



---

**DRAFT ARB ACTION MEMO / MINUTES**

**Date:** July 1, 2024

**Time:** 1:00 PM

**Meeting Room:** Lane Auditorium

**Members:**

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

**Staff:**

Margaret Maliszewski  
Mariah Gleason

**CALL TO ORDER:** Mr. Henningsen called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m. and established a quorum.

**DISCLOSURES:** None.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

**CONSENT AGENDA:** None.

**REGULAR REVIEW ITEMS**

a. **ARB2024-43: Three Notch'd Center**

**Location:** 5368, 5370, and 5380 Three Notch'd Road

**Proposal:** To construct a two-story multi-tenant building on a 2.32-acre site that will be shared with an existing car wash building.

Staff Contact: Mariah Gleason

Representative: Kevin Schafer

Mariah Gleason summarized the staff report in a PowerPoint presentation. Mr. Matsuno asked if there was a typo in recommendation 8a regarding caliper size. (There was not.) Kevin Schafer addressed the ARB, summarizing the proposal and the applicant's response to the recommended conditions. He noted agreement with all but the recommendation regarding the comprehensive sign plan, showed where the wall signs would be located, and clarified that signs not located at the gooseneck lamps would not be illuminated. He clarified the locations and visibility of rooftop equipment, agreeing that additional renderings could be provided. He showed an image of the dumpster enclosure. He clarified that the gooseneck lamps would have no effect on the photometric plan. Mr. Van Der Werf asked staff if it was typical to approve sign applications with the final architecture. (Yes, but mainly to ensure that the architectural design has provided for wall signs.) He asked the applicant if the signs at the corners could be centered over the bays. (Yes.) In discussion the ARB agreed that sufficient information was provided in the applicant's presentation to illustrate the approach to wall signs, and the review and approval of the comprehensive sign plan could be postponed until after final approval of architecture. Mr. Hancock said that the overall proposal adheres to the guidelines and is responsive to context. The ARB reviewed the list

of recommended conditions and Mr. Matsuno confirmed that the applicant could provide additional renderings to confirm lack of visibility of rooftop equipment.

**Motion:** Mr. Matsuno moved for approval of the proposal with the revisions listed in the staff report, as follows:

1. Update the architectural elevation sheets to include specifications for the proposed window glass. Identify the window glass material (SunGuard SN 68 on UltraClear), VLT and VLR performance values, and note that the glass will not be tinted.
2. Provide additional sections confirming that rooftop equipment will not be visible from any vantage points on the Rt. 240 EC.
3. Add the dumpster screen detail to the site plan amendment.
4. Revise the lighting plan to:
  - a. Ensure that the plan is clear and legible when enlarged,
  - b. Ensure that specification sheets are clear and legible when enlarged,
  - c. Limit maximum light levels to 20 fc, and
  - d. Include all information for proposed tilted light fixtures, including the angle of the tilt, whether light will reflect off illuminated surface materials, and an updated photometric plan that accounts for the additional light fixtures.
5. Move the lighting note from Sheet 16 to Sheet 17 (photometric plan) and provide the full text.
6. Revise the existing conditions sheet of the site plan to locate and label the existing street tree at the southwest corner of the property.
7. Revise the landscape plan to:
  - a. Show the large street trees at 3½ inches caliper at planting,
  - b. Increase the size of trees along the eastern side of the site to 2½ inches caliper at planting as indicated in Figure 2, below,
  - c. Address the tree conflicts on the northern perimeter of the site,
  - d. Update the label for the Red Maple trees along the rear property boundary to note 9 maple trees are provided, instead of 8, and
  - e. Revise the planting size of new interior and perimeter parking lot trees to a minimum of 2½ inches caliper.
8. Revise the planting schedule to include existing trees that will remain on site.
9. Revise the label for the number of parking spaces provided in the parking aisle with the loading zone to note 15 parking spaces.
10. Revise proposed contour lines to show tie-ins that are more rounded and blend with the existing terrain. Proposed contours should have a ten-foot minimum radius where they meet the adjacent condition.
11. Revise the plan to include tree protection fencing details and locations on the grading, landscaping, and erosion and sediment control plans for existing trees that will be retained. If existing trees will be removed, revise the plan to show their removal and revise the landscape plan to exclude outlines of existing trees to be removed.

Mr. Henningsen seconded the motion.

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

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

### **a. Minutes Approval:**

**Motion:** Mr. Hancock moved for approval of the minutes from the June 17, 2024, ARB meeting.

Mr. Van Der Werf seconded the motion.

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

### **b. Other items from staff or ARB members: None.**

- c. **Next ARB Meeting:** Monday, July 15, 2024, 1:00 PM – Lane Auditorium  
All members present indicated that they planned to attend the July 15 meeting.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 1:28 p.m. to the next ARB meeting on Monday, July 15, 2024, at 1:00 p.m.