

I. Call to Order

Chair Daniel McKay 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: Daniel McKay, Angela Niggli, Jean Svadlenka, Ken Pitta, and Katie Hamm

Staff present: Daniel Pauly, Kimberly Rybold, and Kerry Rappold

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

V. Election of 2020 Chair and Vice-Chair

Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager, reviewed the rules for nominating and electing the Development Review Board Panel A (DRB A) Chair and Vice Chair.

A. Chair

Angela Niggli nominated Daniel McKay as 2020 DRB-Panel A Chair.

Chair McKay confirmed there were no further nominations, and closed the nominations.

Daniel McKay was unanimously elected 2020 DRB A Chair.

B. Vice-Chair

Katie Hamm nominated Angela Niggli as 2020 DRB A Vice-Chair.

Chair McKay confirmed there being no further nominations, and closed the nominations.

Angela Niggli was unanimously elected 2020 DRB A Vice-Chair.

VI. Consent Agenda:

- A. Approval of minutes of September 9, 2019 DRB Panel A meeting
- B. Approval of minutes of December 9, 2019 DRB Panel A meeting
- C. Approval of minutes of January 13, 2020 DRB Panel A meeting

Chair McKay moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Angela Niggli seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

VII. Public Hearings: None.

VIII. Board Member Communications

Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager, asked Board members to introduce themselves and comment on what aspect of the built environment they liked about the Wilsonville community.

Each of the Board Members introduced themselves, noting how long they had lived in Wilsonville and where, their professional background, and what they most enjoyed about Wilsonville's built environment, which included the city's parks system, open space, walkability, and the priority of natural resources, as well as the how well-planned the city was and the thoughtfulness of City Council to grow Wilsonville slowly and conscientiously.

IX. Staff Communications

A. SROZ Training

Kerry Rappold, Natural Resources Program Manager, presented an overview of the Significant Resource Overlay Zone (SROZ) via PowerPoint. This portion of the Development Code addressed natural resources protection and understanding the nuances of the Code would be helpful when reviewing applications involving SROZ. He reviewed the efforts in creating and adopting the initial program that complied with Statewide Planning Goal 5 and Metro's Title 3 and Title 13 requirements, and how the City's existing Code standards helped protect wetlands, riparian corridors, and wildlife habitat. He also described the SROZ review process and criteria. His responses to Board member questions were as follows:

- A property owner could propose a map change and not go through the Significant Resource Impact Report (SRIR) process if they could demonstrate that none of the functional criteria rated as High.
 - As an example, the existing pond at the Renaissance Boat Club had been part of the SROZ due to the water source that fed the pond, which was described as an old stock pond. After Staff reviewed the information submitted from the developer to show the pond was no longer locally significant, which involved a fairly extensive process, the area was no longer deemed a wetland. As a result, the developer was able to use the pond as an amenity on site, as well as for stormwater management.
- Some riparian corridors had no areas of limited conflicting use (ALCU). For instance, a locally significant wetland would have a 50-ft buffer, which was a prohibited area entirely, so there would be no ALCU. Recently, an applicant was unable to demonstrate that a wetland was not locally significant, so any development had to be outside both the wetland and the buffer. The ALCU was the most important items to understand regarding the SROZ Code, as it was the starting point for everything.

- The Code identified the Approximate Potential Tree Height (APTH) of each tree at maturity, which was used to protect the area in which the tree could fall.
- The mitigation process was fairly prescriptive in the Code, and some mitigation requirements were added to comply with Title 13. The Code was very specific about the types of trees and shrubs that had to be planted, as well as the quantity, size, and spacing and even how the new plantings were protected. A five-year maintenance and monitoring period was required on any mitigation site, so the property owner submits an annual report on how the site was functioning and whether it was successful or not.
 - After the five years, the property owner has fulfilled their obligation and the site was expected to thrive on its own. The City did not take control of the mitigation site.
 - Typically, a two-year establishment period was expected for any restoration or enhancement planting, and hopefully, the owners would be compelled to maintain the site over time.
 - The City required that 80 percent of the mitigation plantings survive over the five-year period.

X. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:16 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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