

Architectural Review Board

MINUTES OF August 9, 2023

ARB MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chair, Cyndy Hillier
Board Member, Patrick Gaynor
Board Member, Skip Stanaway
Board Member, Lisa Quichocho

STAFF PRESENT:

Steve Koper, Community Development Assistant Director
Lindsey Hagerman, Office Coordinator
Madeleine Nelson, Assistant Planner
Erin Engman, Senior Planner

ARB MEMBERS ABSENT:

Board Member, Chris Goodell

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL:

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Board Member Stanaway made a motion to approve Architectural Review Board minutes of 2022-2023. Board Member Gaynor seconded. The Board unanimously voted to approve minutes of 2022-2023.

ACTION ITEMS:

1. Consideration of a one-year extension request of the Architectural Review Board decision dated March 14, 2022, for the proposed Tualatin Logistics Park development, case file AR21-0011. The project proposed to construct an approximately 452,800 square-foot multi-tenant distribution warehouse on a 24.16-acre site located in the General Manufacturing (MG) District at 20400 SW Cipole Road (Tax Lot: 2S128A000100).

Madeleine Nelson, Assistant Planner, provided an overview of the project scope which included key points: site background, project overview, applicable criteria. She explained the applicant

<p>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</p>
--

VLMK Engineering + Design, on behalf of Fore-Sight Balboa LLC, requested an extension of the Architectural Review Board decision dated March 14, 2022, for the proposed Tualatin Logistics Park development, case file AR21-0011. The applicant requested to extend the decision through March 14, 2025.

Ms. Nelson went over the site background and project overview which included the current use of the Tualatin Island Greens driving range. She noted AR21-0011 approved a 452,800 sq. ft. building for intended use of manufacturing and warehousing.

Ms. Nelson noted Architectural Review 21-0011 was reviewed against the criteria listed in Chapter 33, 73A through 73G, 74 and 75 including Tree Removal, Site Design Standards and Public Improvements and Access Management. She noted the plan was adopted with conditions of approval on March 14, 2022.

Ms. Nelson explained the procedures for the decision extension are found in TDC 33.020 (10). She explained the approval criteria in TDC 33.020 (10)(e) must be applicable and may grant the extension. She noted the applicant's previous application included a special study regarding Transportation Impact Analysis. She explained this special study is still relevant and no new study would be required.

Ms. Nelson shared the findings demonstrate that the request for extension meets the applicable criteria of the Tualatin Development Code with the recommended Conditions of Approval. Therefore, Staff respectfully recommends approval of the one-year extension of Architectural Review 21-0011 for a revised expiration date of March 14, 2025.

Tyler Reeves, from VLMK spoke on behalf of the applicant team about their extension request. He explained some of the reasons for their request include taking a step back to look at the market. He noted how beneficial this project is to them and the community.

Board Member Quichocho made motion to approve AR22-0011 with conditions of approval extension. Board Member Stanaway seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously to approve AR22-0011.

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

COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF:

Erin Engman, Senior Planner introduced herself and provided an informational presentation for the Basalt Creek Employment zone project. She shared that City Council had recommended that the Architectural Review Board preview the work.

Ms. Engman went over the project's background and why the Basalt Creek Zone (BCE) is being proposed. She noted that presently the Manufacturing Park district, which is currently applied to the planning area allows for a narrow set of uses that are no longer supported by the industrial marketplace. Because of this, staff was directed to work on a legislative amendment to create a new zoning district. This district will also act as a catalyst for development and will grow the tax base in the Basalt Creek area to meet urban renewal goals. She explained this zone was studied through economic and market trends, incorporating City Council, public and stakeholder feedback.

Ms. Engman shared City Councils' priorities to support adopted documents while limiting warehouse uses, encouraging flex space, incorporate commercial uses, and maintain a nice landscaped feel. She then went on to explain the limitations of the current zone before discussing the extensive public outreach conducted on behalf of the project and the feedback received. She noted residents expressed concern over road maintenance with increased truck traffic, that uses be conducted in a completely enclosed building, to maintain a pleasant public interface, and to encourage higher paying jobs. She then went on to share the stakeholder feedback and the project's guiding principles.

Ms. Engman shared the BCE zone's purpose statement and highlighted the proposed design standards. She highlighted standards for landscaping, sound barrier construction, and building design. She shared some visuals of what these standards would look like. She also shared the City is looking to update the functional classification of Tonquin Loop and 112th Avenue to separate residential and industrial traffic. She noted this separation would include masonry fence standards between the two zones.

Ms. Engman stated the current draft code received unanimous recommendation in support from the Tualatin Planning Commission.

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

Board Member Gaynor gave his opinion on landscaping standards including softening any required walls or fencing with landscaping to be visually pleasing for the community. He noted that providing shrubs interior to the fence (or residential facing) and trees exterior to the fence (or industrial facing) may be more pleasing to enhance the buffer between uses.

Board Member Stanaway noted about the difficulty of landscaping within 15 feet while taking advantage of layering to soften vertical structures. Board Member Stanaway spoke about the importance of breaking down the scale of the buildings. Ms. Engman noted that we studied possible standards balanced with stakeholder feedback regarding the design of flexible tenant spaces. Steve Koper, Assistant Community Development Director spoke about the challenges of including objective massing standards for industrial development. Board Member Stanaway mentioned use of paint, reveals, as well as columnar and perpendicular landscaping to break down massing. He cautioned that to be successful, the standard can't be too prescriptive. Mr. Koper mentioned that there is limited opportunities to apply discretionary standards for staff level reviews.

Chair Hillier noted that it sounds like a culture change and that the Board has done a pretty good job creating conversations and engaging in them.

Board Member Quichocho noted these design standards are new and based on research, market trends, and opinions. She asked if there is a way to measure performance for the standards or if there is a framework to modify the standards if they aren't performing as intended. Ms. Engman answered if we find we are not getting the result hoped for, we can always revisit the standards through a text amendment.

Board Member Stanaway spoke about good lighting and need for it in the community. He also noted that Tualatin is a Tree City and should that landscaping retention should be enforced for any development. Mr. Koper shared that predominantly developers over-landscape a large development and that Ms. Engman pointed out a middle ground allows for development of small sites with constraints.

Board Member Stanaway asked how stormwater water run-off is being reviewed by Clean Water Services. He's noticed that detention is now largely underground as opposed to the more traditional infiltration ponds. Mr. Koper confirmed that stormwater is managed by Clean Water

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

Services standards and that they prefer on-site infiltration as a treatment method, though some of Basalt Creek may not have a very good infiltration rate. Mr. Koper confirmed that there is nothing in our code that would preclude underground detention.

Board Member Gaynor asked if there were mechanism to create meaningful landscaping for area of underground systems. When percentages aren't tied to stormwater facilities, could that area be more "focused landscaping?" Is there a mechanism to incentivize meaningful interior landscape options like plaza amenities, as it interconnects to employee value? Mr. Koper shared he is familiar with standards for office and multifamily development, but that it would be interesting to also consider for industrial development. Mr. Koper also shared that there are Parks and Recreation opportunities to provide an interconnected trail, as the regional Ice Age Tonquin Loop Trail.

2. Update on previous projects

Mr. Koper shared an update of projects approved by the Architectural Review Board since 2020. He went through 5 sites explaining the progress these included the following: Herman Road Industrial, Tualatin Logistics Park, Plambeck Gardens, LAM Office Building, and Alden Apartments.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn was made by Board Member Stanaway. The motion was seconded by Board Member Goodell. The Board voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 8:00 p.m.

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