

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

**Development Review Board – Panel B
Minutes–April 27, 2020 6:30 PM**

<u>Approved</u> July 27, 2020

I. Call to Order

Chair **Samy Nada** called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.
The meeting was conducted and recorded via Zoom.

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: Samy Nada, Ellie Schroeder, Shawn O’Neil, Richard Martens, and
Nicole Hendrix

Staff present: Kimberly Rybold, Daniel Pauly, Barbara Jacobson, Cindy Luxhoj,
Khoi Le, Shelley White, Andy Stone, Beth Wolf

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 February 24, 2020 DRB Panel B meeting

Ellie Schroeder moved to approve the February 24, 2020 DRB Panel B meeting minutes as presented. Shawn O’Neil seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

VI. Public Hearing:

A. Resolution No. 376. Nicoli Pacific Industrial Building and Storage Yard: CIDA Architects & Engineers – Representative for David Nicoli, Nicoli Pacific LLC – Owner. The applicant is requesting approval of a Stage I Master Plan Modification, Stage II Final Plan, Site Design Review, Class III Sign Review and Type C Tree Removal Plan for development of Phase 1 of a new three-Phase Industrial development. The subject site is located on Tax Lots 300 and 500 of Section 14A, Township 3 South, Range 1 West, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Cindy Luxhoj

Case Files:	DB20-0002	Stage I Master Plan Modification
	DB20-0003	Stage II Final Plan
	DB10-0004	Site Design Review
	DB20-0005	Class III Sign Review

Chair Nada called the public hearing to order at 6:36 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.

Cindy Luxhoj, 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.

Ms. Luxhoj presented the Staff report via PowerPoint, noting the property's location and surrounding features, and briefly reviewing the site's background and the proposed applications with these comments:

- The Nicoli Pacific property was approximately 6.2 acres in two undeveloped parcels, adjacent to the Walnut Mobile Home Park. The site was located in Area of Special Concern E in the Comprehensive Plan and subject to requirements of the Screening and Buffering Overlay Zone along the southern property boundary shared with the Walnut Mobile Home Park.
- The focus of tonight's hearing regarded Phase 1 of a three-Phase Industrial development totaling approximately 85,000 sq ft within two parcels, Tax Lots 300 and 500. Phase 1 development would occur on Tax Lot 500. After an approved lot line adjustment and partition plat, the parcel was approximately 2.35 acres. The subject site fronted on SW Boberg Road and was zoned Planned Development Industrial (PDI). (Slide 3)
 - The Hardscape Plan for Phase 1 was also displayed (Slide 3), which included a single-story, 13,200 sq ft metal building with 2,024 sq ft of office, an 1,800 sq ft storage mezzanine, an accessory wash bay, and repair areas. The building would be 30 ft, 8 in tall, and the site would also have an approximately 52,700 sq ft paved outdoor storage yard north of the building.
 - The property owner, Nicoli Pacific, LLC, through DP Nicoli Shoring Solutions, provided shoring equipment such as steel plates, trench shields, and slide rails to the construction industry. Industrial operations onsite included loading and unloading of shoring equipment, equipment washing, and equipment repair.
 - The objective of the development, as described in the Applicant's materials, was to provide an efficient and functional facility that fit into the surrounding industrial context and respected the sensitivity of the adjacent residential area.
 - In addition to Phase 1 development, the request revised the Stage I Master Plan for the entire property.
- Proper noticing for the application was followed, including clarifying background information about the project and comparing it to the proposal in 2019 that was withdrawn. It also outlined adaptations for the hearing process and providing testimony that were adopted by the City in response to the Covid-19 pandemic.
- The Applicant sent the letter dated April 03, 2020 to the Walnut Mobile Park Residents to explain changes to the project since their application last year and to solicit comments from

residents. A copy of the letter had been emailed to Board members and had been entered into the record as Exhibit B4. No comments to either the public notice or the Applicant's letter had been received to date.

- A Stage I Master Plan for the entire property was approved by the DRB in May 2019, which included three speculative industrial flex buildings totaling approximately 96,000 sq ft developed in three phases. The Master Plan anticipated each building accommodating office technology, headquarters, manufacturing, and warehousing.
 - The Stage I Master Plan Modification sought to change the order of development, the anticipated building size for Phases 1 and II, and the overall size of the full development due to unanticipated site grading limitations and economic obstacles associated with the development as initially proposed last year. A comparison of the previously-approved Master Plan and requested modification was included in the Staff report. (Slide 6)
 - With the Stage I Master Plan modification, Phase 2 of the previously-approved plan would become Phase 1 of the current application, and include a smaller, 13,200 sq ft one-story building with a larger 52,700 sq ft outdoor storage yard on Tax Lot 500 and fronting SW Boberg Rd. This current phase did not have building frontage on SW Boones Ferry Rd. There was no change to Phase 3.
- The Stage II Final Plan reviewed the function and design of what was now Phase 1, and included assurance the proposal met all the performance standards of the PDI Zone. The proposed Stage II Final Plan met or would meet, with conditions of approval, the traffic and vehicle access, industrial performance, pedestrian access and circulation, parking, and landscaping standards of the PDI Zone.
 - No waivers to the development standards had been requested by the Applicant, and a condition of approval ensured that the outdoor storage area would not begin operation until the required site-obscuring fencing and plantings were installed and approved by the City.
 - A visual separation and site-obscuring screen of the outdoor storage yard from adjacent properties and the public right-of-way was required. As proposed, screening of the outdoor storage yard met the required High Screen Standard. The storage yard would be surrounded by a 6-ft tall chain link fence with privacy slats on all sides. Landscaping on the north and east side included Sky Pencil Japanese Holly, which would meet a mature height of 6 ft to 8 ft, along the inside of the perimeter fencing and upright European Hornbeam trees, spaced approximately 30 ft on center. On the west side, facing SW Boberg Rd, landscaping would be outside the fence and include the aforementioned Holly and Hornbeam as well as Otto Luyken laurel, Mexican feather grass, and ground cover plantings.
 - The City's industrial performance standards required limitations on noise that could be generated by truck circulation and loading/unloading activities within 100 ft of residential areas, particularly related to night operations.
 - The project's south driveway and drive aisle, the main entry point for trucks accessing the storage yard, was located within 100 feet of the Walnut Mobile Park's property line. To ensure compliance with the standard, a condition of approval was included to prohibit truck circulation and maneuvering in the area between 10 pm and 7 am so long as the property to the south was used for residential purposes.

- Additionally, the area must be clearly marked with signs or other means that indicated the limitation. (Slide 9)
- The previously approved Zone Map Amendment for the property rezoned the site from RA-H to PDI. The approval was conditioned to give consideration to design objectives of Area of Special Concern E, and those conditions continued to apply to the proposed development.
 - Additionally, the previously-approved Stage I Master Plan included conditions specific to the Screening and Buffering Overlay Zone that required appropriate screening and buffering for areas where residential and non-residential land uses abut. For industrial properties, either a 10-ft buffer with landscaping to the high wall standard or a 20-ft buffer with landscaping to the high screen standard was required. There were also restrictions on outdoor motor vehicle access and exterior operations and signs. The DRB could impose additional landscape requirements to minimize the visual impacts of any approved vehicle access points. Those conditions continued to apply to development proposed in the current Phase 1 application.
 - In response, the Applicant had proposed a 30-ft-wide buffer with landscaping to the high screen standard between the proposed development and the north property boundary of the mobile home park which exceeded the Screening and Buffering Overlay Zone requirements for buffer width by 10 ft. A 6-ft-tall chain link fence with privacy slats was proposed for the northern boundary of the buffer area and dense plantings meeting the high screen standard would line the fence on the south side to provide additional screening of industrial operations. Trees, shrubs, and ground water in the stormwater swale through the center of the buffer area would further screen activities to the north.
 - Per the Applicant, the landscape plantings were low maintenance and would provide a visually appealing environment for residents of the mobile home park.
 - In addition to meeting the buffering requirements, the development also complied with the conditions by being carefully designed, promoting continuity with other development in the area, minimizing conflict between truck traffic and residential activities, and not allowing motor vehicle access, exterior operations, or signs in the Screening and Buffering Overlay Zone.
 - Staff noted the Applicant had addressed concerns expressed by the mobile home park residents, which she offered to elaborate on should the DRB have questions.
 - Site Design Review. The proposed project included a new engineered metal building on the south side of the Phase 1 site with a secured, screened outdoor storage area on the north side. The building's main entrance was on the north side, and substantial glazing at the northwest corner would provide eyes on the street to the interior, north to the storage yard, and west to Boberg Rd. (Slide 11)
 - As described in the Applicant's materials, the layout and design provided variation in materials complementary to the commercial industrial context of the location while offsetting the simplistic geometry of a standard metal building. The contrasting color selection and varying texture of vertical metal siding and ground and split-face CMU block wrapping the base added interest and color, giving the building a modern aesthetic appeal.

- Landscaping would enhance and improve connectivity to neighboring properties along SW Boberg Rd, while contributing to the development's visual environment and providing buffering and screening to the residential area to the south.
- Class III Sign Review. The building would have frontage on SW Boberg Rd, and building-mounted signs were proposed on the north and west sign eligible elevations. No signs were proposed on the south and east sides of the building, and no freestanding signs were proposed along the Boberg frontage. Proposed signs were appropriately located on the building and within the allowed sign area for each elevation. The signs were typical of and compatible with development in the PDI Zone with design and colors reflecting corporate identity, placement in recognizable sign bands, and proportional to the building facades. The signs were compatible with the building's color scheme and architectural elements and met the dimensional requirements.
- Type C Tree Removal Plan. The Phase 1 site was open field with two Red Oaks roughly in the center and another eight trees located along the south boundary. Most of the trees, except for the Oaks, were tree stump sprouts and had been topped for utility line clearance. Species included hazelnut, hawthorn, and big leaf maple.
 - The Applicant proposed removing all ten trees and mitigating their removal by planting 32 trees in landscape areas and 22 trees in the stormwater facilities on the Phase 1 site, which substantially exceeded the mitigation requirements.
 - The adjacent property to the north had three deciduous trees with drip lines that extended into the subject site along its northern boundary. The Tree Maintenance and Protection Plan included tree protection fencing along the north property boundary at the drip line of the trees to protect them during construction.
- Staff noted the City had received a letter on April 1, 2020 from Dave Nicoli, owner of Nicoli Pacific, LLC., that requested accelerated review of the current application and waiver of some requirements governing the application approval process. Mr. Nicoli asked that his letter be shared with the DRB, City Manager, and City Council, which it was. The City responded to Mr. Nicoli's letter on April 6 with assurances that the City was working hard to facilitate the successful approval and completion of the project. Both letters were included in the record as Exhibits B3 & A3, respectively.
- Staff noted a correction to Condition of Approval PFA9, one of the Engineering Division conditions on page 17 of 60 in the Staff report. Condition PFA9 should state, "**Prior to issuance of Final Building Certificate of Occupancy, construct record** an 8-ft-wide public utility easement (PUE) along the site's frontage on SW Boberg Rd."
- Based on the findings of fact and information included in the Staff report and information received from a duly advertised public hearing, Staff recommended approval with conditions of the requested applications for Phase 1 of the Nicoli Pacific Industrial Building and Storage Yard Project.

Shawn O'Neil stated that the applicant's letter to the Walnut Mobile Park residents on April 3 referenced a May 21, 2019 meeting. He asked if anybody from the City had attended that meeting.

Ms. Luxhoj confirmed she had attended the meeting and that there were quite a few residents in attendance.

Mr. O'Neil asked Ms. Luxhoj to share any comments she had heard from the residents at that meeting about their concerns or proposed ideas, and if the City would help him understand how those ideas, if any, were incorporated into the proposal before the Board this evening.

Ms. Luxhoj stated that per the meeting's sign-in sheet, 15 people had signed in. As she recalled, several residents whose homes backed up to the subject property were in attendance to look at the proposal. Their concerns were summarized in the notes provided by the Applicant and included trucks entering and existing the property.

- One resident at the northwest corner of the mobile home park, whose residence was likely closest to property line, was concerned with trucks exiting the south driveway and possibly presenting safety conflicts due to her parking space location. In the newest proposal, the circulation of trucks had changed. Trucks would enter via the south driveway but exit from the north driveway, several hundred feet from the south property boundary.
- Noise, particularly at night, was another concern, which had been addressed by the noise abatement area that was within 100 ft of the property boundary. Also, the storage yard was on the north side of the building. Any night or emergency operations outside of the abatement hours would utilize only the north driveway, not the south driveway.
- In the previous proposal, the buffer area was 10-ft wide with a 6-ft wall on the north side of the buffer area. In the new proposal, an additional 20-ft was added to the buffer. The wall was replaced with a chain link fence, but more substantial landscaping had been added.
- One letter was received from Shirley Keith, the resident in the above-mentioned northwest corner of the mobile home park, and her concerns centered around providing as much buffer as possible between the property boundary and the site activity. Ms. Luxhoj believed that had been achieved with the new proposal. Ms. Keith was also concerned about truck traffic, the south driveway, and having that driveway as far from her as possible. In the new proposal, there was 30-ft separation.

Mr. O'Neil thanked Ms. Luxhoj for her clear response. He asked if the noise abatement at 10 pm was a Wilsonville standard or specific to this proposal.

Ms. Luxhoj replied it followed the standard Noise Ordinance requirement of 10 pm to 7 am.

Ellie Schroeder stated that the latest letter, dated April 3, (Exhibit B4), gave a phone number for residents to call, but the number was only available during business hours. She asked how residents could contact the Applicant if operations occurred outside of business hours. She added the police would not respond because it would be a civil manner.

Ms. Luxhoj clarified the number in the letter was to address the proposed development.-

Kimberly Rybold, Senior Planner, clarified if operations occurred outside normal business hours that would be a nuisance issue and Code compliance issue. During non-business hours,

residents could call the police, who would then likely coordinate with the City's Code Compliance Officer to work through that.

Ms. Schroeder said she believed it was not beyond the capability of the Applicant to provide an individual who could take those calls rather than residents calling police.

Barbara Jacobson, City Attorney, suggested the Applicant address that matter during their presentation.

Ms. Schroeder stated the temporary permit, B78, stated that the chain link fence would enclose the outdoor storage area, noting it stated, "A condition of approval will ensure that the outdoor storage area won't begin operation until the fence is erected and landscaping is in place unless a Temporary Occupancy Permit is issued if they post a bond." She asked how long the bond would be good for if the Applicant had not erected the fence and put in the landscaping.

Ms. Rybold explained the temporary occupancy permits were issued by the Building Division, which were typically only good for a certain period of time, and could only be renewed a limited number of times. In order to get final occupancy, the Applicant would have to complete those landscaping improvements, which inherently created a timeframe for them in terms of the difference between the temporary and final occupancy. She confirmed the Applicant's incentive was that they would lose the bond if they did not complete the work. The bond also allowed the City to install the landscaping itself if needed, and the City would also withhold approval of the final occupancy permit until it was completed.

Richard Martens stated there was a reference in the application to an equipment washing facility. He asked if that gave rise to any mitigation requirement for the runoff. He noticed there was a reference in the report to the stormwater analysis to be prepared by a professional engineer, but he was unsure if that related to the washing activity or normal stormwater management on the property.

Ms. Luxhoj stated the Applicant could provide more information regarding the wash bay, but she understood any wastewater post equipment cleaning would be recirculated because the Applicant used a self-contained system with no discharge from the wash bay to the sewer. She confirmed that the stormwater analysis that was to be prepared did not relate to the equipment washing facility, only to normal, ground water management.

Nicole Hendrix commented that while the noise abatement fell into hours of a traditional schedule per City ordinance, 10 pm was still pretty late.

Chair Nada stated that under the traffic and vehicle access portion of the report, the Applicant had asked for a waiver on the distance between the two driveways. The City had required 300 ft, but the waiver requested only 100 ft. He asked about the strategy for requiring the 300 ft, adding he wanted to ensure the 100 ft requested in the waiver would still provide adequate safety.

Khoi Le, Development Engineer, stated that in the City Code 300 ft of driveway space between driveways was preferred, but the minimum was 100 ft. If the Applicant met the minimum spacing of 100 ft, the deviation was approvable. Staff approved of the subject waiver because the second driveway to the north was only for trucks. Passenger vehicles would only use the south driveway, which would keep truck traffic to a minimum. The second driveway was secondary, not primary. Therefore, the south driveway met the 300-ft space requirement from the mobile home park and also 300 ft space requirement from the north driveway.

Chair Nada asked how many trips per day were considered "minimal trips."

Mr. Le explained that for a collector street in an urban area, the Code allowed less space between driveways due to slower traffic, more pedestrians, bikes, etc. on the street, and therefore, the City had leeway to allow for the minimum distance between driveways. Additionally, constraints due to the driveway locations and within the urban area prevented the driveway from being placed 300 ft away.

Chair Nada stated it appeared that the Traffic Study only studied two intersections, Boberg Rd and Boeckman, and Boones Ferry and Barber St. He asked if other intersections had been studied.

Mr. Le explained that this application did not require a traffic study and that what Chair Nada had looked at was from the previous application. The Applicant only provided a memo because the number of trips generated by this development was minimal, at only 11, during PM Peak Hours, so no actual Traffic Study was necessary.

Chair Nada called for the Applicant's presentation.

Gavin Russell, CIDA Architecture & Engineering, 15895 SW 72nd Ave, Suite 200, Portland, OR 97224, thanked everyone for attending the meeting. He presented the application via PowerPoint, which also addressed the letter sent to the Walnut Mobile Home Park residents (Exhibit B4) with these key comments:

- On April 3 the Applicant sent out a brief overview of the changes to the development on the site with additional images and information. The Applicant chose to use a letter since they could not meet in person with residents, but they had had the opportunity for an open conversation with the residents and the owner of the Walnut Mobile Home Park property over the past year.
- The current proposal implemented the design standards that had been previously discussed with some changes, such as the 30-ft buffer with chain link fence and privacy slats and a high screen standard for landscaping.
- The Applicant was preserving as many trees as possible on the site.
- No signage would be located in the buffer area, and no industrial work would be performed in the buffer area.

- The Applicant had tried to minimize traffic conflicts by placing the driveways more than 300 ft from the existing Walnut Mobile Home Park driveways. A new public sidewalk was also included, which would help with safety and increase pedestrian movement along Boberg Rd.
- The Applicant had implemented the 100-ft sound reduction boundary. An elevation was displayed showing the view of the proposed building from the Walnut Mobile Home Park and what the sound reduction boundary would look like once built.
- He believed the Board had copies of the letter sent to the residents, and noted the Applicant's intent was to work with the neighbors and promote a good relationship.

Mr. Martens asked if the washing facility was self-contained from a wastewater standpoint.

Mr. Russell confirmed that it would be self-contained, and deferred to either Dave Nicoli or Craig Harris to better answer the question.

Ms. Schroeder stated she was quite impressed, adding the Applicant had done a wonderful job. She was glad to see the Applicant had been in contact with the community, noting it must be difficult to have residential in the middle of a light industrial area. She asked who residents could contact if they had any issues during non-business hours with the operations at the proposed site, and specifically during construction. Was there a phone number residents could call 24/7 and avoid calling 911.

Mr. Russell replied the Applicant did not have a plan for that currently, and deferred to Dave Nicoli to respond further. He believed it would be an ongoing conversation that would occur and be cleared up once they moved forward.

Ms. Schroeder believed the more the Applicant could create a good relationship with their neighbors, the better everything would go for the Applicant, and the neighbors would feel more included in the project.

Dave Nicoli, Nicoli Pacific LLC, PO Box 2401, Lake Oswego, OR 97035, stated the number for the general contractor or designated manager for the project would be posted and would be given to all residents in the mobile home park. He explained that once the business opened, the work number would be 24/7 because the company sometimes did emergency work and residents could easily call that number.

- The wash bay system was designed by a company in California and completely self-contained. No water would go into the City's storm or sanitary sewer, in fact, there would not even be a storm or sanitary sewer in that area. The wastewater would get filtered and cleaned. The heavy debris had a settling tank that would be periodically emptied. Water would be added as needed due to evaporation. Although not required, the system would be covered. A member of City Staff had looked at the same facility at the Applicant's Tualatin location. Currently, they had five in operation on the West Coast and they worked very well.

Ms. Schroeder stated that she had been in the water treatment business, and could speak to that system. She added that it also reduced water usage, which was also good for the city.

Mr. O'Neil asked Tara Lund if she had received any emails or phone calls directly from any residents after the April 3, 2020 (Exhibit B4) letter had gone out.

Tara Lund, CIDA Architecture & Engineering, 15895 SW 72nd Ave, Suite 200, Portland, OR 97224 confirmed she did not receive any emails, phone calls, or any feedback at all after the letter went out. She further clarified that if she had received any phone calls outside of the hours posted in the letter, she would have received notification of those calls.

Mr. O'Neil asked if the business would be conducting any operations after 10 pm, including trucks coming and going. He understood the 10 pm noise abatement was in the City Code, but he wanted clarification on how the site would be utilized, if at all, in the evening.

Mr. Nicoli replied that D.P. Nicoli normally operated from 7 am until 5 pm, but it was an emergency-type business, so, if they received an after-hours call from an entity that required their product, they would have to access the property in the evening to get the equipment. That was rare, and he could not remember the last time that had happened in Oregon, but it was possible.

- He explained that the sound ordinance was not scientifically-based, but rather distance-based. The Applicant had hired an acoustics engineer from Stanford who went to the proposed location and measured the ambient noise from the freeway at night. He then went to the Applicant's Tualatin facility and measured the ambient noise while the business was operating during the day. The engineer concluded that no matter how much noise was made, the residents would not hear it because the freeway noise would mask it.
- He believed D.P. Nicoli would be a great neighbor and they intended to stay in great communication with the neighbors. One of his best friends owned the mobile home park property and the Applicant would do their best to be a great neighbor.

Mr. O'Neil appreciated Mr. Nicoli's input and explained that sometimes the DRB worried about the imagery of trucks and business late at night. In reality, it sounded like it would be a rare occasion in the event of emergency.

Mr. Nicoli agreed, adding that was why the property was laid out the way it was so that even in those emergency situations, everything would be 100 ft away and the trucks would use the secondary driveway. As such, he did not believe the neighbors would hear anything.

Mr. Schroeder stated the DRB was thrilled to have a new business in Wilsonville.

Ms. Hendrix thanked the Applicant for all the thought put into the neighbors, adding she appreciated the buffer zone.

Chair Nada asked if the April 3rd letter (Exhibit B4) sent to residents was sent to all residents of Walnut Mobile Home Park or only those residents who lived in proximity to the construction.

Mr. Russell replied it was sent to the residents.

Chair Nada asked how many fulltime employees would be working on the site, noting he wanted to ensure there was sufficient parking for them.

Mr. Nicoli responded they had done a study on that. With the dispatcher, an assistant, and the truck drivers, there would be seven to nine employees.

Chair Nada asked how the contact phone number and any accompanying information to contact the Applicant would be communicated to the residents.

Mr. Russell responded they could send it directly to the property manager, who could then disperse it to the residents.

Chair Nada thanked the Applicant for their effort in presenting the application and reaching out to the residents to ensure all issues were resolved.

Ms. Luxhoj clarified that regarding the wash bay and any potential discharge, a Public Works pre-treatment condition of approval on Page 72 specified that if the intent was not to connect the wash bay to the sanitary sewer, then the owner was required to submit an annual no discharge certification to the City's pre-treatment coordinator, Mia Pan.

- She also noted the following correction on page 11 of 60 under Public Improvements and Dedications, the third sentence should state, "A 3.5-foot ~~landscape~~ *right-of-way* dedication..."

Chair Nada called for public testimony in favor of, opposed, and neutral to the application, noting the various methods available for citizens to submit any comments. No comments or requests for comment were received.

Chair Nada closed the public hearing at 7:35 pm.

Mr. O'Neil stated that he wanted to emphasize that this was a very well put together presentation, the community and neighbors were properly addressed, and there was a meeting. He felt the Applicant had done a very good job. No one copied what the Staff had to say. The Applicant was prepared, really answered questions, and he strongly agreed that the DRB should approve the resolution before the Board.

Chair Nada thanked Mr. O'Neil and agreed with him. The Staff and Applicant had done a really good job at reaching out and communicating to residents.

Ellie Schroeder moved to approve Resolution No. 376 with the corrections to the Staff report noted by Staff. Shawn O'Neil seconded the motion.

- The following corrections were made to the Staff report:
(Note: additional language in bold, italic text; deleted language struck through)
 - On Page 11 of 60 under Public Improvements and Dedications, the third sentence was corrected to state, "A 3.5-foot ~~landscape~~ ***right-of-way*** dedication..."
 - Correct Condition PFA9 on Page 17 of 60 to state, "Prior to issuance of Final Building Certificate of Occupancy, ~~construct~~ ***record*** an 8-foot wide public utility easement (PUE)..."

The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Nada read the rules of appeal into the record.

VII. Board Member Communications:

A. Recent City Council Action Minutes

There were no comments.

VIII. Staff Communications

Kimberly Rybold noted some of City Council's action minutes dated back to February and March. During that time, Planning had some long-range projects that went before the City Council for work session, including the Equitable Housing Strategic Plan and updates on Town Center projects, including the I-5 Pedestrian Bridge Project.

- The Residential Code Modernization Project also had a couple of work sessions and the ordinance was approved on first reading by City Council last month. The ordinance would affect some of the technical details and requirements for PDR Zones in the city, particularly as they related to lot size and open space requirements, so when future projects that were residential in nature came before the DRB, Board members would notice some standards had changed, hopefully in such a way as to make them more workable and usable for all involved.
- She noted Staff continued to work hard to ensure they were still serving customers, issuing permits, and reviewing applications. There were still active applications in, but she did not know when the next one would come before Panel B.

Chair Nada thanked Staff for enabling tonight's meeting to happen virtually.

IX. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:39 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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