

**Development Review Board – Panel B  
Minutes–October 28, 2019 6:30 PM**

---

---

**I. Call to Order**

Chair **Richard Martens** 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: Richard Martens, Samy Nada, Shawn O'Neil, and ~~Elizabeth~~ **Ellie** Schroeder. Tracy Meyer was absent.

Staff present: Daniel Pauly, Amanda Guile-Hinman, and Kimberly Rybold

**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. Consent Agenda:**

A. Approval of minutes of August 26, 2019 DRB Panel B meeting

**Ellie Schroeder** requested two changes to her comments on Page 7 of 7 of the meeting minutes from the August 26, 2019 DRB Panel B meeting. In the second line stating, "...with the Mayor at a public meeting and made him mad.", she believed she had put her own interpretation on his reaction, as she could not know if he was mad or not. As such, she wanted to delete that. In the last full line, she requested that it state, "...it ~~would~~ **could** have been against her."

**Shawn. O'Neil** asked if Ms. Schroeder wanted to delete the words because they were inaccurately recorded or because she did not like it the way it was.

**Ms. Schroeder** replied she believed she had said "it **could** have been against her" in the last full line. She wanted to change the second line because although the wording accurately reflected what she had said, she was interpreting the Mayor's mood, which she did not believe she should do.

**Mr. O'Neil** explained that, in his opinion, whether or not words and phrases were inappropriately recorded, they should not be deleted because the speaker decided at a later date that they did not like what they had said. In this instance, he believed the Mayor would take it as is in stride. Having served on the Board himself for 5½ years, he had said things he wished

he could take back but they still stayed in. He believed the record had to be kept the way it was stated.

**Amanda Guile-Hinman** stated that without knowing the context of the original conversation, her only comment was that if the indication was that was Ms. Schroeder's perception, it could be changed to, "she thought she made him mad"; but if that was said, then that was how it should be reflected.

**Mr. O'Neil** said that perhaps he had misunderstood Ms. Schroeder.

**Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager**, recalled Ms. Schroeder was smiling when she had made the comment about the Mayor.

**Mr. O'Neil** noted he just wanted to ensure the record was accurate. In this instance, he was amenable to the record being clarified because he had not heard Ms. Schroeder correctly, and the context was not being changed.

Following that brief discussion about the accuracy and intention of her comments, Ms. Schroeder agreed to the following corrections:

- In the second line, "...she had disagreed with the Mayor at a public meeting, and *she believed she had* made him mad."
- In the last line, "She did not see any prejudice, as she believed if he would have had prejudice, it ~~would~~ *could* have been against her."

**Samy Nada moved to approve the August 26, 2019 DRB Panel B meeting minutes as amended. Ellie Schroeder seconded the motion, which passed 3 to 0 to 1 with Shawn O'Neil abstaining.**

## **VI. Public Hearings:**

- A. Resolution No. 370. Wilsonville Business Center Master Sign Plan: Ramsay Signs Inc. – Representative for LBA RV-Company XXI, LP and LBA RV Company XXIII, LP – Owners.** The applicant is requesting approval of a Master Sign Plan for Wilsonville Business Center. The subject property is located on Tax Lots 100, 200, 300, 400, 601 and 602 of Section 11C and Tax Lot 300 of Section 11D, Township 3 South, Range 1 West, Willamette Meridian, City of Wilsonville, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Kimberly Rybold.

Case File: DB19-0029 Class 3 Sign Permit for Master Sign Plan

**Chair Martens** called the public hearing to order at 6:40 p.m. and read the conduct of hearing format into the record. Chair Martens declared for the record that he 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.

**Kimberly Rybold, Senior Planner**, announced that the criteria applicable to the application were stated on pages 1 and 2 of the Staff report, which was entered into the record. Copies of the report were made available to the side of the room.

**Ms. Rybold** presented the Staff report via PowerPoint, briefly noting the site's location, zoning, and surrounding features, and reviewing the updated Master Sign Plan proposal for the Wilsonville Business Center with these key comments:

- The entire Wilsonville Business Center had a Master Sign Plan approved for the entire development in 1988. The multi-building complex extended farther out than the subject property. Over time, the multi-building complex had been divided into individual tax lots with several different property owners.
  - The legibility of the previously-approved Master Sign Plan had often presented challenges for both individual tenants in the complex, as well as City Staff, in determining individual tenant sign allowances throughout the complex and achieving a consistent sign style.
- The owner of the subject portion of the Wilsonville Business Center, LBA Realty, had applied for and received approval of a revised monument directory and building identification signs in 2017. Those signs utilized a more modern design and created a system of wayfinding and identification for LBA Realty's portion of the development.
  - Because the subject complex was multi-tenant, the City liked to have a Master Sign Plan on file. As a result of the work the City had done with the Applicant a couple of years ago to obtain the previously approved signs, Staff had also encouraged the Applicant to apply for an updated Master Sign Plan based on the City's current Sign Code regulations. The prior sign approvals would be incorporated into the new Master Sign Plan, along with a minor modification to the directory sign to incorporate some additional logos that would complement some building address identification signs on the complex.
  - The proposed Master Sign Plan would provide a framework for the approval of future tenant signs through the City's Class I Sign Permit process and an easier approach for tenants to get sign approvals in a timelier manner, while meeting the current City standards and other standards outlined in the Plan. The Master Sign Plan would also provide a framework for the location of signs relative to the existing tenant spaces, and address sign materials, size, and other placement requirements.
  - As an existing development, a number of existing signs already existed at the complex, (Exhibit B2) and while some might not meet the existing requirements, those signs would be considered legally nonconforming and allowed to remain place. Any subsequent tenant sign requests would have to meet the requirements of the new Master Sign Plan.
- The proposed Master Sign Plan had the same criteria as the General Sign Permit as well as these few additional items that were specific to master sign plans:
  - Compatibility with the zone. New tenant signs, as well as building and monument identification signs, would require a refreshed modern look consistent with industrial development and surrounding PDI zone.

- Nuisance. No evidence or testimony had been provided suggesting that the Master Sign Plan would create a nuisance or negatively impact the value of surrounding properties.
- The Master Sign Plan focused on how tenant signs related to the individual tenant spaces and other sign elements. All of the proposed signs would be located in a defined sign band on the existing building, and the existing monument signage was spaced out in a way to account for other site elements, such as landscaping.
  - Signage design was consistent and compatible throughout the development. All of the signs would be constructed of a minimum of 1-in deep, individually fabricated aluminum pan letters with aluminum face and returns, which would create a consistent look. Any modifications would require landlord approval prior to a tenant applying for a permit with the City.
- The Master Sign Plan had been developed to be consistent with the City's existing building sign regulations, which were based on tenant size. If a tenant space were to increase or decrease, the City would look at the entirety of the tenant size to determine the sign allowances. This provided flexibility for different tenant configurations, and any fonts and colors could be approved by the landlord on a case-by-case basis, which also provided flexibility for tenants.
- Staff recommended approval of the proposed Class III Master Sign Plan with the conditions as noted in the Staff report.

**Chair Martens** confirmed there were no questions and called for the Applicant's testimony.

**Darin Hauer, Ramsay Signs, 9160 SE 74th Ave, Portland, OR, 97206** said the Applicant would appreciate approval of the Master Sign program, noting it had been quite a journey. All of the buildings' drawings had to be recreated since no plans existed due to the age of the development.

- He confirmed there was no signage advertising the business over the loading docks. He explained that numbers were permitted at the loading docks, which were strictly for delivery trucks.

**Ellie Schroeder** asked how a driver would know which business a loading dock belonged to if there were businesses on each side of it. Page 13 showed an elevation that featured a sign on either end of the building with loading docks in the middle.

**Mr. Hauer** responded that the loading docks were pretty dedicated. Tenants were allowed a sign at their business entrance, but not above the loading dock. The small, black squares shown above the loading dock doors were numbers for the dock doors, which were allowed per the Sign Code.

**Ms. Schroeder** said she was unclear how a new driver would know which loading dock belonged to which company.

**Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager**, noted that the City was content neutral, so whether the sign had identifying information or not was irrelevant. Per the City's Sign Code, the loading dock elevation was not a sign eligible façade, other than for onsite identification, like numbers.

**Mr. Hauer** introduced Project Manager Eric Conrad, who was present in the audience and had done a lot of the work on putting together the Master Sign Plan.

**Chair Martens** noted no one else was in the audience to testify. He confirmed there were no additional comments or questions from the Board and closed the public hearing at 6:55 p.m.

**Shawn O'Neil moved to approve Resolution No. 370. The motion was seconded by Ellie Schroeder and passed unanimously.**

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

#### **VII. Board Member Communications:**

- A. Results of the September 9, 2019 DRB Panel A meeting
- B. Recent City Council Action Minutes

**Kimberly Rybold, Senior Planner**, noted the minutes from the Panel A meeting, which involved a sign permit with a waiver for a new, digital changeable copy sign at the Wilsonville Library. The sign would be the first in the city designed to coordinate with the City's recently approved Signage and Wayfinding Program. The library was still in the process of obtaining a building permit, but the sign should be up soon.

**Chair Martens** noted an email earlier in the day that mentioned another sign change that was approved by Staff.

**Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager** explained that Class II Sign Permit was for a refresh of the signs at Target.

**Shawn O'Neil** asked if anyone had addressed the issue with the digital signs. He commented how lucky it was that Panel A addressed that application.

**Mr. Pauly** responded it had been drafted. He noted that Panel B had still reviewed more digital signage applications than Panel A.

**Ms. Rybold** concluded the only item of note in City Council's action minutes was Council's approval of the right-of-way vacation that had come before Panel B in August.

#### **VIII. Staff Communications**

**Kimberly Rybold, Senior Planner**, reported that the Planning Department was now fully staffed. New Assistant Planner Georgia McAlister and new Associate Planner Phillip Bradford

would be introduced to the Board at some point in the near future. Mr. Bradford, in particular, would be working with the DRB a lot on some applications. A few applications had come in that Staff was in the process of reviewing and should be brought forward to the Board within the next few months.

**Chair Martens** stated he continued to be impressed by the level of detail that went into the planning process in the city. As a citizen, he appreciated that very much and commended Staff for a job well done.

**Ms. Rybold** confirmed the November Board meeting would address a project near the water treatment plant to accommodate the Willamette Water Supply Project. The proposed application would look at the proposed construction of a raw water intake facility.

**Mr. Pauly** noted he would be out of town that week.

**Mr. O'Neil** added he would also be out of town.

**Ellie Schroeder** noted that her husband and her had just taken a tour of the water treatment plant and encouraged others to do so as well.

**Daniel Pauly, Planning Manager**, asked that Board members confirm their schedules with Shelley White to ensure a quorum was present for the November meeting.

**Ms. Rybold** stated the project timeline was such that Staff hoped to have the meeting in November.

**Chair Martens** asked if there were any updates on the final Villebois project.

**Mr. Pauly** replied he had not had any updates from the realtors on the Clermont project since the last Board meeting.

**Mr. O'Neil** asked if the shutoff valve for the Kinder Morgan Pipeline had gone into place, as he had noticed Staff had approved some of the trees being cut for that purpose.

**Mr. Pauly** responded the tree cut allowed for the masonry enclosure for the electrical and communication equipment associated with the pipeline. A satellite and some cell phone receptors were still needed in order to communicate from the offsite location. He was uncertain of the status of the enclosure, but quite a bit more work needed to be done. The enclosure would look like a waste and recycling enclosure when finished.

## **IX. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 7:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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