



Development Review Board - Panel B

Regular Meeting Minutes

July 28, 2025

Wilsonville City Hall & Remote Video Conferencing

<https://www.ci.wilsonville.or.us/meetings/pc>

CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

Approved

February 23, 2026

Chair Barrett called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm.

CHAIR'S REMARKS

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

ROLL CALL

Present for roll call were: Rachelle Barrett, Megan Chuinard, Kamran Mesbah, and Dana Crocker. John Andrews was absent.

Staff present: Daniel Pauly, Stephanie Davidson, Kimberly Rybold, Georgia McAlister, and Shelley White

CITIZEN INPUT

There was none.

CONSENT AGENDA

1. Approval of the February 24, 2025 DRB Panel B Minutes

Megan Chuinard moved to approve the February 24, 2025 DRB Panel B meeting minutes as presented. Dana Crocker seconded the motion, which passed 3 to 0 to 1. (Ayes: Chuinard, Barrett, Crocker. Nays: None. Abstains: Mesbah)

PUBLIC HEARING

2. **Resolution No. 441. ParkWorks.** The applicant is requesting approval of a Class 3 Sign Permit, Waiver, and Site Design Review for the installation of a 355-square-foot wall sign and a mural on an industrial building visible from SW Parkway Avenue and Interstate 5.

Case Files:

DB25-0002 ParkWorks

-Class 3 Sign Permit (SIGN25-0007)

-Waiver (WAIV25-0001)

-Site Design Review (SDR25-0002)

Chair Barrett called the public hearing to order at 6:35 p.m. and read the conduct of hearing format into the record. Chair Barrett and Kamran Mesbah 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.

Associate Planner McAlister announced that the criteria applicable to the application were stated starting 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 and on the City's website.

Associate Planner McAlister presented the Staff report via PowerPoint, briefly noting the site's location, current zoning, and Comprehensive Plan designation, as well as surrounding land uses. She reviewed the requested applications, all of which required discretionary review, with these key comments:

- Proper noticing for the application was followed with notice mailed on July 8th to all property owners within 250 ft of the subject property, published in the newspaper, and posted on the site and the City's website. One public comment in support of the mural was received during the comment period and was included as Exhibit C1.
- The proposed sign was proposed on the building's west façade, which faced SW Parkway Ave and was adjacent to the main parking area, making it eligible for a wall sign. The Applicant proposed the placement of a painted wall sign on the north portion of the upper west façade. The subject request was for a 355 sq ft sign, which exceeded the 132 sq ft wall sign allowance; therefore, requiring a waiver, triggering a DRB review per the Sign Code.
 - The sign was designed to be compatible and complementary with the existing building and surrounding development, aside from its size. Placing the sign on the upper portion of the west façade above the red brick, and within the gray/black parapet, fit well with the existing architecture and modern industrial feel of the campus and matched the existing Master Sign Plan. (Slide 5)
- Waivers exist to provide flexibility while upholding the intent of the Development Code regulations. When reviewing a waiver, a key question was to determine how far a proposal should be allowed to depart from the standard. If the level of departure was on a spectrum, one end would be the "minimum necessary" test, which the City used for variances to address a specific hardship, and the departure from the standard had to be the smallest amount needed to relieve that hardship. The Code did not apply the minimum necessary test to waivers.
 - The other end of the spectrum would be a "complete waiver" or treating the standard as if it did not exist once the Applicant provided justification. In nearly all cases, a complete waiver disregarded the purpose and objective of the Code standards being waived by implying the regulation was not necessary. The Code did not support the complete waiver approach due to lack of language clearly endorsing complete waivers and by requiring justifications that showed the Code's purposes and objectives were still met with the waiver.
 - Because waivers had to be supported by reasonableness in the Development Code and applicants were required to justify waivers based on how they better achieved

objections of the regulations being waived, the extent of the departure had to be commensurate with the justification.

- If the departure went beyond what was needed to meet the justification, it lost its connection to the waiver's purpose, so while waivers were not held to the same strict standard as variances, they still leaned much closer to "minimum necessary" than the "complete waiver" end of the spectrum. The expected level of departure could be described as reasonably justified.
- Tonight, the Board had to determine if the waiver for the 350 sq ft sign was reasonably justified and would result in improved design; a sign more compatible and complementary with the ParkWorks building, site, zone and surrounding developments; and if the sign would improve, or at least not negatively impact, public safety. The content of the sign was not under consideration.
- Per the Applicant, the need for a 350 sq ft sign was due to visibility, functionality, and design, and the absence of readily identifiable signage on the building. In addition, the remote location of the main entrance and existing monument sign made it difficult to identify both the building and the development from Parkway Ave and I-5. The Applicant's methodology for calculating the ideal sign, readability, and visibility could be found in their narrative, Exhibits B4 and B5, and the waiver criteria findings.
- Staff noted that the Sign Code did not use the same methodology, based on visibility calculations, to determine sign allowances. Instead, the wall sign allowances within the Sign Code were calculated based on the length of the sign-eligible façade to allow flexibility while meeting Sign Code objectives. Sign area allowances could be transferred to adjacent facades or increased based on location of entrances, number of tenants, and adjacency to I-5, none of which were relevant in the subject review.
- While significant flexibility existed, the Sign Code limited walls signs that used bonuses or transfers to an absolute maximum of 200 sq ft. The limitation was established with the understanding that 200 sq ft was adequate space to achieve the objectives of the Sign Code related to design, compatibility, and wayfinding, regardless of the size of the building or other extenuating factors.
- The 200 sq ft absolute maximum supported compatibility between developments and consistent application of sign regulations throughout the community. The Sign Code included an absolute maximum sign allowance of 200 sq ft, which supported the argument that maximum visibility was not the goal of the Sign Code regulation. Instead, the Code prioritized how a wall sign would blend and work with building architecture, specifically, identifiable sign bands.
- The Sign Code also regulated design, variety, number, location, and types of signs in a manner that allowed flexibility while maintaining consistency throughout the city. Key objectives of the Sign Code regulations included assuring signs were sufficiently visible from abutting streets for wayfinding and identification, as well as signs that were designed and placed in a manner complementary to the overall design and architecture of the site. The Code further emphasized staying within defined architectural elements as approval criteria.

- When considering the waiver, Staff encouraged the Board to prioritize consideration of how the sign related to the existing building's parapet as an architectural element that served as the sign band.
 - Architectural compatibility was a key consideration in determining whether to waive the façade's maximum sign allowance. The Code required the sign to be placed within the definable sign band so that there was definable space between the sign and the edges of the feature in which it is placed, as shown by the red arrows on Slide 12.
 - Definable space could be understood as the negative space surrounding the sign while the sign would be considered the positive space. The relationship between positive and negative space impacts other important design principles, such as balance, proportion, rhythm, and emphasis. The Sign Code's requirement for definable space ensured that signs were complementary and compatible with building design, fit within the architectural aesthetics and sign design principles, and helped with readability by limiting conflicts between architectural elements and sign design by assuring there was adequate negative space to reduce visual noise.
- Architectural and size compatibility with surrounding developments was part of the criteria. The most recent waiver request approval for an increased wall sign allowance was for I&E Construction's 130-ft wall sign located on the building's west façade and facing I-5, similar to the subject application. The sign allowance was 64 sq ft and the approved waiver allowed for an additional 70 sq ft. The 134 sq ft sign was integrated within the building's architecture and centered within a large aluminum mesh screen. The size of the sign was appropriately sized for the architectural feature it was placed within, leaving plenty of definable space on all sides. The sign was also less than the absolute maximum sign 200 sq ft allowance. (Slide 13)
 - The nearby Audi Dealership featured another comparable sign. The dealership's northwest façade was visible, but set back from I-5 and the parallel street, Boones Ferry Rd, and included two signs that total approximately 200 sq ft. Both signs were placed thoughtfully in relationship to the building architecture and spaced appropriately between the building's façade edges and glazing elements, creating a clean look with definable space specific to the sign. Because the 200 sq ft allowances were broken up between the two signs, the appearance of the signage did not overly dominate the façade. While there was only two feet between the signs and the edges of the architectural features they were placed within, the simple design of the façade prevented the sign from feeling cramped or inappropriately placed.
 - The nearby Sysco development was also comparable in location, building size, and orientation with considerable distance between the west façade and adjacent roads similar to the ParkWorks campus. The existing wall sign was approximately 185 sq ft, which was within the sign allowance based on the façade length and under the 200 sq ft maximum sign allowance.
- The Applicant proposed a 355 sq ft sign, which was appropriately placed within the parapet of the west façade, however, the sign was larger than signs in other comparable developments in the area. The parapet was approximately 11.5 ft tall, and the sign lettering and logo varied in height with the logo being the tallest portion of the sign, measuring just

above 8 ft, and the lettering between 5 ft to 6.5 ft. With the sign centered between the top and bottom edges of the parapet, the amount of definable space ranged between about 1.75 ft and 3.25 ft.

- Regarding both readability and complementary design, the larger a sign was in relation to the architectural feature in which it was placed, the more definable space was needed to provide balance between positive and negative space. While the definable space provided with the proposed wall may be adequate in relation to larger, less-constrained architectural features or a smaller sign, the large sign looked cramped within the parapet and would detract from the design of the building. Based on the façade, 132 sq ft was the maximum allowed sign area. (Slide 16)
- The smaller sign might not have fit as well on the parapet as the 200 sq ft sign. While there was definable space, an argument could be made that too much space was provided, throwing off the balance between the positive and negative space. (Slide 17)
- Staff recommended a condition of approval to limit the sign to the absolute maximum sign allowance of 200 sq ft, which would balance the positive and negative space appropriately, leave a noticeable definable space between the sign and the edges of the parapet, and not dominate the architectural feature, but instead, add interest to an otherwise plain façade and enhance the design. The 200 sq ft sign was more compatible in size with the surrounding developments as well.
- Site Design Review. The Applicant had also proposed adding a mural to the south section of the upper west façade, changing the building's appearance, which triggered Site Design Review. The mural was distinctly different from a sign and should be reviewed as such. Under Wilsonville Code, a mural may or may not be classified as a sign, hinging on whether or not it conveyed a message or was considered protected speech under state or federal law.
 - The subject mural was a custom-designed, tree-lined silhouette, contained no words, trademarks, or recognizable messages, served purely as a visual design, and did not communicate protected speech.
 - The proposed mural qualified as an architectural feature, not a sign. A review of the legislative history of the 2012 Sign Code updates supported that interpretation. As an architectural feature subject to Site Design Review, the DRB may evaluate and request changes to the materials, colors, or other design elements; however, the mural had no size limit.
 - The proposed mural was the first of its kind to be reviewed by the DRB under the Site Design Review process. The review was subjective, and therefore, the context of the site's surrounding developments and zoning was extremely important. How the Site Design Review criteria were applied to the review of various murals would vary significantly depending on that context. The proposed mural would be installed upon the existing ParkWorks development, which had a particular aesthetic, unique setting, and history, and should be reviewed with that context in mind.
- Staff's review took into account the site conditions, Planned Development Industrial (PDI) Zone, aesthetics of the development, and impact to the community. The tree line depicted in the mural was reflective of the natural woodlands both surrounding and incorporated

within the development and demonstrated thoughtful and compatible design choices. The close relationship between trees and the ParkWorks Industrial Center is a unique feature of the site and not common in most industrial areas.

- The use of only two colors and silhouettes to create the mural resulted in a clean industrial feel that seamlessly integrated the surrounding nature into a cohesive design unique to the development's context. The mural would be painted on the ParkWorks building's west façade, which faced outward onto Parkway Ave and I-5. The west façade was not the main entrance of the building, but it was the most visible façade from offsite. The mural would add a point of interest to the façade but retain the clean, modern aesthetics of the development and enhance any drab or monotonous characteristics of the building design while remaining harmonious with the existing industrial campus.
- Due to the prominent location, the mural would be visible to people in the community, as well as visitors and employees of the development, emphasizing the importance of its impact on the community. Staff anticipated the mural would have a positive impact on the overall community due to the additional interest it would add to the building. Additionally, as a Tree City USA, the use of trees in the mural reflected Wilsonville's longstanding commitment to maintaining a healthy tree canopy, a point of community pride.

Kamran Mesbah confirmed Staff did not have a graphic with medium-sized lettering and asked if Staff had looked at the balance between the two graphics. He understood Staff had separated the sign and mural, but to him they appeared as one visually, so the balance should be within the whole graphic presentation.

Ms. McAlister replied that was partly why 200 sq ft was more appropriate than 132 sq ft. The sign and mural had been isolated for most of the review because the sign criteria regarded the building and the existing context, and while the mural would add additional context, it was not yet on the building.

Mr. Mesbah understood that legally, they had to be dealt with separately, but experientially, when they were observed, it worked as one piece. He noted the roof projecting up from the brick building was kind of part of the graphic.

Chair Barrett asked what criteria the Board should use to determine approval of the mural.

Ms. McAlister responded that size was not a factor. Rather, the Board should apply Site Design Review criteria as if looking at the paint on or architecture of a building. Because the criteria were loose, Staff emphasized the context of the site and the existing building. Because the review was very subjective and the criteria differed from the sign criteria, approval would vary from mural to mural. Mural criteria could include color and the mural's color scheme coordinates with the building.

Planning Manager Pauly added the Board could also use, as examples of similar criteria, how corner treatments and screening filled space or contributed to the architecture of the building or provided visual interest; if the materials used was consistent with the architecture and the surrounding environment, etc.

Dana Crocker asked if any waiver the DRB granted to ParkWorks would apply only to the subject area and design or would it also apply to any design and signage on the site.

Ms. McAlister clarified that when approving the sign allowance waiver, the Board was not reviewing the content, only the sign's position, size, color, etc. The Applicant could repaint it with different content. She confirmed that once the waiver was approved for that specific area, it stayed in place regardless of the content.

Planning Manager Pauly added Staff was specific in the findings that the sign was a white painted wall sign only, and while paint colors could be changed, it could not be converted into a different type of sign, such as a backlit cabinet sign.

Chair Barrett called for the Applicant's presentation.

Scott Caufield, Consultant, Tube Art Group, presented the Applicant's presentation with these key comments:

- In response to Mr. Mesbah's earlier comment, he displayed the ParkWorks Site Plan and Proposed Wall Sign Wall Mural (Exhibit 1) which showed the building frontage in its entirety as proposed with both the sign and mural. (Slide 1)
 - Proportionality was a main point in supporting the Applicant's proposal of the 350 sq ft sign, especially when considering the sign and the mural together. The sign also stood out, blended nicely, and was complementary to the graphic, but not overpowering.
- While the proposed sign was significantly larger than allowed, the skewed position of the building relative to Parkway Ave and I-5 changed the viewing angle, which was an important consideration regarding sign size. Additionally, the building was setback from the frontage by approximately 450 ft at its farthest corner. (Slide 4)
 - While the Audi building on the opposite side of I-5 was also set back, the building also sat square to the frontage and did not have as much vegetation between it and the roadway as the ParkWorks building did. Additionally, the ParkWorks building had a landscaped earth berm that further obstructed its view.
 - He asked the Board to consider that the larger-than-normal sign was intended to create visibility and ensure the sign could be seen from both Parkway Ave and I-5 to the degree possible.
 - Regarding the definable space, the ParkWorks sign and logo layout was actually pulled up high and not centered on the parapet, so the Applicant believed the size of the sign could be retained if it was pulled down in a way to balance the definable space, both on top and underneath the ParkWorks logo, which might be a potential solution to better balance the negative space and the sign itself.

- He continued the presentation via PowerPoint providing additional information for the Board's consideration as follows:
 - Photos of ParkWorks viewed from Parkway Ave, showing the berm, and from I-5 South were shown. He indicated the approximate locations of the ParkWorks sign, logo, and tree mural, noting the metal roof or shroud showing above the brick wall that he believed covered mechanical equipment. (Slides 3-4)
 - Driving along Parkway Ave, the berm increased in size and the vegetation had grown taller than shown, obscuring the line of sight, which was an important point.
 - The view from I-5 South really illustrated how the berm and landscaping obstructed the view of the building, which sat low and was dark; nothing made it stand out or noticeable.
 - In contrast, the photo of the Wilsonville Chevrolet building was taken farther away from Parkway Ave. The building sat parallel to the frontage and I-5, making it much more visible without the obstructions of the ParkWorks building. This slide was provided to illustrate what the Applicant was trying to accomplish with the larger sign proposal. (Slide 5)
 - The reasons to support the waiver request was that the 350 sq ft sign was proportional to the overall size of the wall and parapet and perfectly complemented the proposed tree mural. Additionally, the sign as proposed was necessary to ensure adequate visibility from the adjacent roadways and to compensate for the deeper setback and skewed viewing angle when approaching ParkWorks Industry Center.

Megan Chuinard asked if the proposed sign would be large enough to be seen from I-5, and if the reduced sign size might be seen more completely in between the trees.

Mr. Caufield replied openings were seen when he had driven by the building numerous times in both directions on Parkway Ave and I-5. He confirmed that depending on the viewing angle, the smaller sign could be viewed more completely or in its entirety between the trees. The site was challenging in that something different obscured the view from almost every vantage point.

Planning Manager Pauly confirmed he had a quick mock-up of the smaller 200 sq ft sign on the building to compare visually with the Applicant's proposed 355 sq ft sign.

Mr. Mesbah noted the Applicant's pictures did not show the metal shroud, which blocked the sign, so it was difficult to determine whether a smaller sign would blend and balance better with the mural than the larger, bolder proposed sign, which moved more toward a modernist-type approach, which was basically wall-to-wall on the frame with a poster as opposed to a more traditional approach of leaving the positive and negative spaces. However, that would help the Applicant because the Code was not written that way.

Planning Manager Pauly confirmed he had created a quick mock-up of the smaller 200 sq ft sign on the building, entered into the record as Exhibit A3, to enable the Board to compare the smaller sign size visually with the Applicant's proposed 355 sq ft sign.

Chair Barrett asked if swapping the sign and mural locations had been considered given the location of the berm.

Mr. Caulfield replied he did not know if the Applicant had considered swapping the locations.

Mr. Mesbah noted that from northbound I-5, no sign of any size would be visible because a driver would not fully turn around to see it while driving. From I-5 southbound, the sign would only be visible temporarily until the new building was constructed, so he did not believe the size of the sign mattered due to the angles. Viewing the signs from Parkway Ave would be similar given the minimal view windows available. Additionally, since most people used GPS, he did not believe the sign was needed for wayfinding but simply served to put a name on the building.

Mr. Caulfield understood Mr. Mesbah's point, but noted that for drivers looking for the building, the ability to see it and identify it actually mattered.

Mr. Mesbah replied the wayfinding was irrelevant because anybody driving north looking for the building would see the big sign post next to Parkway Ave, immediately followed by the two driveways, and those driving south would know something was back there. As such, the wayfinding argument was a bit tenuous. However, he understood the need to label the building.

Mr. Caulfield agreed the building needed to be labeled and identified, as ParkWorks was an important employer regionally, and the property was beautiful and unique. The owner wanted to identify the building and make a mark so to speak.

- He had inquired about the future building and could not confirm there were any plans to construct a future building any time soon. The Applicant's proposal to identify the building was based on the here and now and that tried to be respectful of the Code and the requirements therein, but in a way that made a strong statement and identify the building.
- He noted that in certain instances, the Sign Code allowed for the transfer of sign area from other portions of the building. Based on language in the Code, none of the conditions that allowed such a transfer of sign area applied to the ParkWorks building.
- However, the overall building was quite large and there were several thousand linear feet of exterior wall, none of which contained a wall sign. Given the size of the building and the overall scope and scale, the subject wall was the only wall that qualified for the placement of the sign. If the Applicant was able to transfer some of the sign size, it might help secure a larger sign, but in this particular case, the Code did not allow for it, even with so much wall areas not currently utilized for a sign.

Ms. Chuinard asked Staff for any clarification they might have about the other potential building.

Planning Manager Pauly explained the potential building had been approved and had a two-year active window set to expire in December. He confirmed there was uncertainty as to whether the building would be developed, so the sign would likely be visible from the right-of-way for an extended time. Per the Sign Code, visibility from the right-of-way was not the top priority because the monument sign directed from the right-of-way and once on site, visitors could see the building identifier.

- The building would be a modern tilt-up concrete building with two stories.

Mr. Caulfield confirmed the height of the brick wall shown on the slides was approximately 18 ft high and the parapet was 11.5 ft high, so close to 30 ft total.

- He confirmed the proposed building would sit parallel to Parkway Ave (Exhibit 1) and that the entry monument sign on Parkway Ave would remain.
- He commended Associate Planner McAlister and Staff for being incredibly patient and helpful in getting through the subject application. It had been a long process and the Applicant was very grateful.

Mr. Mesbah asked Mr. Caulfield if the smaller sign would work after having seen it on Exhibit A3.

Mr. Caulfield replied that appearing before the Board with a Staff recommendation for approval with conditions was much better than appearing with a recommendation for denial, so the Applicant appreciated the spirit in which the reduced sign area was offered. He believed the Applicant's position was stronger. Although there was nothing inherently wrong with a smaller sign, the larger sign better met the Applicant's needs. While the smaller sign would work and be even better than what was currently there, he was not the owner, and he did not want to speculate as to whether the owner would accept a proposal for a 200 sq ft sign which he had not discussed with them.

Chair Barrett confirmed the Applicant would have to take any conditions imposed by the Board back to the owner for approval.

Chair Barrett confirmed with Staff that no one was present at City Hall and no one on Zoom indicated they wanted to provide public testimony.

Kimberly Rybold clarified the height of the new approved building was approximately 35 ft high.

Mr. Mesbah stated that although he believed the Applicant's proposal worked better for the subject property, accepting such a large sign could set precedent for oversized signs in the future.

Planning Manager Pauly replied that like the I&E sign, it was vital that the Findings be very specific to the rationale for approval. When the DRB had reviewed the perforated metal I&E

sign along I-5, it was specifically stated that the sign would not have been approved at that large of a size if it was a channel letter or traditional sign, but the way it integrated with the architectural element set it apart and made it a unique one-off scenario that prevented it from becoming a precedent. On the subject building, the sign band was set, and the façade was simple and amenable to modern design. Setting a precedent could likely be avoided by including as much detail as possible that was specific to the subject site in the Findings as to why the Board believed the large sign provided a better balance with the mural.

Mr. Mesbah understood transferring signage from the other walls of the building did not apply because they were not projection walls.

Planning Manager Pauly replied Staff attempted to think through all scenarios. If multiple frontages were on the building, then some of the sign area could be transferred over; however, with a façade length like the ParkWorks building, it was assumed that such transfers were not that common. Any size limitations that were determined were based on existing signs in the community, and Staff determined that 132 sq ft was big enough for a building façade of that size.

- He confirmed the brick wall was larger than the parapet, but the sign could not be on the brick wall because the calculation was based on the length of the façade, not the dimensions of the band, with the absolute maximum being 200 sq ft, including any transfers, bonuses for additional entrances, and things like that.

Chair Barrett confirmed there was no additional questions or discussion and closed the public hearing at 7:38 pm.

Megan Chuinard moved to adopt the Staff report with the addition of Exhibit A3. Kamran Mesbah seconded the motion, which passed 3 to 1. (Ayes: Chuinard, Barrett, Mesbah. Nays: Crocker.)

The following exhibit was entered into the record:

- Exhibit A3: Mock-up diagram created by Staff to compare the visual difference between Staff's recommended 200 sq ft sign and the Applicant's proposed 355 sq ft sign on the building.

Megan Chuinard moved to adopt Resolution No. 441. Kamran Mesbah seconded the motion.

Mr. Mesbah stated that given the City's current design standards, he did not believe the Board had the specifics needed to justify why the application was different in order to approve the waiver request. Although visually he preferred the Applicant's proposal, he did not see the wiggle room necessary to confirm it worked within City's standards. Additionally, he did not think the City should look at that because it was too subjective.

Planning Manager Pauly reminded that if the Board denied approval, City Council would want to understand why, and he encouraged Board members to state any reason for a no vote on the record.

Ms. Crocker explained that ParkWorks was trying to maximize its space on the building for the business and should have the opportunity to do so. She believed the proposed sign and mural fit with the building and approving the waiver would not change the standard for any other proposal. The Board should honor what the Applicant was requesting rather than going with Staff's recommendation.

Ms. Chuinard agreed it was challenging when a business wanted to make a specific tailored product for its client, but the Board was bound to the Code, and she believed the Staff report was appropriate for the circumstances and that any changes would likely need to happen through the Code.

Chair Barrett asked if the Board wanted to propose any changes to the motion.

Mr. Mesbah asked Ms. Crocker what she saw on the building that caused her to be in approval of the waiver, noting the Applicant wanting to maximize their space would be a reason for any applicant to apply for a sign waiver. Nothing on the building façade or parapet looked special to justify the larger sign and ensure approval would not set a precedent.

Ms. Crocker replied that the building was askew and was difficult to see from Parkway Ave and I-5 because of its location on the site and the speed of vehicles when passing it, so she understood why the Applicant wanted to maximize that space.

Mr. Mesbah responded that he did not believe drivers on I-5 would be able to identify the building, regardless of sign size; however, vehicles on Parkway Ave would and the monument sign on the site was also visible from Parkway Ave. People know Wilsonville or not, and if not, they would likely use GPS to find ParkWorks. He had not seen the full purpose in the application, but it was good try. When driving up and down I-5 he did not understand the point of the signage as the building was not communicating that badly for him.

Ms. Crocker stated she did not see a noticeable difference in the mock-ups between the smaller and larger signs to warrant the sign being smaller. The larger sign looked okay from the exhibits the Board was shown.

Mr. Mesbah countered that he did not see enough of a noticeable difference in the bigger sign to violate Code.

The motion passed 3 to 1. (Ayes: Chuinard, Barrett, Mesbah. Nays: Crocker.)

Chair Barrett read the rules of appeal into the record.

BOARD MEMBER COMMUNICATIONS

3. Results of the March 10, 2025 DRB Panel A meeting
4. Recent City Council Action Minutes

Kamran Mesbah asked if the Town Center Master Plan redesign had progressed at all.

Planning Manager Pauly understood additional outreach was being conducted to understand community sentiment regarding the project. He also noted that City Council had approved the removal of the minimum parking standard citywide as the best option available, so the Board would no longer be considering or reviewing parking minimums.

Chair Barrett asked how that would impact the Board.

Planning Manager Pauly explained that developers would generally provide enough parking. Staff had done studies of areas around multi-family developments and had developed a playbook of options to pursue if parking congestion issues developed around those areas. He confirmed that it applied to residential as well, noting the market would continue to demand parking. He noted that the inability to require minimum parking was an executive order signed by the governor, litigated, and found to be legal. Given the clear and objective standard from the State, Council did not have many options, making it an easy decision.

- Unless a larger item was on the DRB's agenda, Staff would provide a legislative update in September to review changes in law and the impact on the Board. Staff was awaiting further guidance from various state agencies, particularly the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD).

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:53 p.m.