

Architectural Review Board

MINUTES OF March 9, 2022

ARB MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chair, Nancy Grimes
Board Member, Skip Stanaway
Board Member, Nichole George
Board Member, Patrick Gaynor
Board Member, Chris Goodell
Board Member, Lisa Quichocho

STAFF PRESENT:

Steve Koper
Erin Engman
Lindsey Hagerman

GUESTS:

Havlin Kemp

ARB MEMBERS ABSENT:

Board Member, Carol Bellows

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL:

The meeting was called to order at 6:40 p.m. and roll call was taken.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Review of the July 22, 2020 minutes were approved. Board Member Stanaway moved to approve minutes and seconded by Chair Grimes

6 Aye

0 Nay

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

ACTION ITEMS:

- 1. Consideration of an Architectural Review application (AR 21-0011) for an approximately 452,800 square foot industrial building on 24.16 acres in the General Manufacturing (MG) zone at 20400 SW Cipole Road (Tax Lot: 2S128A000100).**

Erin Engman, Senior Planner presented the staff report for the project and entered new public

<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>

testimony as Exhibit J and amended conditions of approval as Exhibit K into the record. Ms. Engman went through the Architectural Review criteria for approval which included key points: Site Background, Project Overview, Applicable Approval Criteria.

After introducing the site background and proposal overview, Ms. Engman spoke about the approval criteria, beginning with the tree removal requirements to construct the proposed improvements. Conditions of approval are recommended by staff to address tree removal and preservation.

She then spoke about how the proposal complies with the zoning standards which include: setback, building height, and permitted uses. A condition of approval is recommended to ensure the speculative development will comply with permitted uses. Ms. Engman talked about how the proposal complies with site design and site standards. She mentioned the inclusion of design features, such as, windows, lighting, safety, security, storage, and screening. She recommended a condition of approval to ensure compliance in providing walkways between main building entrances and sidewalks along the public right-of way.

Ms. Engman spoke about landscaping standards required for Tualatin Development Code. She stated the application proposal demonstrates compliance requirements for: minimum landscape area, landscape buffers, tree preservation, irrigation, revegetation of disturbed areas, and minimum standards for plantings.

Ms. Engman moved on to parking standards. She stated the proposal meets the following standards: minimum parking requirements, bike parking, drive aisle standards, and loading berth. She did recommend a condition of approval to comply with ingress/egress requirements for industrial uses.

Ms. Engman spoke about waste and recyclable storage requirements and recommended a condition of approval to address the requirements. These requirements she spoke about included adding a minimum storage area, location, design/screening, and access.

She then went on to summary conditions of approval recommended to address Chapter 74 requirements for public improvements and 75 for access management standards. The presentation was concluded the board asked questions of staff. Board Member Stanaway did ask about the dimensional length of the proposed building and Stormwater detention plans,

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

which were deferred to address directly with the applicant.

Havlin Kemp, on behalf of the applicant, VLMK Engineering, introduced himself and addressed Ms. Engman's presentation, stating the staff report is accurate. He let Board Members know that instead of repeating the presentation information just shared, he would address the key points.

Halvin Kemp presented on the behalf of the applicant, VLMK Engineering + Design. Mr. Kemp spoke about the site utility plan in detail. He spoke about the storm water plan. He let the board members know the storm water will collect in an underground detention chamber that flows to the public system off 124th St.

Board Member Stanaway asked if the storm water underground storage facility would be a tank. Mr. Kemp answered yes, and showed on the site map where the location of filtration system would be located. Steve Koper, Assistant Community Development Director, spoke about the approval process. He spoke about how the storm water standards would have to comply with Clean Water Services in order to meet approval.

Mr. Kemp explained in detail of the plans to comply with conditions of approval from city staff which includes tree removal, access, street lighting improvements, walking path.

Board Member Stanaway asked what the dimension of the building is.

Mr. Kemp answered the building is approximately 452,800 square feet total.

Chair Grimes asked if Mr. Kemp can elaborate the grade of proposed development difference.

Mr. Kemp explained the grade difference from 124th street to the finished building has different grades.

Chair Grimes asked for clarification on the storm water runoff.

Mr. Kemp explained the current water system is being pumped into the wetlands. He explained the proposal would convey storm water to the public storm line system.

Board Member Goodell asked about tree removal and if they are planning on removing more trees. Mr. Kemp answered they have revised their 1st proposal, and do not propose to remove any more trees than necessary.

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 Stanaway asked if their plan is to maximize the use of the land. Mr. Kemp answered yes they wanted to maximize the use and follow city code.

Board Member Stanaway wanted to know why the large facility design has not been broken up to help scale the building. Mr. Kemp explained the slope of the development being lower than the property line.. He noted the office location on the site map. He explained they choose to make office entrances more prominent for design reasons.

Board Member Stanaway asked if the applicant had a lighting plan for the entire building. He shared the importance of having soft light outside the building. Mr. Kemp answered they could place LED lighting and have less harsh lighting installed.

Board Member Gaynor spoke about the landscaping trees maturity and how they would withstand the weather elements. He spoke about the landscaping border design being broken up. He voiced concern of monoculture and the survivability of the current landscape plan overall. He spoke about incorporating hardier tree species and looking for cohesive design overall. Mr. Kemp responded they will take a look at landscape comments and see what they can do.

Chair Grimes asked if the frontage landscaping would be possible to create a berm. Mr. Kemp answered it could be possible to berm it up on the Northside of the property. Mr. Koper spoke about the city staff plan to continue to work with the applicant on landscaping.

Board Member Goodell asked if there's a code requirement for the height of trees with the City of Tualatin. Mr. Koper answered there is not a specific code that addresses the size of the trees. Ms. Engman spoke about Evergreen trees standards being 5ft. in height meeting city requirements. She noted that the city will work with the applicant on making sure the requirements are met.

Board Member Stanaway asked about the access of the site for utilizing both lanes on 124th street and noted how hard it is for traffic safety. Mr. Koper answered and spoke about engaging with a third party traffic study from operational standpoint. He stated the third party did find the applicant met traffic expectations.

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

The Architectural Review Board members discussed how they felt about moving forward with making a decision. Board Member Gaynor asked if Board Member Stanaway felt okay with how things were with the project. Board Member Stanaway answered in he would like more design elements but feels comfortable with the additional conditions of approval presented in the meeting to further modify architecture, landscaping, and lighting in order to meet purpose and objectives related to promoting attractive sites and buildings that are compatible with the surrounding environment.

Board Member Gaynor moved to approve AR21-0011 with the additional conditions of approval. Motion seconded by Board Member Stanaway.

6 Aye

0 Nay

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY. Architectural Review Application AR21-0011 was approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS/ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

None.

COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF

Mr. Koper stated the only communication staff had is upcoming Architectural Review Board meetings.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn was made by Board Member Stanaway. The motion was seconded by Chair Grimes.

6 AYE

0 Nay

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY. The Architectural Review Board meeting was adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

<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>
