widening was being done to the very north entrance because of the lack of the ability to turn left and right at the entrance to the center of the building. He added the site would have three entrances, but the one that was of concern to Mr. Springall was not being touched. For that driveway, Staff required that a concrete berm or bumper type construction, some 100-ft long, be installed to eliminate left hand turns either into the driveway or out of the driveway, so it would be a right-in or right-out only entrance.

**Mr. Springall** said he was not sure if he followed the ADA pathway from the property to the marked pedestrian crossway and asked if it could be highlighted on the Site Plan.

**Mr. Youngblood** displayed the proposed Site Plan and described where the pathway fell. He noted the driveway was originally approximately 25 ft wide and they planned to widen it to approximately 36 ft wide, which was where a crosswalk would come in. He indicated an existing bus stop, which he believed might be the reason for the crosswalk to the Costco Center. When he had been on the site, he had seen people at the bus stop but never saw anyone cross the street, though he assumed people did.

**Mr. Springall** asked if the pathway in the photo was the pathway to the sidewalk on the street.

**Mr. Youngblood** answered yes, indicating on the photo where the pathway went and noting that it crossed the onsite driveway and connected to the existing sidewalk, which ran along pretty much the entire front of the building. He noted a 5 percent running slope was allowed for an ADA path and the first section of the northern driveway was too steep to meet that requirement.

**Mr. Springall** confirmed disabled people in a vehicle could come north along SW Parkway Center Dr and turn right into the northern entrance. He asked if ADA parking was located close to the showroom entrance.

**Mr. Youngblood** replied yes, five ADA spaces were available for customers and two additional ADA spaces were located at the rear of the building for the employee entrance.

**Mr. Springall** asked to see the north elevations.

**Mr. Youngblood** displayed the proposed north elevation, stating the building height remained the same and all of the existing rollup doors and big bumpers around the doors were going to be removed and replaced with the storefront glazing. One existing rollup door would be replaced with a vehicle entry for the vehicle warehouse and three glazed rollup doors, located at the far east end, would be open in the morning for customer service vehicles. He noted the paint colors were driven by Chrysler and corrected that the Rocky Gray was the field color for the majority of the building, and the darker gray was an accent color that would also be used for doorways. The majority of the other end of the building would remain the same with the glazing brick, but they also planned to wrap and tie the required Chrysler façade back into the existing building face. He noted the design included mostly brick, glass and a little bit of the aluminum finish panels which were all Chrysler requirements.

**Mr. Springall** believed the west elevation looked spectacular and would naturally invite people to the dealership as they were heading from the I-5 junction, which was obviously what the Applicant was going for. He was not so keen on the north elevation and understood it was an eyesore with the remains of all of the rollup doors from the Hollywood Video, adding there might not be much that could be played with there. The building was very uniform in its appearance east to west and he was not sure if anything could be done to make the north elevation look more appealing, adding landscaping might be enough, but he was not sure.

**Mr. Costello** noted a very offensive retaining wall that had been used to screen the truck docks would be removed and replaced with a landscape screen, which he believed would soften the face and the whole field. The north elevation, which was a service entrance, was depressed from the roadway and, while it was not ideal, he believed the landscape screen would increase its attractiveness.

**Mr. Youngblood** said in a sense they were layering the public's appreciation of the building by removing the retaining wall and adding the low screen landscaping standard along SW Elligsen Rd and SW Parkway Center Dr. He believed the removal of the big black bumpers, cleaning up the façade, painting and everything else would be quite beneficial to the project. He noted the wall was a tilt-up concrete wall, which was somewhat difficult to modify, cut away and add to, so changing it would be difficult.

**Mr. Edmonds** asked if a monochrome colored paint would be used on the retaining wall or if it could be broken up with the two gray colors.

**Mr. Youngblood** responded that was a very good point and he believed they could definitely work with Chrysler, Staff and the Commissioners to determine a paint scheme that would break up the retaining wall.

**Mr. Springall** agreed it would not need to be anything structural and could just be paint and landscaping.

**Vice-Chair Ruud** called for public testimony in favor of, opposed and neutral to the application. There was none. He closed the public hearing at 8:59 pm.

**Simon Springall moved to accept the Staff report as corrected, striking the last sentence of Section B26 on page 32. Kristin Akervall seconded the motion.**

**Mr. Springall** said he was not sure if the Board wanted to make any further changes or recommendations to the Staff report for approval. He noted changing the paint had just been discussed, but that seemed to be something that could be negotiated by Staff unless a formal change needed to be made.

**Mr. Edmonds** responded he would rather that the Board not make an open-ended condition. He noted the Applicant planned to work with Staff, which was part of the record, so he did not believe a condition was needed.

**Ms. Akervall** believed the paint change was a good suggestion.

**Vice-Chair Ruud** said he did not like the grate either, but it did not sound like there were many options at this time.

**Mr. Springall** added that was the same with the path to the ADA, as the crossing was not widely used, and most disabled drivers would probably just drive there being it was a car dealership.

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Kristin Akervall moved to approve Resolution No. 282. The motion was seconded by Simon Springall and passed unanimously.**

**Vice-Chair Ruud** read the rules of appeal into the record.

**Chair Fierros Bower** returned to the dais at this time.

- C. Resolution No. 283. Building W3 at I-5 Corporate Park: VLMK Consulting Engineers - representative for Jack Martin, Martin Real Estate Development – owner/applicant.** The applicant is requesting approval of a Revised Stage I Preliminary Plan, Stage II Final Plan, Waiver and Site Design Review for development of a 2-story 34,500 square foot industrial manufacturing/office building. The subject property is located on Tax Lot 1200 of Section 11D, T3S, R1W, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Daniel Pauly

Case Files: DB14-0041 – Revised Stage I Preliminary Plan  
DB14-0042 – Stage II Final Plan  
DB14-0044 – Waiver  
DB14-0043 – Site Design Review

**Chair Fierros Bower** called the public hearing to order at 9:05 p.m. and read the conduct of hearing format into the record. All Board members declared for the record that they had visited the site. No board member, however, declared a conflict of interest, bias, or conclusion from a site visit. No board member participation was challenged by any member of the audience.

**Daniel Pauly, Associate Planner**, announced that the criteria applicable to the application were stated 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.

**Mr. Pauly** presented the Staff report via PowerPoint, noting the subject property's location and briefly reviewing the planning history related to the subject site with these key comments:

- Stage I Plan Revision. The revision to the Master Plan added another building to the parking lot at the northwest corner of the master plan area.
- Stage II Final Plan. An aerial photo of the current site displayed areas where modifications were proposed. He noted the building was two stories, 34,414 sq ft and situated against a forested wetland with a parking lot between it and SW Parkway Ave.

- He displayed building elevations, noting the building was a tilt-up stained concrete construction with a lot of glazing and different architectural features to create more visual interest. The façade's rollup windows were also designed to have a glaze matching other windows in the building.
- The building was surrounded by parking, so parking was very close and convenient to the entrance. The Applicant had met the 93-stall minimum at 94 stalls and maxed out the number of compact stalls, as the existing parking lot already had a lot of compact stalls.
  - The parking lot had more than 75 stalls, so a condition of approval required that vanpool and carpool parking spaces be placed according to Development Code standards, which were essentially the nearest spaces to the front of the building besides the ADA spaces.
- The required bicycle parking was provided and all of it could be deemed long-term parking with half inside the building and the other half under a covered area at the building's entrance.
- The building was industrial and had a 1-story loading berth located on the northern side, which was a good location as it was outside the main pedestrian and employee parking area. Two other loading docks with truck access were located at the northwest and southeast corners of the building.
- Circulation was direct and sufficient to serve the site, as pedestrian connections existed through the parking lot, to the sidewalk along SW Parkway Avenue and around the building, so a thorough onsite pedestrian circulation existed for the portion that was being reviewed.
- The campus had nice landscaping with a mixture of native vegetation and some really nice planted landscapes. Behind the building was a native forest and the building was wrapped with landscaping with plenty of landscaping surrounding the parking, including the relocation of existing screening along SW Parkway Ave .
- Mixed solid waste and recycling storage was provided at an appropriate location that had been approved by the hauler and the City.
- Over the years, many traffic studies had been done onsite and plenty of traffic capacity was left from what was originally planned, so no traffic issues came out of the traffic study.
- A waiver was requested for the setback from the north property line where 20 ft was being considered rather than 30 ft and one of the waiver considerations would allow the flexibility and site planning to take advantage of the shape and design of the site. The waiver would allow a single-story dock area on the north portion of the property, while also locating the building in an area that would maximize use of existing parking, and providing a view of the native forest out of the building. Staff recommended approval of the waiver and believed it was a very reasonable request.
- Site Design Review. The best representation of the proposed building's appearance was the existing Building W2, which was similar in construction and glazing. The campus setting used a lot of the same type of construction, but had unique architectural features so the overall look was not monotonous but tied into the other buildings.
  - The proposed landscaping was similar to the high quality landscaping on the rest of the campus.
  - He noted an email regarding an inaccuracy in the Landscape Plan. The plan showed vine maple around the parking lot which was actually a hornbeam tree, an appropriate parking lot tree.
  - Staff believed the landscaping was well done, as it had been throughout the entire campus.
- He noted the following corrections to the Staff report:
  - Correct the spelling of "Elligsen Road" in the Location section on page 1 of 55.
  - Correct the spelling of "campus" under Stage II Final Plan (DB14-0042) page 4.
  - Correct "Details of Finding" in Finding B47 on page 37 to state, "~~No motorcycle parking is proposed~~ **The bicycle parking provisions are met as explained in Findings B48 and B49.**"
    - The review criterion introduced the general provisions for bicycle parking, which was discussed in detail in the subsequent finding.

**Ms. Akervall** asked for clarification about Finding B48 which referred to a minimum of seven bicycle parking spaces needing to be provided. The second paragraph of Page 63 indicated that Table 8 identified that ten bicycle parking spaces needed to be provided at the new building. She sought clarification about which number was required and how many the Applicant was providing.

**Mr. Pauly** clarified seven bicycle spaces were correct based on the use that the Applicant stated. He noted DKS & Associates might have been considering or assuming a different use at that point in the report when they did the traffic study.

**Chair Fierros Bower** asked if the waiver to the 20-ft setback would run along the entire property line on that side.

**Mr. Pauly** replied yes, adding the waste enclosures were included within the 30-ft setback, so it was about 20 ft. He noted north of the setback was a vacant field area of the Xerox campus and a previously built berm, so a sufficient buffer existed between that and any development now or in the future.

**Mr. Springall** asked if the Applicant proposed a single tenant or multiple tenants for this building and whether that made any difference to the application.

**Mr. Pauly** responded that would not make any difference to the application, though he understood the Applicant had an interested tenant; otherwise the Applicant probably would not be building it at this point. He did not know whether the tenant would occupy the entire building, but noted the representative that was present tonight might be able to speak more to that. He confirmed traffic studies were based on the ITE manual and the uses, not whether it was a multi or single tenant.

**Mr. Edmonds** responded the traffic studies typically looked at the highest and best use, so a good traffic figure was being seen and it was not a very conservative figure.

**Mr. Pauly** agreed, adding the ITE would assume the worst-case scenario.

**Mr. Springall** noted if there were multiple tenants, only one entrance to the building existed.

**Mr. Pauly** responded the building would be an empty shell, so a lot could be constructed internally such as a tenant improvement with a shared lobby and separate internal entrances. He confirmed bicycle parking could be shared inside, but noted more bicycle parking could be added around the front entrance. He added these were the sorts of firms he believed liked to support and attract employees that enjoyed bicycling, so they would provide such facilities.

**Mr. Springall** asked about the Landscape Plan and Condition PDB 5. He noted one of the Mylar foldout plan charts that was part of the application stated that the Applicant planned to use Roundup to clear existing invasive plants. He asked if it was permissible to use Roundup when the location was so close to the Significant Resource Overlay Zone (SROZ).

**Mr. Pauly** responded he did not know and unfortunately Kerry Rappold, Natural Resources Manager, was not available to provide an answer either. He confirmed the Roundup would not be used inside the SROZ and would not affect it. The conservation easement was in place there, so anything impacting the SROZ would be closely watched by both Staff and the owners of the easement at the State. He reiterated he was unfamiliar with the specific standards but his assumption was that the design team was professional and had worked with those sorts of things. He added Staff would work with Mr. Rappold and the necessary authorities at the State before anything that might affect that natural area was done.

**Mr. Edmonds** asked how the trees on the east side of the building would fit into the narrow area of the building.

**Mr. Pauly** responded the area was fairly wide, noting it looked small because the picture was small but, assuming the sidewalk was 5 ft, there was a good 10-ft area, not including the tilt up concrete. The Code encouraged plantings near buildings and he did not see anything particularly irresponsible, or anything that would damage the building or anything that would be an issue in terms of the planting choices.

**Ms. Akervall** confirmed Mr. Edmonds was referring to the trees between the building and SROZ.

**Mr. Edmonds** stated window glazing was there and he was unsure if the trees were upright or full round trees.

**Mr. Pauly** responded four existing trees would be removed to accommodate the new structure and the Applicant could provide some clarification regarding whether those were the trees that were indicated as being removed.

**Ms. Akervall** said some were being removed, but she asked if trees were being added further south, as it was hard to read the Landscape Plan.

**Mr. Pauly** recommended returning to the Site Plan slide that indicated the existing trees and noted planted landscape trees identified in the Site Plan might be removed. His understanding of the Site Plan was that the Applicant intended to have a view into the native forest from that side of the building and was not trying to fit anything else into the little space because they wanted to build as close as possible to the easement. He added the Applicant could provide further clarification.

**Chair Fierros Bower** asked if mechanical units were proposed to sit on the roof.

**Mr. Pauly** answered yes, adding he did not see any screening issues there. He noted the Applicant might be able to discuss the detail of the parapet, its height from the roof and screening of the equipment; often times that could vary depending on the tenant and whether they needed specific cooling units, etc.

**Mr. Springall** said he had just found Condition 2 in Exhibit C3 on Page 89 of the Staff report which answered his question

**Mr. Pauly** responded he knew Mr. Rappold was on [inaudible] with that stuff. He confirmed the condition stated all herbicide use to eradicate invasive species should be reviewed and approved by Mr. Rappold.

**Chair Fierros Bower** called for the Applicant's presentation.

**John Brooks, VLMK Consulting Engineers, 3933 SW Kelly Ave, Portland, OR, 97239**, said the property's owner, Jack Martin, regretted he could not be at tonight's meeting. He provided a brief overview of VLMK and the Applicant's history in Wilsonville, noting Mr. Martin was unusual in that he always wanted to do something that was a bit higher standard than what was around him. For this project, Mr. Martin wanted to attract a higher end, high tech manufacturing user.

- The Applicant was going extra tall on the floors so he could accommodate a high tech manufacturing user inside that needed more clear height to hang utilities from the ceiling. The taller floors provided the extra clearance, but in order to keep the proportions right the windows were larger and taller and the panels were extra thick to provide deeper reveals.



- He was not sure if the Board had the chance to go behind Building W2, where it faced the natural area but the Applicant liked to focus on the natural area to get the natural plants to grow and become part of the building.
- Bicycle parking was of particular interest to him because he rode his bike a lot and his bike went inside the building and hung from the ceiling above his space, which was something that could be seen in Building W2.
- He noted the building was an empty shell and would be developed when the tenant moved in. The building was intended to be for single user, but could conceivably be a multi-tenant building. The traffic counts and traffic use tended to be conservative, so it would make no difference if one or two tenants occupied the building. He noted the building did not have as high of a floor area use because a manufacturing use usually meant big pieces of equipment and fewer users.
- The parapets on the top of the building were extra tall and the Applicant had designed for two very large mechanical units because the manufacturing industry tended to generate more heat. The extra tall parapets would provide screening and the fact that no high ground existed above the building helped.
- The SROZ was interesting, as the entire piece of property was developed before the SROZ designation went into effect and the property was still under the jurisdiction of the Division of State Lands (DSL) on a DSL permit. The Applicant was discussing the removal of non-native species, which he really did not see out there, and he believed the SROZ was in really good shape.
  - The trees along the parking lot were probably the closest to being non-native, but the Applicant's intent was to work with the City to start planting and growing natural plants, so the whole buffer area became a much more natural area and enhanced the building. He believed the Board would appreciate the Landscape Plan was by and large better than the City's standards, noting that was just one of Mr. Martin's things, as could be seen in the pictures of Building W2.
  - He displayed pictures of Building W2, noting Mr. Martin did his first stained concrete building in the Seattle area 12 to 15 years ago. He added that it took a little extra effort, but by the time he came down to do these buildings they were pretty good at it. Perlo Construction did the last two buildings and would use the same treatment. He indicated colors that it would be close to, noting Mr. Martin wanted to have more of a two-toned color so it would have more of a terracotta kind of effect, instead of just a simple plain finish.

**Mr. Springall** said he had noticed a well-hidden trail behind the building and through the SROZ. He asked if the trail was a public trail.

**Mr. Brooks** responded the trail was part of the condition of the original master plan and was on private land so no easement existed over it. He did not think the public should be encouraged to go through private property because of crossover easement issues, but said nothing was stopping anyone from using it.

**Mr. Springall** confirmed the intended use of the path was for the employees of the buildings.

**Mr. Brooks** displayed the location of the path and building, noting the existing access would be maintained. He believed another trail access point existed that went offsite to the Xerox campus and that the trail stopped behind Building W2.

**Mr. Springall** noted some of the cool machinery in the DW Fritz building could be seen from the rear side of the building. He was glad to see that the access to that trail was still available.

**Mr. Brooks** noted in the first application screening, buffering and the reduced setback were discussed and this was an odd corner on the site, so the purpose of the setback was to accommodate the building and get access for the fire department around the end of the building. The way he had always looked at

adjustments or variances was, if the intent of the Development Code could not be met, what could be provided to ensure the original intent of the Code was being achieved? In this case, the Applicant wanted to state the intent of the setback was to buffer any impacts of rear development from the neighbors, which could be made up for by berming a little bit and also by increasing landscaping to provide additional screening. He noted the Applicant tried to concentrate on that quite a bit at the beginning to ensure, if he was asking for that variance, something that met the Board's standard was done.

- He displayed the Landscape Plan, noting increased landscape screening and trees. He noted the loading dock was where the most work would be done, indicating it was recessed and an area that was raised and bermed, so the effect of the two, with the extra trees right along the property line, kind of increased the buffer and screening. He added the loading dock should disappear in just a few years.

**Ms. Akervall** asked if the trees that were seen in between the building and SROZ could be discussed.

**Mr. Brooks** responded the four existing trees were to be removed and columnar trees would be placed back inside, adding the Applicant was doing everything they could to place as many native plants in the balance between the edge of the buffer and the building. Outside of that, they could work with the Natural Resources Manager of the SROZ to do something as a separate project. Under the DSL permit, the Applicant was allowed to encroach into the buffer zone, not into the SROZ, as long as they restored it to its native conditions when the project was done. So if they had to make a 5-ft cut to put footings in they could, as long as they restored it. He added it was easy to restore the buffer zone now because it was all grass with a little bit of rose and willow starts, but they started about 10 ft or 15 ft in, so one had to start walking into the trees before their legs would get scratched. He noted the hedge at the edge of the parking lot would be removed and all that was being disturbed was the hedge and a gravel barrier so very little encroachment of the existing grasses would occur.

**Mr. Springall** said he was very pleased that the Applicant was using similar designs and techniques for the building. He believed it would be a very good asset.

**Mr. Brooks** noted the building would be very visible from the freeway and he believed it would be a very nice look, adding nothing like this building existed facing the freeway anywhere.

**Mr. Springall** agreed, adding that developing this section of SW Parkway Ave would help Wilsonville finally develop that northern section that they were trying to get industrial uses in as well. He believed this was a great application and he was very supportive of it.

**Ms. Akervall** agreed, adding she believed they did a great job with the architecture.

**Mr. Brooks** responded the architect was not present at tonight's meeting either, noting VLMK were the civil and structural engineers. He explained when a client came to VLMK with special requests they acquired an architect to consult on the project to ensure all finishes were worked out and put together. He appreciated the Board staying for the extra applications, as it reminded him of the old days.

**Ms. Akervall** said this was a nice note to end on and thanked Mr. Brooks.

**Chair Fierros Bower** called for public testimony in favor of, opposed and neutral to the application. There being no one in the audience, the public hearing was closed at 9:43 pm.

**Ken Ruud moved to accept the Staff report with the corrections as read into the record by Daniel Pauly. Simon Springall seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.**

**Kristin Akervall moved to approve Resolution No. 283. The motion was seconded by Ken Ruud and passed unanimously.**

**Chair Fierros Bower** read the rules of appeal into the record.

**VIII. Board Member Communications**

A. Results of the May 29, 2014 DRB Panel B meeting

**IX. Staff Communications**

**Mr. Edmonds** thanked the Board for all of their hard work tonight. He believed everything would level out as the wave of applications was over and no more planning consultants would need to be hired. He appreciated the Board's hard work, as he realized it took a lot of time from their families and he thanked them for their time.

**Chris Neamtzu, Planning Director**, invited the Board to the Basalt Creek public open house and workshop scheduled for next Tuesday night from 6:00 pm to 8:30 pm at the Horizon Christian School on Boones Ferry Rd. The event would be the first major public engagement opportunity for the Basalt Creek project and would have some interesting tabletop mapping exercises, interactive voting with keypads and instant polling on laptops. He added a pretty good crowd was expected to attend and the event provided an opportunity to lay out a vision for what the Basalt Creek area could be. He wanted to make sure the event was on everyone's calendar, adding if anyone wanted to know more about the event, they should contact him and he would provide them with materials, the exact room, address, etc.

- He noted Mr. Springall was helping with the Frog Pond project and that second task force meeting was scheduled to take place Thursday, June 12<sup>th</sup>. He knew the Board was very interested in the project, so he would try to keep them informed going forward.

**X. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 9:47 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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