



UNOFFICIAL

Architectural Review Board

MINUTES OF June, 29 2022

ARB MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chair Nancy Grimes
Board Member Carol Bellows,
Board Member Patrick Gaynor
Board Member Lisa Quichocho
Board Member Stanaway

ARB MEMBERS ABSENT:

Board Member Chris Goodell

STAFF PRESENT:

Steve Koper
Keith Leonard
Lindsey Hagerman

GUESTS:

Chris Thornton
Craig Harris
Kyle Bertelsen

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL:

The meeting was called to order at 6:33 p.m. and roll call was taken.

REVIEW OF MINUTES:

None.

ACTION ITEMS:

- 1. Consideration of an Architectural Review application (AR21-0018) requesting approval of three buildings totaling 442,575 square feet located on a 21-acre site at 11345 SW Herman Road (2S122D000550). Building A will be 148,600 square feet, Building B will be 142,550 square feet and Building C will be 151,425 square feet.**

Keith Leonard, Associate Planner presented the staff report for the project and noted there were additions made to the record.

Mr. Leonard provided a site description and the project overview. The applicant AAI Engineering, requests approval to construct three industrial buildings totaling approximately 442,575 square feet. He noted the applicant anticipates use of warehouse to be freight movement and light manufacturing.



Mr. Leonard provided a site background, procedure and review criteria for Architectural Review Type III which includes Chapters 73A-73G. He noted the conditions of approval may implement identified public facilities and services needed to serve the proposed development through Chapter 74 and 75.

Mr. Leonard explained a tree removal permit was submitted in conjunction with the Architectural Review application, as allowed by code. He shared the applicant plans on removing 77 trees due to poor health or conflicting with project's improvement.

Mr. Leonard spoke about site zoning and development standards found in Chapter 61 for General Manufacturing. He explained the City staff finds the proposal complies with yard setback, building height allowance and permitted uses.

Mr. Leonard let the board members know the applicant will be required to obtain a flood hazard area development permit illustrating compliance with TDC 70.170 and 70.180. He shared and showed on site map the property contains Natural Resource Protection Areas including Wetland Conservation Natural Areas (WCNA) in purple and Open Space Natural Areas (OSNA) in brown.

Mr. Leonard went over the Regional Ice Age Tonquin Trail being proposed by Parks Department to be constructed along the eastern property line of the property. He explained a 15 foot easement was required for 12 foot multipurpose pathway of the trail.

Mr. Leonard spoke about the site design standards found in Chapter 73A. He stated staff recommends the applicant submit an updated landscaping plan. A condition of approval has been recommended to the board members for additional screening for the loading dock areas has been suggested by utilizing evergreen or conifer type trees for year-round screening.

Mr. Leonard explained the landscaping standards found in Chapter 73B. He stated staff recommends a standard conditions of approval in support of tree preservation measures during construction, revegetation and post construction activity.

Mr. Leonard addressed the parking standards found in Chapter 73C. He noted the application proposed ha 335 parking stalls with 305 being required, 50 bicycle parking stalls proposed and drive aisle with loading dock. He stated staff recommends conditions of approval with an updated landscaping plan that will include parking lot landscaping.

Mr. Leonard spoke about waste and recyclables standards found in Chapter 73D. He explained the applicant has proposed six trash enclosures, two for each building with north and south ends of each building. He said staff recommends condition of approval the addresses required



waste and recycling requirements.

Mr. Leonard spoke about public improvements standards which included in Chapter 74. He stated the applicant has proposed an underground storm water detention system for up to the 25-year storm event and hydromodification requirements required.

He noted there are some areas that can't be detained due to topography but equivalent detention will be required where possible. He spoke about proposal will require compliance with both the City and CWS storm water drainage requirements.

Mr. Leonard spoke about the access management standards found in Chapter 75. He noted that site access being proposed has four points of ingress and egress along the SW Myslony Street frontage. He let members know staff recommends that the eastern most driveway be increased from the proposed width of 30 feet to 36 feet.

Mr. Leonard concluded his presentation by noting that the Findings and Analysis demonstrate that the proposal meets the applicable criteria of the Tualatin Development Code with the recommended Conditions of Approval and asked if there were any questions from the Architectural Review Board.

Board Member Skip asked why there was an adjustment width of parking standards and who is recommending the standard. Mr. Leonard answered this was a recommendation from city engineer.

Board Member Bellows asked to explain the subterrain storm water drain and why it is needed. Steve Koper, assistant community development director let her know we would defer to the applicant.

Chair Grimes asked about the proposed parking, including entrances in proximity of the proposed trail location overlaps with the development. Mr. Koper shared where the Tonquin Trail would tie in with the site access. She noted her concern for the multi-use trail with families going on them with driveways and industrial buildings. Mr. Koper shared the location on site plan map with portion of trail being sidewalks. He noted staff can recommend the Parks department place signage on the South side of the trail.

There were no further questions of staff or public testimony. Chair Grimes gave the applicant the opportunity to make a presentation.

Kyle Bertelsen, development partner Phelan Development provided background of their company business and how many projects and buildings they have worked on in the surrounding area. He noted this particular project would bring in a mix of local and national companies light manufacturing due to the size of the buildings. He spoke about concerns of



floodplain, street alignment and future Tonquin Trail.

Craig Harris, civil engineer partner AAI Engineer spoke about the storm water retention system. He explained the requirements to match 25 year flood for capture and releasing it for no impact.

Board Member Bellows asked what would happen in a larger flood. Mr. Harris answered letting board member know code requirements take a look at 100 year storm requirements He noted similar projects that did have similar flood requirements.

Board Member Stanaway asked about the litigation of flood plain, he asked where the wetland is. Mr. Harris answered by showing the site flood plain map where the 100 year flood plain prediction is on the site.

Chair Bellows asked if the water runoff from the parking lot would go directly into the creek. Mr. Harris answered no they would not flow into Hedges Creek. He explained how the run-off water would be treated and filtered along with testing and needed certification requirements for water run-off plan.

Board Member Stanaway asked about landscaping plan width of planning strip. Mr. Harris answered it is 10 ft - 5 ft for planer strip required by the Tualatin Development Code. He noted about providing diversity and break up the scale of the building and landscaping.

Cal Coastworth, architect partner Carlile Coastsworth Architects spoke about the site parking, driveways and location to the street. He mentioned the landscape has been advised to update for condition use and they have opportunity to breakup landscape.

Board Member Gaynor spoke about the site landscape design and where there are opportunities to improve. These opportunities included ground cover, different variety of trees, planter strip and plants that can handle harsh environment.

Board Member Stanaway asked about the site design on the building' s variation of height design. Mr. Coastworth answered the design is created for volume with rack purpose function. He spoke about the truck dock having a site design break of design.

Board Member Stanaway asked why they choose to have no variation in color or canopy to break in color. Mr. Coastworth answered the intent of variation with traffic and more of uterian element. Band on the bottom of the building due to truck surfaces. Lighting through the site to help wash down the walls to create design elements.



Board Member Stanaway asked about northside of design site features. Mr. Harris spoke about no parking in front. He spoke about if they install any windows they will have racks on them and have skylights to provide variation of lightings. He mentioned they could modify site design to have windows up high for additional light.

Chair Bellows noted the importance of skylights and wanted to know why they didn't install any. Mr. Coastworth let board members know they have 150 skylights currently for the site design.

Chair Grimes asked how far the setback is from the corner for the proposed Tonquin trail. Mr. Coastworth explained how they worked with the city for determining setbacks and how driveways were determined for conflicts. Mr. Koper also noted that the trail might connect with the pathway.

There were no further questions to the applicant. Chair Grimes then gave the public opportunity for testimony.

Chair Grimes moved to staff comments. Mr. Leonard asked if they would like make any additional amendments to staff report.

Board Member Stanaway made the motion to approve AR21-0018 as modified with the hearing tonight. He stated this included condition scale of the breakdown of landscape east and west clear store windows or other means. Condition of landscape diversity and use of evergreens and revision of the street trees. Motion Seconded by Board Member Gaynor.

5 Aye

0 Nay

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY. Architectural Review application AR21-0018 was approved with conditions.

COMMUNITION TO CITY STAFF:

None.

COMMUNICATION FROM CITY STAFF:

None.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn was made by Board Member Bellows. The motion was second by Board Member Stanaway.

5 AYE

0 NAY



MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY. The Architectural Review Board meeting was adjourned at 8:27 p.m.