



FINAL ARB ACTION MEMO / MINUTES

Date: January 21, 2025

Time: 1:00 PM

Meeting Room: Lane Auditorium

Members:

Chris Henningsen, Chair: Present
Frank Hancock, Vice-Chair: Present
Frank Stoner: Present
Dade Van Der Werf: Present
Taro Matsuno: Absent

Staff:

Margaret Maliszewski
Khris Taggart

CALL TO ORDER: Ms. Maliszewski called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. and established a quorum.

ANNUAL MEETING

- a. Election of Chair: Ms. Maliszewski asked for nominations for Chairperson. Mr. Stoner nominated, and Mr. Van Der Werf seconded, Mr. Henningsen for Chairperson. The ARB voted 3:0 (Matsuno absent, Mr. Henningsen abstained) in favor of the motion.
- b. Election of Vice-Chair: Mr. Henningsen nominated, and Mr. Stoner seconded, Mr. Hancock for Vice-Chair. The ARB voted 3:0 (Matsuno absent, Mr. Hancock abstained) in favor of the motion.
- c. Adopt ARB 2025 Submittal and Meeting Schedule: Mr. Henningsen asked for a motion to adopt the 2025 Submittal and Meeting Schedule. Mr. Hancock motioned and Mr. Van Der Werf seconded acceptance of the ARB 2025 Submittal and Meeting Schedule. The ARB voted 4:0 (Matsuno absent) in favor of the motion.
- d. Adopt ARB Rules of Procedure: Mr. Henningsen asked if any ARB member wanted to change the Rules of Procedure. No one did. Mr. Henningsen asked for a motion to adopt the ARB Rules of Procedure. Mr. Stoner motioned and Mr. Hancock seconded acceptance of the Rules of Procedure without changes. The ARB voted 4:0 (Matsuno absent) in favor of the motion.

DISCLOSURES: Mr. Henningsen asked if anyone had anything to disclose. Mr. Stoner disclosed that he would recuse himself from the Flow Mercedes discussion. Mr. Henningsen disclosed that he would need to leave the meeting at 3:00 and would turn the meeting over to Mr. Hancock at that time.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

CONSENT AGENDA: None.

REGULAR REVIEW ITEMS:

- a. **ARB2024-70: Flow CVL Mercedes-Benz**

Location: 1313 Richmond Road

Proposal: To replace the existing auto dealership building with a new Mercedes-Benz showroom of approximately the same size and to undertake associated site improvements.

Staff Contact: Margaret Maliszewski

Representative: Kevin Schafer

Ms. Maliszewski summarized the staff report in a PowerPoint presentation. ARB members asked about the location of the current service drop-off (at the rear building) and clarified that the proposed drop-off is not on the EC side of the building. Kevin Schafer represented the applicant and addressed the ARB, describing the proposed design, the context of the site, and the relationship of the topography to the building. He discussed the plinth, roof form (unique), and proposed colors. He addressed staff's comments, noting the dramatic shadows, appropriate step back, and unifying roof element, and showed a brighter image of the building. He discussed the material proposed for the base, noting that parged masonry or EIFS were under consideration. He said it was important to break the base plane, to elevate the finish above, and that the ACM at grade could be a maintenance issue. He said that the high gloss white can be toned down for the service building.

ARB members asked for clarification about the base material, asked if brick could be considered (yes), and asked for clarification on the extent of the ACM panels. No members of the public were present to speak about the project. In discussion, the ARB noted the interesting building forms, that staff's comments were on target, that there is work to be done at the transition of materials (maybe an alternate color or material; the treatment may make itself distinct over time; masonry has precedent on the corridor and would provide more texture), and that full landscape requirements should be met. Regarding the color for the service building, the ARB noted that a lighter color will stand out more in the dark surroundings. Members suggested that a deeply recessive color would be appropriate and that gray may be a better alternative to the gloss white.

Motion: Mr. Hancock moved to provide the applicant with the comments listed in the staff report, as follows, to be addressed with the next submittal:

1. Provide additional information comparing the black metal and paint finishing to show how they will achieve an appropriate appearance on the corridor.
2. Revise the white gloss color of the service building side elevations to a more muted tone.
3. Provide in the architectural drawings the manufacturer's specifications for the window glass showing that VLT is not below 40% and VLR does not exceed 30%.
4. Include the existing light fixtures on the existing conditions plan. Provide details and a photometric plan for building-mounted lighting.
5. Add the standard lighting note to the site plan: "Each outdoor luminaire equipped with a lamp that emits 3,000 or more initial lumens shall be a full cutoff luminaire and shall be arranged or shielded to reflect light away from adjoining residential districts and away from adjacent roads. The spillover of lighting from luminaires onto public roads and property in residential or rural areas zoning districts shall not exceed one half footcandle."
6. Show all existing-to-remain landscaping on the plan and label it as such. Ensure that it is consistent with the previously approved plan or identify proposed changes and show that plant quantities are not reduced with the current proposal.
7. Include the standard plant health note on the plan: "All site plantings of trees and shrubs shall be allowed to reach, and be maintained at, mature height; the topping of trees is prohibited. Shrubs and trees shall be pruned minimally and only to support the overall health of the plant."
8. Revise the reference to SDP-2008-39 on the cover sheet of the site plan to read SDP-2008-38.
9. Revise the site plan to include a diagram that identifies parking space types (display, customer, employee, service, etc.) consistent with the approved Special Use Permit for outdoor display.
10. Show existing landscaping on the plan. Show that proposed grading will not occur within the drip lines of trees to remain.
11. Show tree protection fencing on the site plan.

12. Note that separate applications are required signs.

Mr. Van Der Werf seconded the motion.

The motion was carried by a vote of 3:0. (Matsuno absent, Stoner recused)

b. ARB2024-71: 400 Rio Road West

Location: 400 Rio Road West

Proposal: To establish outdoor storage of equipment and plumbing materials, with associated site improvements.

Staff Contact: Khris Taggart

Representative: Valerie Long

Mr. Taggart summarized the staff report in a PowerPoint presentation. ARB members asked if there was a detail on the gate (no) and if the entrance is existing (yes). Valerie Long represented the applicant and addressed the ARB. She described the project location, zoning, parcels, existing conditions, and proposed work. She said that there were no gate details available yet, agreed to add a note regarding maintaining existing wooded area, said that no changes to the building are proposed, that the applicant is not comfortable with a 45' setback from the fence for stored materials, and that they can't predict how much of any particular item will need to be stored at any given time. ARB members asked if an opaque fence was considered (yes, but the length would make it challenging to meet the guidelines), what the maximum storage height would be (12'), what setback was acceptable for taller items, if the setback would be on the plan or a condition (probably both), and if the Rio Road entrance to the storage area could be closed for a continuous landscape (will consider). No members of the public were present to speak on the application. In discussion, the ARB noted that the proposal would be a great improvement over the existing condition, that the evergreens could be sited differently for more effect, that the naturalistic arrangement is appreciated, that more information on the gate and fence is needed, that an opaque fence would be less effective overall than the proposal, and that a height stipulation is important.

Motion: Mr. Stoner moved to recommend revisions to the Concept Plan as listed in the staff report, to be reviewed by the ARB prior to Planning Commission review, amended as follows:

1. Revise the concept plan to show the area suitable for storage of materials and equipment taller than 8'.
2. Revise the concept plan to show that vegetation near the parcel's eastern and western boundaries will remain.
3. Consider eliminating the Rio Road entrance to the storage area.

Mr. Henningsen seconded the motion.

The motion was carried by a vote of 4:0. (Matsuno absent)

Motion: Mr. Van Der Werf moved to support staff's recommended draft conditions on the Special Use Permit edited for consistency with the ARB's comments on the Concept Plan, and revisions for the Final Site Plan, as follows:

Draft Conditions on the Special Use Permit:

1. Materials and equipment must be stored only in areas indicated for storage on the Concept Plan, with materials and equipment taller than 8' located only in the area designated as such on the Concept Plan.
2. Site plan approval is subject to ARB approval of the landscape plan (submitted with the site plan). Landscaping shown on the plan may be required to be in excess of the minimum requirements of the ARB guidelines and/or the Zoning Ordinance to mitigate the visual impacts of the proposed use.

3. Any new lighting is subject to ARB approval. Maximum light levels must not exceed 20 footcandles. The maximum height of pole lights must not exceed 20'. All fixtures must have lamps whose color temperature is between 2000 and 3000 Kelvin. All site- and building-mounted fixtures must be full cutoff.

Recommendations for the Site Plan

1. Include the standard mechanical equipment note on the site plan: Visibility of all mechanical equipment from the Entrance Corridor shall be eliminated.
2. Provide the proposed locations of loading, service, and refuse areas with the site plan. Show how these locations will be screened from the EC.
3. New or relocated chain link fence must not be visible from the Entrance Corridor. Note the locations of any new or moved fence and provide details for all fence types visible from the EC.
4. Provide a lighting plan with the site plan or add a note to the plan stating that no new ground- or building-mounted lighting is proposed.
5. Provide a complete landscaping plan with the site plan. Ensure that the proposed species are on the approved plant list.
6. Consider adding one interior parking lot tree for every ten parking spaces in the employee parking lot.
7. Include the standard plant health note on the landscape plan: All site plantings of trees and shrubs shall be allowed to reach, and be maintained at, mature height; the topping of trees is prohibited. Shrubs and trees shall be pruned minimally and only to support the overall health of the plant.

Mr. Hancock seconded the motion.

The motion was carried by a vote of 4:0. (Matsuno absent)

WORK SESSION:

a. ARB2024-74: High School Center 2

Staff Contact: Margaret Maliszewski

The ARB held a work session on the color choice for the metal on the High School Center 2 building. Ms. Maliszewski summarized the outstanding issue and showed images comparing the dark bronze, medium bronze and gray metal colors. ARB members asked if staff had a rendering of the gray metal (no) and explained how a lighter color metal can transition better to the sky color. Kylan Shirley represented the applicant and addressed the ARB. He showed images of the various metal colors, noting the original design inspiration and explaining how the gray color doesn't provide enough contrast. No members of the public were present to speak on the application. In discussion, the ARB members expressed varying preferences for the gray and bronze colors, some suggesting they would defer to the architects. They noted the distance from the street and the number of other structures on site as reasons to allow a bronze color. They also noted the importance of the spectacular view. Staff noted that the guidelines do not limit review to the building alone, but rather they apply to the building in the surrounding context.

Motion: Mr. Van Der Werf moved for approval of the light gray metal for the High School Center 2 building.

Mr. Stoner seconded the motion.

The motion failed by a vote of 2:2. (Matsuno absent)

After additional general discussion about colors and context, and viewing street views and color samples, staff asked if the ARB would like to make a motion for the medium bronze color.

Motion: Mr. Henningsen moved for approval of the medium bronze metal for the High School Center 2 building.

Mr. Hancock seconded the motion.

The motion was carried by a vote of 3:1. (Van Der Werf no, Matsuno absent)

OTHER BUSINESS

a. Minutes Approval:

Motion: Mr. Hancock moved for approval of the minutes from the December 16, 2024, ARB meeting.
Mr. Henningsen seconded the motion.
The motion was carried by a vote of 4:0. (Matsuno absent)

b. Other items from staff or ARB members:

Mr. Van Der Werf asked when the jail would return for review. Staff said it was scheduled for February 17.

c. Next ARB Meeting: Monday February 3, 2025, 1:00 PM – Lane Auditorium

Mr. Stoner said he would not be able to attend the February 3 meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:41 p.m. to the next ARB meeting on February 3, 2025, at 1:00 p.m.