



UNOFFICIAL

Architectural Review Board

MINUTES OF September 10, 2025

ARB MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chair, Cyndy Hillier
Board Member, Kylan Hoener
Board Member, Matt Kilmartin
Board Member, Skip Stanaway
Board Member, Dongmei Lin
Board Member, Keith Hancock

STAFF PRESENT:

Aquilla Hurd-Ravich, Com. Development Director
Keith Leonard, Associate Planner
Lindsey Hagerman, Office Coordinator

ARB MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m., and roll call was taken.

REVIEW OF MINUTES

Board Members unanimously voted to approve the October 2, 2024, minutes. (6-0)

Member Honer declared bias opinion and removed himself from the Architectural Review meeting. Board Member Kilmartin declared he works with a number of firms involved in this application but doesn't personally know anyone in application tonight.

All Board Members declared they were aware of the signs posted around the neighborhood.

ACTION

1. Mackenzie, on behalf of Lam Research Corporation, is requesting approval to construct a multi-phase project consisting of four buildings for office, research laboratory, storage, and utilities, totaling 241,230 square feet, expansion of an existing bulk gas storage yard, and associated landscaping, parking, and public/site improvements on a 75.96 acre site zoned Manufacturing Park (MP).

These minutes are not verbatim. The meeting was recorded, and copies of the recording are retained for a period of one year from the date of the meeting and are available upon request



UNOFFICIAL

Keith Leonard, Associate Planner, presented an overview of the project, which included site background, project overview, and applicable criteria. Mackenzie, on behalf of the applicant Lam Research Corporation, has submitted a proposal for the construction of four buildings that include an office, lab, utilities and storage buildings, expansion of a gas storage yard, parking, landscaping and other site improvements.

Mr. Leonard described the subject site as being comprised of four parcels that total almost 76 acres of land in the Manufacturing Park zone, located on SW Leveton Drive west of 108th Avenue, south of Tualatin Road and that the land is currently occupied by Lam Research Corporation and is improved with several building and associated site improvements.

Mr. Leonard explained that the Planning Commission granted approval of Industrial Master Plan IMP 24-0001 for the Lam Campus on August 20th and that the IMP is attached to the record as Exhibit D. He explained that the IMP established appropriate building materials and colors, modified setback standards, adjusted the maximum building height, modified parking lot landscaping standards and added tax lot 100 to the IMP area.

Mr. Leonard explained the applicant is proposing to construct a 120,000 SF office building, 90,000 SF lab building, 29,000 SF utility building, 2,230 SF storage building for a total of 241,230 SF of building construction. He stated that the existing bulk gas storage yard would also be expanded and that site access would be from the 3 existing driveways from 108th Avenue, 3 existing driveways from Leveton Drive and that one new truck access is proposed from Leveton Drive. He also stated that the existing Tualatin Road access will remain as an emergency access for Lam while JAE will continue to utilize this access. He added that the existing landscape berm along Tualatin Road would be extended to the west for screening new of a new parking area.

Mr. Leonard went through the criteria for Architectural Review Type III; a land use decision found in TDC 33.020. He noted the submittal on July 8, 2024, deemed incomplete on July 24, 2024, and deemed complete at the request of the applicant on December 16, 2024. He stated that the city sent out three public notices due to the applicant asking for the public hearing to be delayed in order to adjust their plans. He stated that the final notice was sent on May 16, 2025. He stated that the final submittal of material was on July 21, 2025, which moved building construction south toward Leveton Drive, removed an applicant proposed employee access

These minutes are not verbatim. The meeting was recorded, and copies of the recording are retained for a period of one year from the date of the meeting and are available upon request



UNOFFICIAL

from Tualatin Road and that the Planning Commission unanimously approved the Industrial Master Plan IMP24-0001 on August 20th.

Mr. Leonard explained the approval criteria listed in Chapters 73A through 73G, which include site design, landscaping, parking, and waste and recyclable management standards and that these applicable code criteria for a large commercial development are discussed in the analysis and findings. He noted that conditions of approval may implement identified public facilities and services needed to serve the proposed development through Chapters 74 and 75. Chapter 62 contains the requirements for setbacks and other dimensional and use standards.

Mr. Leonard explained that a Tree Removal permit was submitted with the Architectural Review application. He stated that a Tree Preservation Plan and Arborist Report were included as Exhibit A3. He stated that 184 trees over 8-inch diameter were proposed for removal and 197 trees less than 8-inch diameter would be removed and 239 trees over 8-inch in diameter would be retained and protected.

Mr. Leonard stated that the site is located in the MP Zone and subject to Chapter 62 Standards and that the Industrial Master Plan modified building height, building setbacks and parking and circulation setbacks.

Mr. Leonard spoke about the proposed three phases of construction over 6 years, which include construction of the office building, parking lots, the lab building, utility building and storage building. , expansion of the bulk gas storage yard and that the landscaped berm would be extended using the fill from excavations that will occur during Phase 2 would be finished in Phase 3.

Mr. Leonard highlighted the site design standards in Chapter 73A, and that the Industrial Master Plan included a condition that building materials consist of, or be complimentary to masonry, sandstone, metal siding and window glazing with color palettes that are complimentary to earth toned shades. including the color palette, elevations, and examples of building designs in the area. He spotlighted the proposed office building as being similar in design to the office building that is currently being constructed. He went on to describe the designs of the lab, utility, storage and that the proposed construction is similar to the surrounding buildings.

He spoke about the landscaping standards found in TDC Chapter 73B. He noted under TDC 73C,

These minutes are not verbatim. The meeting was recorded, and copies of the recording are retained for a period of one year from the date of the meeting and are available upon request



UNOFFICIAL

the parking and loading standards will be memorialized.

Finally, Mr. Leonard spoke about the waste and recycling requirements under TDC Chapter 73D. He explained that, per the conditions of approval, the proposal aligns with requirements for the waste assessment method, location, screening, and access requirements.

Mike McCarthy, City Engineer, P.E., spoke about public improvements and access management standards as outlined in TDC Chapters 74 and 75. He shared that, with conditions, the proposal complies with requirements including right-of-way and easement dedication, street improvements, a stormwater quality detention facility, and grading/erosion control.

Mr. Leonard shared that the city received numerous public comments, provided as Exhibit F for the Board to review. He stated that comments in opposition primarily focused on traffic and noise concerns. He noted that the City Code Compliance Officer is currently investigating the noise issue. In contrast, comments in support focused on job creation and the positive presence of Lam Research Company.

Mr. Leonard stated that City staff recommends approval of AR24-0002, to be included in the final order, with conditions as detailed in Attachment C. He noted that this ended his staff presentation and asked if there were any questions.

Board Member Kilmartin asked about the expected timeline for resolution of the noise complaint. Kevin McConnell, City Attorney, informed Board Members that there is no specific timeline, but Code Compliance Officer Bryan LaVigne is currently working on the matter.

Board Member Linn asked which code governs noise compliance. Mr. Leonard responded that the applicable development code is TDC Chapter 63. He also noted that Code Compliance follows the Municipal Code. Mr. McConnell added that environmental regulations are set in TDC Chapter 63, and that industrial uses must comply with the City's noise ordinance, which is contained in Tualatin Municipal Code Chapter 6-14. He emphasized that compliance with environmental regulations is mandatory, regardless of whether the Architectural Review Board (ARB) imposes specific conditions.

Board Member Hoener inquired about the pedestrian easement along the right-of-way and whether the rest of the frontage has an existing sidewalk access route around the north side of the road. Mr. McCarthy confirmed this and added that one of the conditions includes a review

These minutes are not verbatim. The meeting was recorded, and copies of the recording are retained for a period of one year from the date of the meeting and are available upon request



UNOFFICIAL

of the walkway to ensure it meets current Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards. He also referenced TDC Chapter 74, noting that the traffic study was reviewed and that DKS Associates was brought in to review the TIA. The study concluded that the proposal meets requirements, and the findings were shared with agency partners.

Chair Hiller asked for clarification regarding the failed intersection at Hazelbrook Road leading to Hwy 99W. Mr. McCarthy explained that the intersection currently has capacity issues. Although this development would contribute a small amount of additional traffic, partner agencies and ODOT concurred with the applicant that mitigation measures along 99W were not required.

Suzannah Stanley, representing the applicant team with Mackenzie, presented an overview of proposed improvements and the tax lot, and introduced the project team presenters. Jennifer Otterness, who leads Site Master Planning for Lam Research, emphasized that Lam adjusted their plans based on community feedback, referencing a neighborhood meeting held over a year ago.

Mrs. Otterness gave a brief history of the development, noting community confusion due to delays and design changes. After initial meetings and feedback, the team revised the plan—removing the Tualatin Road driveway, reducing building size, and adjusting site access. Hearings were delayed due to the complexity of the project, but a revised application was recently submitted. The site is zoned Manufacturing Park and aligns with the City's Comprehensive Plan, which supports employment growth and industrial land use. The current Architectural Review focuses on ensuring the design is attractive, site-specific, and supports Tualatin's economic goals.

Dana Krawczuk with Stoel Rives spoke about the approval criteria. She reminded the Board that their role is limited to design elements, such as architecture and landscaping. While many public comments focused on noise, she noted that a hired expert conducted proper measurements and found no violations. Predicted noise levels from the proposed project remain within legal limits. Concerns about traffic access to SW 108th were also addressed, noting that the northernmost access is existing, so certain approval criteria do not apply. The discussion then moved to the traffic engineer.

Brent Ahrend, Traffic Engineer with Mackenzie on behalf of the applicant, spoke about the

These minutes are not verbatim. The meeting was recorded, and copies of the recording are retained for a period of one year from the date of the meeting and are available upon request



UNOFFICIAL

traffic analysis that Mr. McCarthy previously explained. He highlighted key points, including planned access routes and traffic impacts. He shared that the studies show the project will add only about 15 peak-hour trips—just 1–2% more traffic—with minimal cut-through or school traffic issues. Crash rates are low, and most current congestion is due to unrelated construction. After both projects are completed, traffic is expected to decrease. City staff and ODOT support the findings and the proposed improvements, which include signal coordination, ADA upgrades, paving, and lighting.

Mike Rueter, architect with Mackenzie, on behalf of the applicant, gave an overview of the updated campus layout, highlighting that all new buildings have been moved to the south side of the site along Leviton. Key buildings include a lab, a central utility building, a storage building (not visible from public areas), and a new office building (Building H), designed to match the style of the recently completed Building G.

Materials and architectural styles are consistent with existing campus structures to ensure cohesion and compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood. Mechanical and loading areas are centrally located and screened from public view. Landscaping will match or exceed current standards, and enhanced pedestrian pathways and an internal employee plaza are also planned.

Overall, the design aims to be attractive, functional, and fully compliant with design standards.

Mrs. Otterness briefly read some comments testifying in support of their project.

Board Members raised several questions during the discussion. They inquired why some large ground-level mechanical equipment was not screened, despite standards requiring such screening. There were questions about the timing and scope of traffic counts, specifically whether they included all relevant peak and off-peak hours, including school periods. Members also asked if 24-hour traffic counts had been conducted to confirm peak traffic times on Tualatin Road. Additionally, they sought clarification on Lamb's employee shift schedules, particularly whether the lab operates 24/7 and if night shifts are common. Finally, there was a request to compare the original proposed building size and employee numbers to the current, reduced plan, with the response noting a modest reduction in lab space and an optimized design.

These minutes are not verbatim. The meeting was recorded, and copies of the recording are retained for a period of one year from the date of the meeting and are available upon request



UNOFFICIAL

Public Comments

Supporters emphasized that Lam's expansion is vital for local economic growth and job creation, highlighting Lam Research as a major technology employer in Oregon that plays a key role in maintaining U.S. manufacturing competitiveness. They noted recent regional job losses, underscoring the need for new well-paying jobs. City and state agencies found no significant traffic or noise issues related to the project, and supporters pointed out that it will generate construction jobs and contribute to ongoing economic development. They stressed the importance of balanced, thoughtful industrial growth for the region's future and encouraged approval to help the area compete with international suppliers and sustain its local industry.

Opponents expressed concerns about the impact of Lam's expansion on their neighborhood, noise and particularly increased traffic. They emphasized the need to prevent new or additional commuter traffic through their residential streets and requested measures to protect their community. Safety concerns were raised, highlighting the dangers Tualatin Road's currently poses to residents, children, pets, and pedestrians, with traffic congestion and poor visibility making the area hazardous. Speakers urged the Board to prioritize neighborhood safety and require clear traffic mitigation commitments before approving the project.

In the rebuttal, Mrs. Krawczuk acknowledged the effectiveness of the public process, noting that the current proposal significantly changed in response to community feedback over the past year. Changes include removing access from Tualatin Road and relocating buildings to the south. She emphasized that noise concerns and traffic challenges are being addressed through other appropriate channels but are outside the scope of this specific application. Mrs. Krawczuk reminded the Board that their role is to evaluate the project based on specific architectural criteria, and all expert evidence—including from ODOT and the City—shows the project meets the required standards. She clarified that issues like neighborhood traffic patterns and noise enforcement are valid concerns but not conditions of approval for this project.

Aquilla Ravich-Hurd, Community Development Director, let the Board Members know of the changes on the conditions. This included additional condition 2.1 that was added after 5 p.m. and was added to the packet.

These minutes are not verbatim. The meeting was recorded, and copies of the recording are retained for a period of one year from the date of the meeting and are available upon request



UNOFFICIAL

Board Member Stanaway asked for clarification if every application has to go through same process. Mrs. Ravich-Hurd answered the condition is specific to the application.

Chair Hiller allowed Chris Gilbertson to make a neutral public comment. Mr. Gilbertson shared his opinion that while he supports more business in the area, traffic patterns must also take into account the livability of the city.

In rebuttal, Mrs. Krawczuk reiterated that the new condition is a legal obligation and requested that it be included in the conditions of approval. She explained that it reflects the City's obligations.

Chair Hiller shared information about the City of Tualatin's Neighborhood Transportation Safety Program and how residents can get involved.

Board Member Kilmartin asked Mr. McConnell for clarification on Code 63 (Noise), and whether the Board should consider potential noise associated with the proposed developments. Mr. McConnell explained that the Board can require compliance with the City's noise ordinance if there is a legitimate planning reason supported by evidence. In this case, if the record contains conflicting evidence about whether Lam is violating the ordinance. Regardless, Lam is already legally required to comply, and enforcement falls under the jurisdiction of the municipal court, not this Board.

Member Kilmartin also asked whether City staff had had time to determine if noise would be an issue under the new proposed application. Mr. McConnell responded that the city has not yet done so.

Member Linn asked what the two recommendations were from the traffic study. Mr. McCarthy replied that the recommended conditions were included in the development approval. One involves coordinating traffic signals on 124th Avenue, which the city will handle in collaboration with Washington County. The other involves trimming vegetation at the site to ensure clear visibility, which will be reviewed during the design phase and after construction to maintain safe sight lines.

These minutes are not verbatim. The meeting was recorded, and copies of the recording are retained for a period of one year from the date of the meeting and are available upon request



UNOFFICIAL

Board Member Parsons asked how the community might influence Google Maps to route traffic differently and encouraged efforts to investigate how such navigation changes could be made. Mr. McCarthy responded that it is difficult to influence routing decisions made by platforms like Google or Apple Maps due to their authority and proprietary algorithms.

Chair Hiller asked for clarification on whether the applicant could be required to educate their employees about traffic flow as a condition of approval. Mr. McConnell responded that while the applicant can be asked in good faith, it cannot be made a formal condition. Mrs. Ravich-Hurd confirmed this, adding that traffic impacts from the development are considered low and would not warrant such a requirement.

Board members expressed appreciation for the neighborhood's active involvement and concerns regarding a development application. They acknowledged that while some issues raised are outside their authority, public engagement is vital for community improvement. Board Member Stanaway, a long-time resident, emphasized the importance of speaking up to make the city better. Another shared a personal connection to traffic challenges, affirming they understand the residents' concerns.

Despite these concerns, members agreed that the application met all approval criteria. They thanked the applicant, Lam, for being responsive—adjusting plans, shifting access, and expansion of a berm in response to feedback. Lastly, they highlighted the value of living in a community where both residents and developers are engaged in collaborative problem-solving. The final speaker reflected on personal safety experiences and affirmed the city's ongoing commitment to making the community better for all.

Board Member Stanaway made Motion and Seconded by Board Member Lin to Approve AR24-0002 Lam Research Corporation Campus located at 1115 SW Leviton Drive, with the analysis and findings with corrections as stated by staff tonight, and the conditions of approval, with corrections as read by staff and a new condition of approval 2.1, as read into the record by staff. The Board Member unanimously voted approval. (5-0)

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Hiller made a MOTION to adjourn. Board Member Stanaway SECONDED the motion. The Board Members unanimously voted to ADJOURN the meeting at 9:45 p.m. (6-0)

These minutes are not verbatim. The meeting was recorded, and copies of the recording are retained for a period of one year from the date of the meeting and are available upon request