

**Wilsonville City Hall
29799 SW Town Center Loop E
Wilsonville, Oregon 97070**

**Development Review Board – Panel B
Minutes – September 22, 2014 6:30 PM**

Approved
Nov. 24, 2014

I. Call to Order:

Acting Chair Dianne Knight called the DRB-Panel B meeting to order at 6:30 pm.

II. Chairman's Remarks:

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

III. Roll Call:

Present for roll call were: Dianne Knight, Cheryl Dorman, and Jhuma Chaudhuri. Andrew Karr, Aaron Woods, and City Council Liaison Julie Fitzgerald were absent.

Staff present were: Blaise Edmonds, Barbara Jacobson, and Michael Wheeler

IV. Citizens' Input: This is an opportunity for visitors to address the Development Review Board on items not on the agenda. There was none.

V. City Council Liaison Report: In City Council Liaison Julie Fitzgerald's absence, Blaise Edmonds reported on City Council activities:

At the September 4 City Council Meeting:

- Council heard a request from the Clackamas Community College Board of Education to support bond measure 3-447. City Council voted unanimously in support of the resolution.
- Council unanimously approved a resolution to authorize City staff to work with ODOT and Holland Partner Group to plant trees along the sound wall in an effort to prevent graffiti and vandalism along the wall.
- A resolution was approved to authorize SMART to purchase two new Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) buses. SMART obtained Federal grant money which covered 70% of the cost of the buses.

At the September 15 City Council Meeting:

- Ordinance No. 748 was approved on first reading, imposing a tax on the sale of marijuana and marijuana-infused products in the city of Wilsonville in anticipation of potential voter approval of statewide marijuana legalization measure on the November ballot. The public hearing was held open to allow for further public testimony at the September 29 City Council meeting.
- Ordinance No. 747 was approved, adopting updated Public Works Standards.
- During the session prior to the meeting, City Council reviewed a report by staff Chris Neamtzu and consultant John Fregonese on the Basalt Creek Planning Area between Wilsonville and Tualatin. The joint planning process between the 2 cities, which began in 2014, is expected to be completed in late 2015. There will be several public hearings with both Tualatin and Wilsonville City Councils.

VI. Consent Agenda:

A. Approval of minutes of August 25, 2014 meeting

Cheryl Dorman moved to approve the August 25th minutes. Jhuma Chaudhuri seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

VII. Public Hearing:

- A. Resolution 291. Portera at The Grove: Tube Art Group – applicant’s representative for Branchley Estates Partners Phase 3 LP and CRP Holland Branchley Estates II LP – applicants/owners.** The applicant is seeking approval of a building sign to identify the Portera at The Grove active adult residential development, five (5) directional signs, and a waiver to enable a building sign in a residential zone. The subject site is located on Tax Lots 203 and 204, Section 14A; T3S-R1W; Clackamas County; Wilsonville, Oregon. Staff: Michael Wheeler

Case Files: DB14-0053 – Class III Sign Permit and Sign Waiver

Acting Chair Knight called the public hearing to order at 6:40 pm and read the conduct of hearing format into the record. All Board members declared for the record that they had visited the site. No board member, however, declared a conflict of interest, bias, or conclusion from a site visit. No board member participation was challenged by any member of the audience.

Michael Wheeler, Associate Planner, announced that the criteria applicable to the application were stated on page 1 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 presented the Staff report via PowerPoint with these comments:

- The application was for a Class 3 Sign Review. The applicant wished to install a building sign for the site known as Active Adults at the Grove. The Development Code did not allow for building signs for residential development, thus the request. The applicant requested approval of a building sign, and a monument sign to provide direction to the Terrene Apartments and also to the Portera at the Grove facility.
- He presented a tax map which showed the location of the site as well as the development surrounding the site.
- The applicant proposed a building sign on the entry portico that would say “Portera at the Grove.” He pointed to a highlighted area depicting the location of the signage on the south face of the elevation, shown on an enlarged section of Sheet 1 of 6.
- The East Elevation View slide with the red “Sign A” showed where the “Portera at the Grove” sign would be located on the building.
- The companion signage (Sign B) was about an 18 sq. ft. sign intended to guide individuals arriving on Ash Meadows Lane that the Terrene was located to the right and that Portera at the Grove was to the left.
- There were four additional directional signs (Sign C, D, E and F) for various functions at Portera at the Grove (Passenger Drop Off, Visitor Parking, Parking, Deliveries), shown on two slides.
- He presented another drawing which showed, in red, the locations of the additional directional signs.
- The language of the Code would not allow the building sign in a residential zone without the benefit of a waiver and some of the directional signs are in locations that could only be allowed by exceptions in the Code.
- On the representation of Sign C and Sign B, showed sign B illustrated as being in the middle of the sidewalk. Staff believed it was an unintentional illustration and identified it as a conditional of approval by assuring that the sign was placed out of the sidewalk somewhere on the side of the park.
- The final slide showed the whole Branchley Estates project and the location of the Portera at the Grove application central to the north end of the development.
- While the numbers of the signs were not allowed by the Code specifically, they could be achieved through the waivers that were requested. To have a model of Code to be able to use to evaluate the signs, Staff borrowed what would be allowed if it were a commercially zoned parcel. Staff evaluated

the directional signs not satisfied by the Code language in the conclusionary findings in the staff report.

- The recommended conditions of approval were found on page 5 of 17:
 - PD1 ensured sight vision clearance
 - PD2 limited the size of the large directional sign to 18 sq. ft.
 - PD3 and PD4 were perfunctory conditions requiring Class I permits prior to installation
 - PD5 recommended that the large directional sign be moved from the sidewalk to the park land directly adjacent.
- He concluded by saying that Staff recommended approval for the signs.

There were no questions from the DRB.

Acting Chair Knight called for the applicant's testimony.

Brenner Daniels, Holland Development, 1111 Main Street Suite 700, Vancouver, Washington 98660, stated he had no further comment.

Acting Chair Knight called for questions.

Mr. Daniels stated a few items for clarification:

- Regarding the location of Sign B, the intent was to have the sign placed in the park as opposed to right of way.
- The applicant was fine with the maximum size of 18 sq. ft. as conditioned in PD2.
- Five directional signs were being requested. Of those, Sign B would be used from the onset. The other signs would be for future needs and would be installed as needed.
- The copy used in the application for directional signs was used as an example. The actual writing on the signs may differ depending on what was needed in the future.

Acting Chair Knight called for questions. There were none. She then called for audience testimony.

Dan Osterman, Tube Art Group, indicated that he was fabricator of the signage and that his address was located on the sign-in sheet. He reiterated that the designs submitted were kept to a minimum and took into consideration the surrounding areas. The building sign would be subdued by ambient light. The design is sensitive to the architecture of the building and would provide an important marker to the main entry. He had no problems meeting the conditions of approval.

Blaise Edmonds questioned, for the record, whether he was part of the applicant's team.

Mr. Osterman affirmed that he was. He offered to answer any questions.

Acting Chair Knight called for questions. There were none. She declared the public hearing closed at 6:55 p.m. She then called for discussion. There was none.

Cheryl Dorman moved to approve Resolution 291. Jhuma Chaudhuri seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Acting Chair Knight read the rules of appeal into the record.

VIII. Board Member Communications

A. Results of the September 8, 2014 DRB Panel A meeting

IX. Staff Communications:

There were none.

X. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:56 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Shelley White, Planning Administrative Assistant