

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

**Development Review Board – Panel B
Minutes–September 28, 2015 6:30 PM**

<p><u>Approved</u> November 23, 2015</p>

I. Call to Order

Chair Aaron Woods 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: Aaron Woods, Cheryl Dorman, Richard Martens, Shawn O’Neil, and Council Liaison Julie Fitzgerald. Dianne Knight was absent.

Staff present: Blaise Edmonds, Barbara Jacobson, Steve Adams, Michael Wheeler, Daniel Pauly, and Jennifer Scola.

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

V. City Council Liaison Report

Councilor Fitzgerald reported on the following items recently addressed before City Council:

- The Public Works Department was working on a plan on how to comply with a retrofit update requirement of the stormwater management in the city to meet federal requirements related to how all the city’s stormwater was being filtered and managed as it went into streams and the Willamette River. These requirements related to keeping the rivers clean and ensuring temperatures, bacteria, and etc. were addressed appropriately.
- City Council approved the addition of crosswalks on Canyon Creek Rd which would enhance pedestrian safety.
- The Transit Master Planning Task Force, which included a number of citizens, was providing feedback on how the SMART transportation system was working and how it connected with TriMet. More feedback was being sought, so anyone with comments should contact SMART.
- She noted City Council was testing the use of iPads to review materials and reports electronically instead of receiving paper materials and the new format was working very well. She was uncertain if the detailed maps used by the DRB could be adequately seen in electronic form, so they might still need to be in paper form. City Council was glad to respond to anyone with questions about how the new format was working.

VI. Consent Agenda:

- A. Approval of minutes of August 24, 2015 meeting

Richard Martens moved to approve the August 24, 2015 DRB Panel B meeting minutes as presented. Shawn O’Neal seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

VIII. Public Hearing:

- A. **Resolution No. 313. Clackamas Community College Pole Yard Expansion: Clackamas Community College – Owner/Applicant.** The applicant is requesting approval of a Stage I Preliminary Plan Revision, Revised Stage II Final Plan, Site Design Review and Type ‘C’

Tree Removal Plan for expansion of the existing electrical lineman training facility at the Wilsonville Campus of Clackamas Community College. The site is located on Tax Lot 1300 Section 13CB, Township 3 South, Range 1 West, Willamette Meridian, City of Wilsonville, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Daniel Pauly.

Case Files: DB15-0041 – Stage I Preliminary Plan Revision
DB15-0042 – Revised Stage II Final Plan
DB15-0043 – Site Design Review
DB15-0044 – Type C Tree Removal Plan

Chair Woods called the public hearing to order at 6:38 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, AICP, 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 for the proposed Clackamas Community College Training Yard Expansion via PowerPoint (Exhibit A3), noting the project's location and surrounding features with these key comments:

- The proposal was for a major expansion of the existing electric lineman training yard at the Wilsonville Campus of Clackamas Community College, which included the installation of a 75 ft lattice tower and a number of 55-ft wood poles.
- The requested Stage I Preliminary Plan Revision would expand the existing 21,000 sq ft pole yard to 45,000 sq ft. Reviewing several slides, he briefly described the history of revisions made to the college's site since the original 1990 Master Plan.
- The Stage II Final Plan Revision regarded the reprogramming of the existing pole yard and additional programming for the expanded pole yard area.
 - The proposed programming for the existing pole yard included the existing 12 poles, underground vaults, and storage containers, as well as the proposed 75-ft lattice tower, which would be located on the north portion of the site, close to the post office, and two 55-ft wood poles, along with other shorter pole areas, a pole rack, three additional underground vaults, a transformer structure, pad with transformer, crane training area, and a cover over the existing storage containers.
 - The expanded pole yard area program regarded mainly wooden poles. He indicated that the six pairs of poles in the center and circle of poles shown in the upper right hand corner of Slide 13 were proposed to be up to 55-ft tall.
 - He noted Finding B49 related to Development Code Section 4.181, which discussed exceptions to the height limit. The proposed poles were significantly higher than the 35-ft height limit in the Planned Development Commercial Town Center Zone, however, above ground electrical towers and poles were one of the exceptions. Staff believed the proposed poles qualified for the exemption, because even though the poles would be used for training purposes, rather than actual electrical transmission, the necessary function required the poles to be that tall.
 - Screening. The existing vegetation, especially the trees, provided a lot of screening, particularly to the north and the west. Additional screening proposed to the south included Leyland cypress and other plantings that would grow quickly.
- Off-site Visibility. He reviewed several images and photographs in Exhibit A2 showing views of the subject project site from 13 different locations in the city to demonstrate the visual impact the proposed towers and poles would have on the community. At each location, he looked at the visibility

of the 55-ft poles and 75-ft lattice tower, which was small compared to those in the BPA easement, which he believed were 100- to 125-ft high.

- It was important to consider what portion of the tower/poles was visible because the visual height was quite low at some of the most visible locations due to the distance between the view point and the tower or poles. Diagrams were provided for each location, showing the distance between the view point and tower/poles, vegetation or a building that predominately blocked the view, and the visible portion of the tower/poles according to what staff could determine (Page 52 of 95 of the Staff report).
- He described the distances to the tower/poles, any vegetation or structures that blocked the view, and the visible portion of the tower/poles for each of the 13 viewpoint locations (Page 86 of 95) with these key comments:
 - Concerns had been expressed via email about the project's visibility from the Korean War Memorial, but the existing shrubs and trees, totally blocked the view of the tower/poles. (Locations 3 and 4)
 - While more visible in the winter months, the view from Town Center Path near the college and post office property line would be substantially obscured by the existing trees, which were pretty dense. This was the closest public location to lattice tower. (Location 6)
 - The visual impact would be minimal at the following locations because existing trees or a building obscured all but the tops of some of the poles and/or tower: Town Center Park Fountains; Town Center Path just north of the college's gravel path; Town Center Loop East sidewalk at post office delivery area curb cut; and Town Center Loop East sidewalk at the college's north entrance. (Locations 2, 5, 7, and 10)
 - The top of the tower would be seen pretty clearly from the post office parking lot sidewalk south of the post office building, which was about 200 ft from the tower. (Location 8)
 - The top third of the tower would be visible from the Town Center Loop East sidewalk at the college's main entrance. (Location 11)
 - Although at a distance, the tops of all the new proposed tower/poles could be seen from the Town Center Loop East sidewalk between the college and Courtyard Dr. (Location 12)
 - About the top third of the tower and the tops of the poles would be seen from the Town Center Loop East sidewalk along the Providence parking lot. However, the parking lot trees would continue to grow and would further obscure the view. (Location 9)
 - The biggest visual impacts would be seen from Courtyard Dr at the west City Hall parking lot driveway and Courtyard Dr and Town Center Loop E where about the top half of the new tower and all the proposed poles would be seen. (Locations 1 and 13)
- He continued reviewing the Staff report via PowerPoint (Exhibit A3), noting that the Site Design Review did not include a lot of architectural detail as the power poles and equipment were a standard design. The coverage of the storage container was an appropriate durable material that met the site design review criteria.
 - The landscaping was professionally designed and included appropriately sized and spaced plant materials. He noted that in the electronic copy of the packet, the paper copy of the Landscape Plan was missing; however, Staff would ensure it was included in the record.

Jennifer Scola, Assistant Planner, continued the Staff report via PowerPoint by presenting the Type C Tree Removal Plan with these comments:

- Of the 14 trees inventoried in the surrounding area of the project, 9 trees were proposed for removal, eight willow trees and one Hawthorn tree, which were indicated on Existing Conditions (Slide 21). The only trees proposed for removal were located within the area of the proposed expansion.
- The Applicant's Mitigation Plan exceeded the Development Code's required 1:1 replacement ratio. Seventeen fast-growing cypress trees were proposed along the south edge of the property and a red maple tree was also proposed to a landscape area near the parking lot.

Chair Woods noted the Summary on Page 7 of 95 of the Staff report referenced poles that were mainly wooden. He asked if there were poles of other materials.

Mr. Pauly clarified that he intended to say the project included mainly poles as there would be other storage racks and equipment in the pole yard. "Mainly" was not intended to reference the pole material.

Cheryl Dorman confirmed that the trees at the Korean War Memorial belonged to the City.

Richard Martens asked if the fast-growing trees would take away from the trees' durability and longevity.

Mr. Pauly responded the proposed trees were not a trash tree, but were fairly durable and a good option for this kind of application.

Chair Woods asked if the cover for the 8x12 ft trenching/shoring hole, shown at the bottom left corner of the sheet, would be locked.

Mr. Pauly deferred to the Applicant, but understood the professional training area would follow best practices and overseen by OSHA.

Mr. Martens asked what if Staff knew what might be built immediately south of the subject site, noting the proposed project would be most visible to the parcel to the south.

Mr. Pauly replied the parcel was zoned Planned Development Commercial Town Center, which allowed for vertical mixed use, so a residential use was possible. Kaiser Permanente currently owned the property and had for decades. No timeframe had been indicated for development and Kaiser provided no comment about the proposed project.

Mr. Martens noted the existing screening was very effective since he had no clue the current facility was there having driven by the site countless times.

Mr. Pauly said the biggest difference was that the training facility was barely noticeable at this time, but the facility would be noticeable with the proposed expansion.

Chair Woods called for the Applicants presentation.

Ray Moore, All County Surveyors & Planners, said his firm was hired by Clackamas Community College to put the application together. He noted that Shelly Tracy from the college and Tom from PGE were present to answer any detailed questions about the program. He thanked Staff for the wonderful sight analysis conducted around the pole yard. He had reviewed the Staff report, which was pretty straightforward, and said the Applicant could satisfy all the conditions of approval. He noted his firm would be doing the final engineering, staking, and etc. for the project.

Chair Woods asked about the trench and whether the cover would be secured.

Mr. Moore believed the trench was already present and the Applicant locked the gate that surrounds the entire facility and plywood was placed over the trench, which the Applicant would continue doing.

Chair Woods confirmed the trench would not be visible from the outside; only the plywood placed over the trench.

Chair Woods called for public testimony in favor of, opposed, and neutral to the application. Seeing none, he confirmed the Board had no further questions and closed the public hearing at 7:04 pm.

Shawn O’Neil moved to adopt the September 21, 2015 Staff report as presented and approve Resolution No. 313. Cheryl Dorman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Chair Woods read the rules of appeal into the record.

B. Resolution No. 314. A Storage Place DBA Wilsonville Storage: David K. Shefrin, Trustee – Owner. The applicant is requesting approval of a Stage I Preliminary Plan Modification, Stage II Final Plan, Site Design Review and Sign Review for construction of a three-story commercial self-storage facility and associated improvements. The site is located at 29200 SW Town Center Loop East on Tax Lot 501 Section 13CB, Township 3 South, Range 1 West, Willamette Meridian, City of Wilsonville, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Michael Wheeler

Case Files: DB15-0037 – Stage I Preliminary Plan Modification
DB15-0038 – Stage II Final Plan
DB15-0039 – Site Design Review
DB15-0040 – Sign Review

Chair Woods called the public hearing to order at 7:06 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.

Michael Wheeler, 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. Wheeler noted the two-page memorandum dated September 22, 2015 from Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue had been identified as Exhibit C5 on Page 16 of 93 of the Staff report as placeholder. Staff did not have the date of the letter at the time the Staff report was published, so the date of the letter would be included in the record. He presented the Staff report via PowerPoint, noting the project’s location and surrounding features, with these key additional comments:

- The proposal was for the development of a 79,900 sq ft storage facility on an approximately 1.2 acre parcel located on the east corner of Town Center Loop East and Canyon Creek Rd. He noted the displayed tax maps still identified Canyon Creek Rd as Vlahos Dr.
 - The enlarged tax map (Slide 6) showed the alignment of the access easement between Parcels 3 and 4. Parcel 4 was the subject of the proposed application.
- The four colored elevations of the proposed three-story structure were displayed (Slides 8 and 9), and the proposed location of the signage, detailed on Sheet A4.1 (Slide 10), and the office at the northwest corner of the building were noted. (Slide 12)
 - The building planes would be softened and broken up by the jogged building walls and architectural treatments on the south and west elevations.
- As footnoted in the Staff report, true north was referenced on the drawings in a lighter shade, and the Applicant used a reference north, which was slightly askew of true north. The Applicant’s narrative used the reference north.
- Early discussions with the Applicant involved trying to provide some visual interest from the exterior by showing that passageways actually had activities at windows and the provided floor plans demonstrated that result. (Slides 17-19)

- Sheet A2.4 (Slide 20) showed the proposed trash enclosure, which was too small to serve the square footage and components of the building as discussed in the Staff report.
- He briefly reviewed the civil drawings (Slides 23-26), noting the site required few grading changes and that the major utilities were already present, either in the public rights-of-way or in the easement that served both the subject and adjacent Parcel 3.
 - The Erosion Control Plan and storm drainage calculations accounted for a rainwater management feature at the south end of the property adjacent to the building. The feature would include specialty plants known to cleanse stormwater, not just a typical ornamental landscape scheme.
 - A revised Landscape Plan included the specialty plants along with the original proposal.
 - The Color and Materials Board was initially provided in photographic form. Sheet A3.2 (Slide 33) illustrated the proposed materials on the future building.
- Staff's submittals also included the original Wilsonville City Center Plan (Exhibit D1) showing the intended commercial use, further details related to the Partition Plat recorded in 2008, and a map of the SMART Transit route showing a transit stop in front of the subject site.
- He reviewed the four issues discussed on Page 3 of 93 of the Staff report and explained that the drawings distributed to the Board included items he did not know existed because he was using previous drawings.
 - Issue 1. The original drawings had not shown that pedestrian circulation was continuous, but the Applicant had addressed the issue by altering the design so pedestrians would now travel in front of the parking spaces that previously interrupted that circulation.
 - The pedestrian circulation was not addressed in the Staff report because originally, the Applicant had not indicated one portion of the pedestrian pathway now shown on Sheet A1.1 (Slide 12).
 - The sidewalk was required to be 5-ft wide, but wheel stops were now shown at each of the proposed parking spaces that directly abutted the sidewalk. In order to accommodate any vehicle overhang, which would obscure about 1½ to 2 ft of the sidewalk in spite of the wheel stops, the City would typically require the sidewalk to be widened to a minimum of 7 ft to accommodate vehicle overhang should it occur. Only one portion of the sidewalk was 7-ft wide, but the sidewalk in front of the remaining parking spaces on the northern side, and all of the parking spaces on the eastern side of the building were only 5-ft wide.
 - He encouraged adding a condition requiring that pedestrian pathways be widened to a minimum of 7 ft where the sidewalk could be obstructed by overhanging vehicles. He would work on the language for the new condition during the Applicant's testimony.
 - Issue 2. Screen Abutting Residential Use. The plantings in the original design, though well designed, seemed a bit low to the ground and did not provide a lot of vertical screening, which would be appreciated by the neighboring property owners once the building was erected and in use. When a facility exceeded 24-ft in height, the Board had the authority to require more mature plant materials for screening. He noted 8-ft was available for additional plantings.
 - Issue 3. Bicycle Parking. The bike rack proposed outside the office entry on Exhibit A1.1 (Slide 12), did not identify the number of bikes that could be served. A minimum of four bikes must be able to be accommodated for the subject site.
 - Issue 4. Solid Waste Storage. The Applicant proposed 175 sq ft of storage, however, based on the floor area of the building and the two respective uses, namely the office and warehousing of materials, the Code actually required an increase to 438 sq ft. Staff believed it was possible to reconfigure the solid waste storage area and still provide convenient access to the facility for the solid waste disposal franchisee, but also to the users of the storage facility without having to go into the vehicle travel lane. Although an additional design challenge, the additional area was required by the Code.
- He noted the four components of the proposed application, noting that the Sign Review was for the two signs wall signs proposed on two elevations.

- Staff believed that with the proposed conditions of approval, the proposed project could meet the requirements of the Development Code. Staff recommended approval of all proposed case files with the conditions, which began on Page 4 of the Staff report.

Cheryl Dorman confirmed Staff had a solution for the pedestrian circulation issue and understood the Board could make a recommendation to make the screening abutting residential use higher, but that no condition had been provided.

Mr. Wheeler clarified that Condition PDC 3 on Page 13 of 93 addressed the screening issue. He confirmed that the solid waste storage issue was addressed in Condition PDC 13.

Richard Martens asked how the square footage for the solid waste enclosure was calculated.

Mr. Wheeler reviewed the calculations which were included on Page 42 of 93 in Finding C26. The Development Code prescribed a minimum of 6 sq ft of storage per 1,000 sq ft of gross floor area for warehouse use. The office use was only 600 sq ft, so 2.4 sq ft of solid waste storage area was required. He confirmed the proposed project was considered as a warehouse in the calculation.

Chair Woods called for the Applicant's presentation.

Displayed before the Board were two display boards that were color renditions showing Perspective – Corner Canyon Creek Rd/Town Center Road (Sheet A0.1) and Perspective—Canyon Creek Rd (Sheet A0.2). Both boards were entered into the record as Exhibit B12 to be included in the plan set.

- A third display board included a composite of four renderings already included in the Staff report: two illustrations showed the building elevations, the sign drawing with red coloring added, and the site plan, also with color added.

Ralph Tahran, Architect, Tahran Architecture & Planning, 13741 Knaus Rd, Lake Oswego, OR, stated he was representing his clients, Jerry Carlson and Robert Sterns. He believed Mr. Wheeler had described the Wilsonville Storage Project very well.

- He presented a perspective rendering of the project from the corner of Canyon Creek Rd and Town Center Lp to show in three dimension the color innovations, distinctive elements, and articulation of the building. (Sheet A0.1) A perspective was also shown of the more service-oriented area of the project from Canyon Creek Rd. (Sheet A0.2) A third display board included the colored site plan, an illustration of the Landscape Plan and the colored building elevations.
- The Applicant had worked with Staff over a period of about four months on the proposed building. From day one, Mr. Edmonds and Mr. Wheeler noted the Applicant would need to take the design a step higher than any other storage building, and that it needed to represent a more pedestrian-oriented building along this important corner of Town Center Lp.
 - He noted that he had designed the building to the east of the subject project and wanted to do something that was representative and complementary to that building and owner. He worked with that adjacent owner, who had been given notice and also wanted approval of the proposed storage project.
 - As he worked through the design with Staff, he focused particularly on the Town Center Lp and Canyon Creek Rd elevations, which Staff mentioned needed to be articulated. He was happy to say the Applicant had Staff's recommendation of approval for a building everyone could be proud of and they wanted to move forward and build the building.
- The building was composed of a few different types of metal materials and textures; metal panels that had several different textures and colors, as well as a masonry base and significant glazing. He believed a design had been achieved that responded very well to the street frontages.

- The Applicant had worked through the issues with Staff over the months, but the Applicant wanted to discuss two conditions. In reading through some of the materials, it appeared the Applicant had the authority to discuss their concerns regarding the conditions, and that the Board had the authority to make some changes.
 - The first concern regarded the landscape requirement on the north side that abutted the retirement center which seemed to be something that was open to opinion. He agreed with the concept and philosophy, but also believed the landscape requirement was pretty well being met there given the large trees that were probably planted by the retirement center. Landscaping was proposed in the 8-ft landscape strip along the Applicant's frontage, but he did not believe the Applicant showed large trees being planted since there were already large trees along the frontage.
 - He circulated three photographs, entered into the record as Exhibit B17, showing the large trees that already existed adjacent to the retirement center. The Applicant believed a pretty adequate screen already existed, but if some reinforcement was needed in there, they were happy to talk about it. He expected that the retirement center was probably required to screen from the Applicant's property in the past, so the Applicant thought the additional screening might be redundant.
 - The second concern regarded the trash enclosure. The Applicant had discussed the proposed 175 sq ft trash enclosure with Republic Services, who approved of the concept and design. He understood this conflicted with the City's trash enclosure calculations, but he did not think that calculation was an appropriate measure for the storage facility; 6 sq ft per 1,000 sq ft of gross floor area was excessive.
 - The proposed 175 sq ft enclosure was quite large and actually two times the size of normal waste enclosures at his client's six different facilities in the metropolitan area. None of the other storage facilities had experienced any trouble in terms of their waste facilities.
 - With the proposed 175 sq ft facility being at least twice as large as any of the others, adding another 300 sq ft, almost doubling the size, was unnecessary and would detract from the facility. The Applicant sought sort of condition deeming the proposed trash facility adequate.
 - He suggested that the owner of the other facilities come forward to discuss his experiences with his other facilities in the metropolitan area and address any questions about how the trash facilities worked.
 - He did not know how to move forward, but the Applicant wanted the proposed project approved with the storage waste facility as currently designed. He offered to address any questions from the Board.

Mr. Martens asked if the tenants would have access the waste disposal facility.

Jerry Carlson, 7100 SW Arbor Lake Drive, Charbonneau, answered yes, the tenants had limited access. The garbage retention areas at the other six facilities were 66, 50, 77, 48, 48, and 77 sq ft with an average square footage of 62 sq ft. The facility in Clackamas had more than 90,000 sq ft of rental area, compared to 58,000 sq ft at this facility, and that waste facility was 7 ft by 11 ft and seemed to be very adequate. The facility had garbage pickup once a week. The lease agreement required tenants to remove their own garbage and leave the unit swept free. They did not leave trash or anything in the unit, which reduced his responsibility to take care of that. Occasionally, a tenant would leave a mattress, which the maintenance person would take to the dump.

Mr. Martens asked if tenants had moving boxes that needed discarded and if the proposed waste area included a recycle bin.

- **Mr. Carlson** responded that occasionally tenants do, but they were asked to remove everything they brought in as part of the lease agreement. Cardboard was recycled occasionally, and a recycle area did exist with three, 55 gallon containers for glass or plastics. There was usually also a 2 or 3 yard roll out container for the general garbage, which was picked up by the garbage truck.

Ms. Dorman understood that the idea was that customers would not use the facility, but take their own garbage in and out with them.

Mr. Carlson responded the facility was not really made to be accessible for customers.

Shawn O'Neil confirmed this was the only facility Mr. Carlson had in Wilsonville.

Chair Woods confirmed the proposed facility was three-stories and asked with regard to the screening if Mr. Tahran had viewed the subject site from the Brookdale senior facility to get an idea if the storage facility would overlook the Brookdale senior facility to the north.

Mr. Tahran stated he had visited this morning. The Brookdale Retirement Center was set back about 20 to 30 ft from the property line. The center had planted trees in there sporadically, probably to create an environment of their own. The retirement facility was almost a three-story building itself and he believed their third story was probably equal to the eave height of the proposed building. No windows or anything that would intrude on the retirement center's private space was proposed. He believed it was a pretty good screen for their use.

Chair Woods asked about the lighting on the north side of the building and if the facility operated 24/7.

- **Mr. Tahran** responded the Applicant went through the City's prescriptive lighting ordinance and 15 ft was the maximum height the Applicant could place luminaires, which would all be down lighting. No lighting would shine outward or upward due to the Dark Sky Ordinance.
- **Mr. Carlson** stated the operating hours were 7 am to 9:00 pm. The building was secure with about 35 to 48 cameras on site, which was access controlled. Every unit was access controlled with a keypad. Tenants would have to key in when coming on site which would dis-arm their unit at that point. Tenants could then access their unit and then key out when they leave to re-arm the unit at the entrance area. He confirmed tenants would only be able to access the facility from 7 am to 9 pm.

Ms. Dorman noted the Board had certain criteria to follow for the garbage area for commercial use, which would make sense if the proposal was a normal commercial building a certain number of people would be expected on a daily basis. She asked what was in place for other storage facilities. After reading through the material and listening to testimony, the requirement did seem a bit excessive. The Code followed like a commercial warehouse, etc. from what she read on commercial storage. The Applicant would have 79,000 sq ft of warehouse space requiring a total of 475 sq ft. With the Applicant's intended use, there would not be a lot of contribution from customers to that garbage facility, so why would the Applicant be required to have such a large space?

Mr. Wheeler responded the requirements for solid waste storage for warehouse use and their office use were extracted from the Code. Staff was not offering a judgment, but responding to the Code's minimum requirement. He had no knowledge from earlier case files or facilities in the city with regard to that requirement and how it was addressed at that time.

Ms. Dorman commented that aside from the Applicant asking for a variance from Code, it made sense that maybe the storage area requirement was larger than what was needed.

Mr. Edmonds replied the DRB could make that judgment, and if so, a finding should be provided regarding why the garbage area should be reduced to a lower amount to support deleting or modifying Condition PDC 13.

Mr. O'Neil asked if not allowing tenants to utilize the garbage facility was standard in the storage industry. His temptation was to use the closest garbage bin available, no matter if the rule said he could or not. He was seeing potential garbage on the ground or tenants using the trash facility anyway.

- **Mr. Carlson** said that garbage cans were provided throughout the facility for trash like pop cans or sandwich wrappers discarded when people were moving, etc. but that was very limited. His facilities had not had that problem. For his facilities, not allowing tenants to utilize the garbage facility was an absolute standard, especially when one had control of the customer like in his facilities. The same was true for many others as well. Some outlying places that had no manager on site and an access of some type, then they had problems with that.

Mr. O'Neil said his key interest was to be consistent with other storage facilities in Wilsonville. He did not have enough here to understand whether other facilities did things much differently. Even though he understood from a garbage perspective that Mr. Carlson was not allowing people to use it, he wondered if the end result would be different.

Mr. Carlson stated twice the amount of space was provided here than done for his very largest facility, the proposed trash area was three times the amount of space.

- He clarified that his largest facility had 90,000 sq ft of rentable space, which was about one and a half times the size of the facility proposed in Wilsonville, which was only 59,000 sq ft but had three times the garbage area at 175 sq ft.

Chair Woods asked how the 175 sq ft area was determined.

Mr. Tahrn said he talked with Republic Services in terms of having garbage and recycle areas and they knew it was larger than the other facilities that his client had.

Mr. Carlson said the Applicant agreed with the extra access so a person could access the trash area without having to walk out into the traffic way. That was not the case with his other facilities, but he agreed that would be fine with this one.

Chair Woods asked how much square footage other facilities in Wilsonville had, and whether this would be the largest storage facility in the city.

- **Mr. Wheeler** replied he did not have any data from any other storage facilities because the City was dealing with an application of the material before the Board tonight. The burden was on the Applicant to demonstrate compliance with the Development Code, not to reflect their approval ability based on what somebody else did. He apologized for not having that background available. There were a handful of facilities, such as the one on Boones Ferry Rd on the north side of Wilsonville Rd.
- He could not know if this was the largest facility in town without digging into the case files.

Mr. Edmonds said the only similar facility would be Just Store It on Wilsonville Rd, which offered indoor climate control storage. He did not recall the square footage, but it was a smaller facility.

Mr. Wheeler added that data could be brought back before the DRB if desired.

Ms. Dorman said she was looking at it what made sense and whether that capacity was needed. The hearing could be continued if the Applicant could bring that information, but she did not believe it was necessary to compare. While it was good to be consistent, the issue had probably not been raised before the DRB previously. She questioned whether it made sense for this facility to have such a large solid waste storage area.

Mr. Wheeler replied that with regard to the calculations discussed earlier, two classes were chosen. Consistently through the report, Staff referred to the bulk use of the building as a warehouse, which was an industrial use, even though in the interpretation included in the record from an earlier inquiry received, that personal storage was viewed as being a commercial use. If commercial floor area requirements had been considered instead for the solid waste area, the requirement would have been much higher than the warehouse use. He understood the concern, but as Staff and having to juxtapose the Applicant's proposal against the review criteria, Staff did not have the latitude of saying, "That did not seem appropriate."

Ms. Dorman agreed that made sense, and clarified she was not criticizing how Staff came up with the calculation, but the Applicant had asked for a variance, so maybe that was something the Board should consider.

Mr. Wheeler clarified a variance was a different process. The Applicant was actually asking the Board to waive that requirement. Staff received no waiver requests, and the Applicant's submitted material expressed that they requested no waivers. He understood the collective desire to do something different, but findings would need to be imbedded in the report to achieve that.

Mr. O'Neil asked if this was the first time Staff had heard about the request to waive the requirement for the garbage facility.

Mr. Wheeler responded yes, noting the Staff report was published a week ago.

Mr. Tahrn agreed he had not asked for a waiver. He had looked at Condition PDB 2 on Page 4 of the Staff report which stated, "The Applicant/Owner shall develop the site for use as a three story commercial storage facility, unless altered by a subsequent Board approval, or minor revisions are approved by the Planning Director."

Mr. Wheeler explained that was for subsequent modifications to the building and/or use, not for the application being considered by the Board tonight. That language was included to avoid being locked into a circumstance that if the Applicant built what the Board approved, but then decided to move a door or expand the building in a very minor way, the Applicant would not be required to return to the hearing body necessarily to do something Staff could review, approve, and expedite at the Staff level. There had been cases where the language was not embedded, and the applicant had to return for a hearing, which was an awkward thing for small improvements.

Mr. Tahrn responded that was his mistake.

Mr. Martens confirmed Staff was in a position of having to benchmark this based upon the Development Code. Staff indicated that if the Board wanted to approve something different, there would have to be a submission of findings.

Mr. Edmonds explained if the Board believed the Applicant provided adequate, persuasive testimony that a reduction of the garbage capacity was consistent with the other facilities that they operate and that the size was adequate, that the board create a finding to support a smaller container size.

Barbara Jacobson, Assistant City Attorney, believed that would need to be tied to a justification for a waiver.

Chair Woods assumed that justification needed to come from the Applicant.

Ms. Jacobson provided some procedural guidance with regard to further questions for the Applicant and making a motion. She suggested that Mr. Wheeler read his conditions into the record before closing the hearing.

Chair Woods confirmed there were no further questions for the Applicant.

Mr. Wheeler stated he assumed the existing 16 conditions related to Site Design Review would remain and suggested adding new Condition PDC 17 requiring that where a proposed pedestrian sidewalk abutted parking spaces, despite the presences of a wheel stop, that those portions of sidewalk be widened to 7 feet to accommodate up to 2 feet of vehicle overhanging the sidewalk. This addressed the minimum Code requirement. He described how parking a truck backward in a parking space at City Hall resulted in having no sidewalk available. Seven feet would provide the needed pedestrian passage in front of the bank of parking on the eastside, south side, and a portion of the parking on the north side. (Slide 12)

- He clarified there was no parking along Town Center Lp, noting the diagram was at an angle with the compass rows. The drive came from Town Center Lp East, headed relative north, turned left, and went relative west back out to Canyon Creek Rd. He indicated on the drawing that the sidewalks on the south were those between the building and drive aisle, and then the property owner's site was directly adjacent to the south, which was retail.
- He confirmed the sidewalk was not facing the street, but the parking abutting the drive aisle. Similarly, on the north side of the building as the drive continued out to Canyon Creek Rd, the segment on the west end where the parking was adjacent to the sidewalk, that 5-ft wide sidewalk would be overhung by vehicles if the 7-ft sidewalk width was not achieved at that location.

Ms. Jacobson asked if the condition could be summarized to say something like, "Wherever there are wheel stops adjacent to a sidewalk, the sidewalk needs to be 7 feet wide."

Mr. Wheeler responded the problem was there were wheel stops on all parking spaces and some sidewalks were already proposed as being wider than 7 ft, so there was no need to require what was already being provided. It should read, "Where parking abuts a pedestrian walkway, despite the presence of wheel stops, those sidewalks shall be a minimum of 7 feet in width." He noted 25 percent of the parking already satisfied that requirement on the north side on the east end.

Mr. Tahrn understood the intent was to have a 5-ft clear sidewalk. Typically, wheel stops are to provide a wheel stop, and then another 2.5 to 3 ft of bumper overhang to achieve the 5 ft of pedestrian movement. That was how the typical parking requirements read from his experience. If the condition stated that the Applicant needed to provide a clear 5-ft sidewalk, it would be less confusing than what he was hearing.

Ms. Dorman understood from Staff that if this was a storage facility, many people would probably be driving trucks to put their belongings in the structure. If a truck was backed in, it might go over that wheel stop and further into the sidewalk.

Mr. Wheeler added that more importantly, the wheel stops on each parking space were illustrated as being so close to the edge of the pedestrian way that there was no way to ensure vehicles would not overhang the sidewalk.

Mr. Tahrn replied they were designed according to the City standards, but if that was not adequate, so be it.

New Condition PDC 17 was read into the record as follows, "Where parking abuts a pedestrian walkway, despite the presence of wheel stops, sidewalks installed by the Applicant/Owner shall be a minimum 7 feet in width."

Mr. Martens noted the letter received from Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue (TVF&R) and asked if the proposed design met their requirements.

Mr. Wheeler responded it would by the time it completed the Building Division's review. As mentioned, Staff simply needed to include the date of the letter, September 22, 2015, in the record. Otherwise, everything in the letter would have been imported into table format in the conditions of approval. The Board needed to include the conditions as written in the letter. The TVF&R conditions did not need to be added piece by piece into the report to achieve the same objective.

Ms. Jacobson confirmed that the Applicant, who was in the audience, had seen and reviewed the letter and was okay with the TVF&R conditions because the conditions in the letter would be the binding.

Mr. Tahrn confirmed the written conditions from TVF&R were acceptable. The Applicant had discussions with TVF&R, and the fire marshal usually came out with cut and dry conditions. The Applicant had proved that they had excessive sprinkler conditions, which lead the fire marshal to approve the access aisles as shown. He understood that was what the Applicant was going to get; and there would be no changes.

Mr. Wheeler assured the TVF&R letter was distributed to both the Board and the Applicant at the same time. He apologized that a placeholder was not put in the conditions portion of the Staff report. They would have been exported into a place in the report as conditions in that form; now, they would simply be conditions by reference in this form.

Mr. Carlson stated that when initially designed, there was no sidewalk at the upper part of Slide 12. That sidewalk was added because a continuous walkway was needed around. There was also a continuous walkway around on Town Center Lp and going around. In contrast, when he walked into City Hall for the meeting, he parked his car, got out, and walked around the back of the car into the building because there was no sidewalk. He did not believe the Applicant needed one, but they were willing to do it. It was just an extra burden in this situation.

- Additionally, he noted there were 25 parking spaces at this facility. His Clackamas facility, which was 1½ times the size of this facility, had six parking spaces that were very seldom filled. The difference between the two was some people would drive in and park in the facility itself by their locker. If the Applicant could get by without the sidewalk, they would love to do that. He guessed they would just accept what was going on and do it, but it seemed in contrast to what happened when he walked into City Hall.

Ms. Dorman suggested the Applicant might want to continue the application to think more about the parking lot and come back.

Mr. Edmonds responded no, the Applicant had an opportunity to request a waiver to reduce the parking and have it addressed tonight. This was kind of late testimony to raise yet another issue to confront at DRB. To go back, Staff would have to renotify a waiver for parking to the surrounding property owners. He did not know why the Applicant was putting themselves in this position right now, because they had been indicating to Staff that they wanted to start construction.

- He clarified the parking issue had been brought up before but the anticipation that it would be raised as an issue tonight was new.

Mr. Martens understood the issue was not so much the parking, but the sidewalk. He asked if the sidewalk was a requirement related to parking.

Mr. Wheeler responded the sidewalk was a requirement related to ADA compliance.

Ms. Dorman understood that due to that requirement, the Applicant added the parking on their own volition.

Mr. Wheeler clarified there were two separate issues. The pedestrian sidewalks were discussed because the Development Code required that they not be obstructed. The parking was required because the Applicant had nearly 80,000 sq ft of floor area for the types of uses being proposed. The comment from the Applicant was that their other facilities did not have that kind of pedestrian way or that much parking so why was the City making them provide those.

- He confirmed the parking had been calculated correctly. In the earlier design of the sidewalks, the segment on the south, which he highlighted on the drawing, was not present. The sidewalk came from Town Center Lp East until it hit the parking space. It came from the office, around the corner of the building passed the solid waste disposal area to the parking space and stopped. Staff was pleased that there was now a pedestrian connection, which he believed would have been caught at building permit anyway had it not been included as a condition because ADA required that connection from both streets to get to the other street. The Applicant could not count the driveway as being that route. The sidewalks and parking were both required for different reasons for the public good.

Chair Woods confirmed there were no additional questions for the Applicant or Staff and closed the public hearing at 8:29 pm.

Shawn O'Neil moved to adopt the Staff report as amended with the addition of new Condition PDC 17, as read into the record, as well as Exhibit C5 dated September 22, 2015 and Exhibits B12 and B17. Richard Martens seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Staff provided guidance regarding the appropriate procedure to address the motion should the Board want to further amend the Staff report.

Shawn O'Neil moved to adopt Resolution No 314 with the amended Staff report as approved. Chair Woods seconded the motion.

Mr. O'Neil did not believe the Applicant had presented sufficient objective evidence, other than testimony that they have other locations outside the City of Wilsonville, to warrant a smaller solid waste storage area. The size should remain consistent with what Staff suggested and the Staff report stated. He personally did not see what was wrong with having the additional trees. It would actually improve the quality for the neighbors. He did not see any issues and would not want to remove those conditions.

Mr. Martens understood the requirement was for more mature trees versus no trees.

Mr. Wheeler clarified that the Code allowed the Board discretion to require more mature plantings when the structure was taller than 24 feet in height. He noted Condition PDC 3 on Page 13 of 93 of the Staff report stated, "The Applicant/Owner shall revise the landscape plan to provide larger or more mature plant materials along the property line abutting the adjacent residential facility per Section 4.176(.04)."

Mr. Martens noted the landscaping plan included trees and landscaping along there. The condition just required them to be larger and more mature.

Mr. Wheeler agreed that was correct; landscaping was proposed along that boundary.

Chair Woods said that having looked at the area, both from the senior facility and the other side, there were a lot of spaces where trees could be planted. It seemed to be very open, and he believed that specifically stating the maturity of the kinds of trees there to add more screening from that facility would be prudent.

Mr. Wheeler confirmed Condition PDC 3 achieved that without being specific, leaving the Applicant to achieve that in their final Landscape Plan.

Mr. O'Neil understood the Applicant wanted the Board to reconsider Conditions PDC 3 and PDC 13.

Ms. Dorman agreed with retaining Condition PDC 3, but the increase in Condition PDC 13 to the 478 sq ft seemed excessive.

Chair Woods agreed that in relation to the area, it seemed to be a lot. But in keeping with the square footage of the facility, he did not believe the size would be too excessive, but right in line with the requirements.

Mr. Wheeler confirmed the exterior area of the solid waste facility would be 20 ft by 22 ft, but the interior space available for the containers and storage of the material would be approximately 17 ft by 22 ft. The additional 303 sq ft required was for the interior of the structure, not its outer dimensions.

Mr. Martens stated he would like to see the requirement for the additional storage space removed. And frankly, he believed the landscape plan, as presented, was adequate given the mature trees that were already present. He would like to see one or both of those conditions removed.

Motion failed 2 to 2 with Richard Martens and Cheryl Dorman opposed.

Richard Martens moved to approve Resolution No. 314, including the Staff report as amended, removing Condition PDC 13, which increased the solid waste storage area. Cheryl Dorman seconded the motion, which passed 3 to 1 with Shawn O'Neil opposed.

Chair Woods read the rules of appeal into the record.

IX. Board Member Communications None

- A. Results of the September 14, 2015 DRB Panel A meeting
- B. Discussion topic: Paperless staff reports, exhibits and application notebook materials

Blaise Edmonds, Manager, Current Planning, stated the concept of going to paperless materials was also discussed with DRB-Panel A. He noted people in engineering and architecture did almost everything paperless and used new and sophisticated applications. A couple concerns were raised about people who were more old school preferred the paper format. One Board member said she liked the paperless idea, but seeing the big notebook in the middle of her living room reminded her that she had got to look at it.

- An agenda was distributed showing links to various agenda and application materials, including staff reports, elevations, and drawings were available on the City's website. The Planning Division did not currently have the budget to purchase tablets for each individual commissioner, but that could possibly be added in the coming budget year. As Councilor Fitzgerald stated, the electronic format was working great for the City Councilors, who had their own tablets.
- It was extremely expensive for developers to publish all the voluminous documents; each notebook cost several hundred dollars.
- At this time, he wanted to know which Board member no longer wanted paper notebooks, so he could tell the developers to only print three copies, for example, rather than ten. To phase in the concept,

those wanting them could still get paper materials until the issues were worked out and the City went totally paperless.

The Board and Staff discussed the idea of moving to paperless staff reports, exhibits, materials, etc. with the following key comments:

- Saving trees was good.
- One challenge was to ensure all the draft paper documents were included on the CD or electronic format. Also, having the clarity of the electronic/online images be as clear as those on CD would be perfect. Even though the material was reduced, they could be blown up to see everything.
- Going paperless was a great idea, but there would be challenges along the way, such as the need for commissioners to have their own portable devices.
- The cost to produce the packets was a sticker shock. This would help the City and its customers save money overall.
- Everyone assimilated information in different ways. The printed packets were overwhelming, but nice to make notes on and refer to during the meeting. Perhaps commissioners could use their iPad if they wanted and have the hard copy at the meeting to write on.
- Over time commissioners have brought their own iPads, but the consideration was whether people wanted to use their private iPad for public use. Some commissioners were willing to do so for their convenience.
- Being able to download the materials while travelling was very helpful.
- If the paperless format was pursued, it would be very helpful to have the information indexed, to make it more user-friendly and have information more readily accessible.
 - It was set up to work exactly that way for City Council and trainings were provided to learn how to use the format.
- On an iPad, assuming the right format, one could zero in on big site plans and move around.
- One observation over the years was that commissioners do not open up their paper plans at the meetings to avoid hitting the microphones or spilling anything.
- Some people, usually those who were retired, spend a lot of time reviewing the plans, but that could be very difficult for those with really busy careers. It was a real challenge, so Staff did their best to provide the summary statements, issues, conditions in the yellow pages at the front of the Staff reports as a starting point to spin off from and go into the plans for more detail.
- One nice thing about the electronic format was the commissioners would receive the Staff report right away, which could be save a lot of problems.

Mr. Edmonds noted that it seemed the consensus from both DRB Panels was that they would like to move to a paperless format. He would report to the Planning Director, who would need to put the items in the Planning budget and also consider the needs of the Planning Commission as well.

Mr. O'Neil stated Staff did an excellent job setting things up, but it would be nice to be forewarned of potentially controversial or intense applications, based perhaps, on citizen input, so the Board would not feel ambushed. It would be helpful, because then they can make sure that they communicate.

Mr. Edmonds explained that with the storage building tonight, the Applicant did not want to go for any waivers because they wanted more smooth sailing and to comply with the Code. He was surprised when they came and approached the Board about wanting waivers.

Mr. O'Neil said he did not believe in ambushes; there were rules and people need to follow the rules. He understood Staff did the best they could.

Ms. Dorman said tonight was the first time in four years that she had an experienced like this.

Mr. Edmonds noted that the Phase 2 school applications which got into the site design, architecture and lighting could come to either Panel A or Panel B, but he could guarantee it would be controversial.

X. Staff Communications

There was none.

XI. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 9:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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