

Staff Report

HEARING DATE: August 20, 2014

TO: Interested Parties

FROM: Jana Fox, Associate Planner

PROPOSAL: **Timberland Senior Housing
ADJ2014-0001 / DR2014-0055 / LD2014-0007 / LO2014-0001 / SDM2014-0005**

LOCATION: The site is bounded by NW 118th Avenue, NW Timberview Lane, NW 117th Avenue, and NW Cedar Falls Drive. More specifically located on Tax Lots 200 & 500 on Washington County Tax Assessor's Map 1N134CD.

SUMMARY: The applicant, Rembold Properties, requests approval for a Design Review Three by the Planning Commission for a 164,978 square foot senior living facility in the Timberland development. The proposed development will include 147 total units, with 89 senior independent living, 41 assisted living, and 17 memory care units. The applicant seeks approval of a Major Adjustment application to the Maximum Height and Maximum FAR standards of Chapter 20. The applicant has applied for a Sidewalk Design Modification for sidewalks and planter strips which deviate from the standards. A Replat One for Lot Consolidation is proposed to consolidate the two existing lots into one lot. A Loading Determination application is sought to reduce the number of loading berths from two to one.

APPLICANT: Rembold Properties, LLC
Kali Bader
1022 SW Salmon Street, Suite 450
Portland, OR 97205

APPLICANT REPRESENTATIVE: Ankrom Moisan Architects
Chris Dalengas
6720 SW Macadam Ave, Suite 100
Portland, OR 97219

PROPERTY OWNERS: Polygon First Commercial Property, LLC
Fred Gast
109 E. 13th Street
Vancouver, WA 98660

DECISION:

**APPROVAL of ADJ2014-0001 DR2014-0055 LD2014-0007
LO2014-0001 SDM2014-0005 (Timberland Senior Housing).**

BACKGROUND FACTS

Key Application Dates

Application	Submittal Date	Application Deemed Complete	Final Written Decision Date	240-Day*
ADJ2014-0001	May 7, 2014	June 25, 2014	October 15, 2014	February 12, 2015
DR2014-0055	May 7, 2014	June 25, 2014	October 15, 2014	February 12, 2015
LD2014-0007	May 7, 2014	June 25, 2014	October 15, 2014	February 12, 2015
LO2014-0001	May 7, 2014	June 25, 2014	October 15, 2014	February 12, 2015
SDM2014-0005	May 7, 2014	June 25, 2014	October 15, 2014	February 12, 2015

* Pursuant to Section 50.25.9 of the Development Code this is the latest date, with a continuance, by which a final written decision on the proposal can be made.

Existing Conditions Table

Zoning	Town Center-Multiple Use (TC-MU) & Town Center-High Density Residential (TC-HDR)	
Current Development	Vacant	
Site Size & Location	The site is bounded by NW 118th Avenue, NW Timberview Lane, NW 117th Avenue, and NW Cedar Falls Drive. The site is approximately 2.98 acres.	
NAC	Central Beaverton	
Surrounding Uses	Zoning: <u>North:</u> TC-HDR <u>South:</u> TC-MU <u>East:</u> TC-HDR <u>West:</u> TC-MU	Uses: <u>North:</u> Attached Residential <u>South:</u> Detached Residential & Commercial <u>East:</u> Attached Residential <u>West:</u> Commercial

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION AND TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page No.</u>
<u>Attachment A:</u> Facilities Review Committee Technical Review and Recommendation Report	FR1 – FR10
<u>Attachment B:</u> ADJ2014-0001 <i>Major Adjustment</i>	ADJ1-ADJ5
<u>Attachment C:</u> DR2014-0055 <i>Design Review Three</i>	DR1-DR16
<u>Attachment D:</u> LD2014-0007 <i>Replat One</i>	LD1-LD4
<u>Attachment E:</u> LO2014-0001 <i>Loading Determination</i>	LO1-LO4
<u>Attachment F:</u> SDM2014-0005 <i>Sidewalk Design Modification</i>	SDM1-SDM3
<u>Attachment G:</u> <i>Conditions of Approval</i>	COA1–COA5

Exhibits

Exhibit 1. Materials submitted by Staff

- Exhibit 1.1 Vicinity Map (page SR-4 of this report)
- Exhibit 1.2 Aerial Map (page SR-5 of this report)

Exhibit 2. Public Comment

- Exhibit 2.1 Email from Thomas McConnell, dated July 21, 2014
- Exhibit 2.2 Email from Phillip Stambaugh, dated July 21, 2014

Exhibit 3. Materials submitted by the Applicant

- Exhibit 3.1 Submittal Package including plans



Timberland Senior Housing
ADJ2014-0001 / DR2014-0055 / LD2014-0007 / LO2014-0001 SDM2014-0005
Vicinity Map



**Timberland Senior Housing
ADJ2014-0001 / DR2014-0055 / LD2014-0007 / LO2014-0001 SDM2014-0005
Aerial Map**

**FACILITIES REVIEW COMMITTEE
TECHNICAL REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS
Timberland Senior Housing**

ADJ2014-0001 / DR2014-0055 / LD20141-0007 / LO2014-0001 / SDM2014-0005

Section 40.03 Facilities Review Committee:

The Facilities Review Committee has conducted a technical review of the application, in accordance with the criteria contained in Section 40.03 of the Development Code. The Committee's findings and recommended conditions of approval are provided to the decision-making authority. As they will appear in the Staff Report, the Facilities Review Conditions may be re-numbered and placed in different order.

The decision-making authority will determine whether the application as presented meets the Facilities Review approval criteria for the subject application and may choose to adopt, not adopt, or modify the Committee's findings, below.

The Facilities Review Committee Criteria for Approval will be reviewed for all criteria that are applicable to the submitted applications as identified below:

- **All eleven (11) criteria are applicable to the submitted Design Review Three and Replat application as submitted.**
- **Facilities Review criteria do not apply to the Major Adjustment, Loading Determination and Sidewalk Design Modification applications.**

A. All critical facilities and services related to the development have, or can be improved to have, adequate capacity to serve the proposal at the time of its completion.

Chapter 90 of the Development Code defines "critical facilities" to be services that include public water, public sanitary sewer, storm water drainage and retention, transportation, and fire protection. The Committee finds that the proposal includes necessary on-site and off-site connections and improvements to public water and public sanitary sewer facilities. The applicant has provided a Service Provider Letter (SPL) from Clean Water Services which shows compliance with stormwater and wetland requirements.

Water Service will be provided to the site by Tualatin Valley Water District (TVWD). TVWD evaluated the water system with the Teufel Master Plan and determined that adequate capacity exists to serve all phases of the development. The development proposes to connect into the 12-inch water line which is installed in NW Cedar Falls Drive.

Development of the subject site will involve the extension of new gravity lateral sewer lines to connect to the existing sewer line in NW Cedar Falls Drive. Adequate capacity exists to serve the proposed development.

Proposed stormwater drainage has been identified and described in the applicant's narrative and plans. The applicant has submitted an addendum to the preliminary

drainage report (Exhibit G of the materials package). The Committee has found the report and associated utility plans to be adequate in addressing the site's on-site surface water management (drainage patterns, treatment and quantity control). The storm system has been designed to convey to the existing detention facility/pond (abutting the development site to the east) built in previous phases of the Teufel Master Plan.

To ensure appropriate design and construction of the essential facilities and utility connections, provide access to manholes and structures, and to ensure adequate maintenance requirements the Committee recommends conditions of approval through the Design Review application.

A *Transportation Assessment* dated February 18, 2014, prepared by Kittelson & Associates, was included with the application. The purpose of the assessment is to compare the trip generation of the current proposal against the Traffic Impact Analysis conducted as part of the 2004 Teufel Master Plan. The current development plans plus the previously approved projects remaining and remaining potential development, result in a net decrease of 2,350 fewer daily trips, 65 few weekday AM peak hour trips and 225 fewer weekday PM peak hour trips than the original 2004 Traffic Impact Analysis. The *Beaverton Development Code* requires a Traffic Impact Analysis for any new use that generates more than 200 vehicle trips per day on average (see BDC 60.55.20). As the current proposal will generate fewer trips than the approved TIA, no Traffic Impact Analysis and or additional mitigation measures are required.

Fire protection will be provided to the site by Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue Department (TVF&R). Comments and conditions of approval have been received from TVF&R. Conditions of approval submitted by TVF&R are included herein. Staff also cites the findings for Criterion H hereto regarding fire prevention.

The Committee finds that the development will provide required critical facilities, as conditioned. Therefore, the Committee finds the proposal meets the criterion for approval.

Therefore, the Committee finds that the proposal meets the criterion.

B. Essential facilities and services are available, or can be made available, with adequate capacity to serve the development prior to occupancy. In lieu of providing essential facilities and services, a specific plan may be approved if it adequately demonstrates that essential facilities, services, or both will be provided to serve the proposed development within five years of occupancy.

Chapter 90 of the Development Code defines "essential facilities" to be services that include schools, transit improvements, police protection, and pedestrian and bicycle facilities in the public right-of-way. The applicant's plans and materials were forwarded to City Transportation staff, City Police Department, and Beaverton School District.

The site will be served by the Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District (THPRD). THPRD Master Trail Plan has an identified Community Trail encircling the entire Teufel development. The Teufel Master Plan approval included conditions of approval related to the timing and details of trail construction. This proposal will not require additional recreational facilities be provided.

The City of Beaverton Police will serve the development site. The Police Department has submitted no comments or recommendations to the Facilities Review Committee.

The Beaverton School District was not provided plans to review as this portion of the development only contains commercial age and disability restricted housing which will not affect school enrollment.

Tri-Met will serve the development site. Tri-Met has submitted no comments or recommendations to the Facilities Review Committee. The site is most directly served by bus line 62 on NW Barnes Road. Tri-Met has not identified the need for additional transit stops related to this development. During the review of the original Teufel Master Plan, Tri-Met requested that NW 118th Avenue be constructed to accommodate busses. This street was constructed with previous phases.

Therefore, the Committee finds that by meeting the conditions of approval, the proposal meets the criterion.

C. The proposal is consistent with all applicable provisions of Chapter 20 (Land Uses) unless the applicable provisions are modified by means of one or more applications which shall be already approved or which shall be considered concurrently with the subject proposal.

Staff cites the Code Conformance Analysis chart at the end of this report, which evaluates the project as it relates the applicable Code requirements of Chapter 20 for the Town Center-High Density Residential (TC-HDR) and Town Center-Multiple Use (TC-MU) zones as applicable to the above mentioned criteria. As demonstrated on the chart, the development proposal meets all applicable standards subject to approval of a Major Adjustment application.

Therefore, the Committee finds that by meeting the conditions of approval, the proposal meets the criterion.

D. The proposed development is consistent with all applicable provisions of Chapter 60 (Special Regulations) and all improvements, dedications, or both, as required by the applicable provisions of Chapter 60 (Special Regulations), are provided or can be provided in rough proportion to the identified impact(s) of the proposal.

The Committee cites the Code Conformance Analysis chart at the end of this report, which evaluates the proposal as it relates the applicable Code requirements of Chapter 60, in response to the above mentioned criteria.

60.55.15 Traffic Management Plan

The application does not include a Traffic Management Plan. The BDC requires a Traffic Management Plan where development will add 20 or more trips in any hour on a residential street (classified as a Local or Neighborhood Route). Less than 20 trips will be

added to the transportation system in any hour; therefore, no Traffic Management Plan is required.

60.55.20 Traffic Impact Analysis

Please see Criterion A, above.

60.55.25 Street and Bicycle and Pedestrian Connection Requirements

The proposal does not include new street or bike connections. The *Beaverton Comprehensive Plan* does not indicate planned connections to adjacent property. The proposal includes on site pedestrian walkways with a five foot width, which connect all buildings on site and connection to the public street system.

60.55.30 Minimum Street Widths

The *Beaverton Comprehensive Plan* classifies NW 118th Avenue as a Collector Street and NW Timberview Lane, NW 117th Avenue, and NW Cedar Falls Drive as Local. Existing right of way is adequate for all adjacent street cross-section designs approved per the Teufel Master Plan Land Use Order. NW 118th Avenue and NW Timberview Lane frontages are fully improved. Typical frontage improvements (curb, sidewalk, and planter) are proposed for NW 117th Avenue and NW Cedar Falls Drive. New street trees are proposed along NW Cedar Falls Drive, NW 117th Avenue, and NW Timberview Lane.

60.55.35 Access Standards

The proposal includes three existing driveway approaches, one on NW Cedar Falls Drive and two on NW 117th Avenue. No new additional driveway approaches are proposed. All driveway approaches exceed the minimum driveway / intersection spacing distance requirements of the *Beaverton Engineering Design Manual*. No obstructions are proposed within the driveway vision clearance triangle. Drive aisles are setback 20 feet from the right of way.

60.55.40 Transit Facilities

TriMet's No. 62-Murray Blvd serves the development site. The nearest stop is approximately 500 feet from the proposed development site at SW Barnes Road / NW 18th Avenue. The No. 62-Murray Blvd runs between Washington Square and Sunset Transit Center, along Scholls Ferry Road, Murray, Millikan, Hocken, Jenkins, Cornell and Barnes. The site is adequately served by transit and the proposal does not warrant additional transit stops.

60.65 Utility Undergrounding

To meet the requirements of Section 60.65, staff recommends a standard condition of approval requiring that utility lines are placed underground.

Therefore, the Committee finds that by meeting the conditions of approval, the proposal meets the criterion.

E. Adequate means are provided or can be provided to ensure continued periodic maintenance and necessary normal replacement of the following private common facilities and areas, as applicable: drainage ditches, roads and other improved rights-of-way, structures, recreation facilities, landscaping, fill and excavation areas,

screening and fencing, ground cover, garbage and recycling storage areas and other facilities not subject to maintenance by the City or other public agency.

The applicant's narrative states that the application proposes private common facilities such as courtyards, gardens, plazas, expanded sidewalks, enhanced pavement treatment, site furniture, lighting and landscaping which will be maintained by the applicant's management company. The proposal as represented does not present any barriers, constraints, or design elements that would prevent or preclude required maintenance of the private infrastructure and facilities on site.

Therefore, the Committee finds that by meeting the conditions of approval, the proposal meets the criterion.

F. There are safe and efficient vehicular and pedestrian circulation patterns within the boundaries of the development.

The proposal includes vehicle drive aisles and on-site pedestrian walkways with a minimum five foot width, which connect all buildings on site and connection to the public street system.

The proposed internal pedestrian pathway system is efficient because pathways are located adjacent to buildings, between buildings, through parking areas, and adjacent to parking areas, all of which provide connection to the public street system. All internal pedestrian pathways that cross intersections or travel lanes include unique materials, color, or pattern which differentiate the pathway from the travel lane. This visual differentiation provides for improved safety as drivers are made aware of pedestrian crossings.

The proposal shows two drive aisle segments with a dimension less than 24 feet, which is the minimum required for two-way travel (see BDC 60.30.15). Staff proposes a condition of approval that the applicant provide a revised plan showing compliance with the 24 foot minimum drive aisle width prior to Site Development Permit Issuance.

Therefore, the Committee finds that by meeting the conditions of approval, the proposal meets the criterion.

G. The development's on-site vehicular and pedestrian circulation systems connect to the surrounding circulation systems in a safe, efficient, and direct manner.

The proposal includes three existing driveway approaches, one on NW Cedar Falls Drive and two on NW 117th Avenue. No new additional driveway approaches are proposed. All driveway approaches exceed the minimum driveway / intersection spacing distance requirements of the *Beaverton Engineering Design Manual*. No obstructions are proposed within the driveway vision clearance triangle. Drive aisles are setback 20 feet from the right of way.

Therefore, the Committee finds that by meeting the conditions of approval, the proposal meets the criterion.

H. Structures and public facilities serving the development site are designed in accordance with adopted City codes and standards and provide adequate fire protection, including, but not limited to, fire flow.

Preliminary comments and conditions of approval have been received from Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue District (TVF&R). Specific details regarding fire flow and hydrant placement will be reviewed for flow calculations and hydrant locations during site development and building permit stages.

The Committee concludes that, subject to meeting the conditions of approval the site can be designed in accordance with City codes and standards and provide adequate fire protection.

Therefore, the Committee finds that by meeting the conditions of approval, the proposal meets the criterion.

I. Structures and public facilities serving the development site are designed in accordance with adopted City codes and standards and provide adequate protection from hazardous conditions due to inadequate, substandard or ill-designed development.

The applicant shall be required to show a public street lighting plan prior to Site Development Permit issuance. By meeting the City of Beaverton's Engineering Design Manual design standards for street lights, the Committee finds that the street illumination system will provide adequate protection from crime and accident. The applicants lighting plan will be discussed further within the Design Review staff report, as lighting relates to private drives and private common open space.

The Committee finds that review of the construction documents at the building and site development permit stages will ensure protection from hazardous conditions due to inadequate, substandard or ill-designed development.

Therefore, the Committee finds that by meeting the conditions of approval, the proposal meets the criterion.

J. Grading and contouring of the development site is designed to accommodate the proposed use and to mitigate adverse effect(s) on neighboring properties, public right-of-way, surface drainage, water storage facilities, and the public storm drainage system.

The applicant's response to Criterion J explains how the site was previously mass-graded as part of the development of the infrastructure to support the master plan. The applicant's response to Criterion J also notes that grading and contouring of the site are further proposed to achieve the development plan.

The applicant states that the proposed senior housing building will be stepped to transition up a 23 foot existing grade change as shown on the grading plans.

The applicant must show compliance with Site Development erosion control measure at the time of Site Development permit issuance.

Therefore, the Committee finds that by meeting the conditions of approval, the proposal meets the criterion.

K. Access and facilities for physically handicapped people are incorporated into the development site and building design, with particular attention to providing continuous, uninterrupted access routes.

The applicant will be required to meet all applicable accessibility standards of the International Building Code, Fire Code and other standards as required by the American Disabilities Act (ADA). Conformance with the technical design standards for Code accessibility requirements are to be shown on the approved construction plans associated with Site Development and Building Permit approvals. The Committee finds that as proposed, the street sidewalks and walkways internal to the development appear to meet applicable accessibility requirements and through the site development and building permitting reviews will be thoroughly evaluated. Therefore, the Committee finds that by meeting the conditions of approval, the site will be in conformance with ADA requirements, and would thereby be in conformance with Development Code Section 60.55.65 and the criterion will be met.

Therefore, the Committee finds that by meeting the conditions of approval, the proposal meets the criterion for approval.

L. The proposal contains all applicable application submittal requirements as specified in Section 50.25.1 of the Development Code.

The applicant submitted the applications on May 7, 2014 and was deemed complete on June 25, 2014, 2014. In the review of the materials during the application review, the Committee finds that all applicable application submittal requirements, identified in Section 50.25.1 are contained within this proposal.

Therefore, the Committee finds the proposal meets the criterion for approval.

Code Conformance Analysis
Chapter 20 Use and Site Development Requirements
Town Center-High Density Residential (TC-HDR) and Town Center-
Multiple Use (TC-MU) Zoning Districts

CODE STANDARD	CODE REQUIREMENT	PROJECT PROPOSAL	MEETS CODE?
Development Code Section 20.20.20. Land Uses – TC-HDR			
Use, Permitted	Residential Care Facilities are Permitted Uses	The applicant proposes Senior Housing with a mix of independent living apartments and a Residential Care Facility, both permitted uses.	YES
Use, Permitted	Attached Dwellings are Permitted Uses		
Development Code Section 20.20.20. Land Uses – TC-MU			
Use, Permitted	Residential Care Facilities are Permitted Uses	The applicant proposes Senior Housing with a mix of independent living apartments and a Residential Care Facility, both permitted uses.	YES
Use, Permitted	Attached Dwellings are Permitted Uses		
Development Code Section 20.20.15. Site Development Standards – TC-HDR			
Land Area Minimum	0	There is no minimum parcel size in the TC-HDR Zone	N/A
Lot Dimensions Minimum	N/A	There are no minimum lot dimension requirements in the TC-HDR Zone	N/A
Yard Setbacks Minimum	Front: 0 Side: 0 Rear: 0	There are no minimum lot dimension requirements in the TC-HDR Zone.	N/A
Yard Setbacks Maximum	Front: Governed by Chapter 60 along MPR.	The setback is governed by the Design Review Process.	See DR Findings
Building Height Maximum	50'	The applicant is seeking a Major Adjustment to Height to allow for up to 59' 6" in the TC-HDR zoned portion of the site.	See ADJ Findings
Minimum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) w/ PUD	0.20	The subject site is part of the Teufel PUD. The applicant proposes an FAR of 1.27 for the development which exceeds the TC-HDR maximum FAR of 1.0, therefore a Major Adjustment is requested.	See ADJ Findings
Maximum Floor Area Ration (FAR) w/ PUD	1.00		
Development Code Section 20.20.15. Site Development Standards – TC-MU			

Land Area Minimum	0	There is no minimum parcel size in the TC-MU Zone	N/A
Lot Dimensions Minimum	N/A	There are no minimum lot dimension requirements in the TC-MU Zone	N/A
Yard Setbacks Minimum	Front: 0 Side: 0 Rear: 0	There are no minimum lot dimension requirements in the TC-MU Zone.	N/A
Yard Setbacks Maximum	Front: Governed by Chapter 60 along MPR.	The setback is governed by the Design Review Process.	See DR Findings
Building Height Maximum	60'	The maximum height of the proposed building is 59' 6"	YES
Minimum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) w/ PUD	0.35	The subject site is part of the Teufel PUD. The applicant proposes an FAR of 1.27 for the development which exceeds the TC-HDR maximum FAR of 1.0, therefore a Major Adjustment is requested.	YES
Maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) w/ PUD	2.00		

Chapter 60 Special Requirements

CODE STANDARD	CODE REQUIREMENT	PROJECT PROPOSAL	MEETS CODE?
Development Code Section 60.05			
Design Review Principles, Standards, and Guidelines	Requirements for new development and redevelopment.	Design Review standards and guidelines will be reviewed in the Design Review portion of the staff report.	See DR Findings
Development Code Section 60.07			
Drive-Up window facilities	Requirements for drive-up, drive-through and drive-in facilities.	No drive-up window facilities are proposed.	N/A
Development Code Section 60.10			
Floodplain Regulations	Requirements for properties located in floodplain, floodway, or floodway fringe.	No mapped floodplains are located within the subject site.	N/A
Development Code Section 60.12			
Habitat Friendly and Low Impact Development Practices	Optional program offering various credits available for use of specific Habitat Friendly or Low Impact Development techniques.	No Habitat Friendly or Low Impact Development techniques proposed.	N/A
Development Code Section 60.15 – Land Division Standards			
Land Division Standards	Standards pertaining to Land Divisions	A Replat One for Lot Consolidation is proposed.	See LD Findings

Development Code Section 60.25 – Off Street Loading			
Loading Facilities	No loading facilities are required for this use.	A Loading Determination is sought for modifications to the loading standards.	See LO Findings
Development Code Section 60.30 – Off-Street Parking			
Off-street motor vehicle parking Parking Zone A	23 Memory Care Beds (0.25 space per bed) = 6 spaces 41 Assisted Living Beds (0.25 space per bed) = 12 spaces 89 Apartments (1 space per unit)= 89 spaces Total Required: 107 Spaces	<u>Vehicle Parking</u> 116 spaces	YES
Required Bicycle Park	Short Term: 2 space / 20 DU's=4 Short Term: 1 space / 100 beds =1 Short Term Total: 5 Spaces Long Term: 1 space / DU=89 Long Term: 1 space / 50 beds= 1 Long Term Total: 90 Spaces	<u>Bicycle Parking</u> Short Term: 5 Long Term: 99	
Compact Spaces	Required residential parking must be provided at standard sizes.	The applicant requests 23 compact parking spaces. 21 of those spaces are required parking spaces (20% of 107 spaces). Excess parking spaces may be compact.	YES
Development Code Section 60.55 - Transportation			
Transportation Facilities	Regulations pertaining to the construction or reconstruction of transportation facilities.	Refer to Facilities Review Committee findings herein.	Yes- with COA
Development Code Section 60.60			
Trees & Vegetation	Regulations pertaining to the removal and preservation of trees.	No trees are proposed to be removed.	N/A
Development Code Section 60.65			
Utility Undergrounding	All existing overhead utilities and any new utility service lines within the project and along any existing frontage, except high voltage lines (>57kV) must be placed underground.	To ensure the proposal meets requirements of this section, staff recommends a condition requiring undergrounding completion prior to occupancy.	Yes- with COA

**ADJ2014-0001
ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS FOR
MAJOR ADJUSTMENT APPROVAL**

Section 40.10.05. Adjustment Applications; Purpose

The purpose of an Adjustment application is to provide a mechanism by which certain regulations in this Code may be adjusted if the proposed development continues to meet the intended purpose of such regulations. This Section is carried out by the approval criteria listed herein.

Section 40.10.15.2.C Approval Criteria

In order to approve a Minor Adjustment application, the decision making authority shall make findings of fact based on evidence provided by the applicant demonstrating that all the following criteria are satisfied:

1. *The proposal satisfies the threshold requirements for a Major Adjustment application.*

Section 40.10.15.2.A.1 Threshold: *An application for Major Adjustment shall be required when the following threshold applies:*

Involves an adjustment of more than 10% and up to and including 50% adjustment from the numerical Site Development Requirement specified in Chapter 20 (Land Uses).

The maximum height in the TC-HDR zone is 50' the applicant requests an adjustment to allow a building height of 59' 6" in the TC-HDR zone, a 19% adjustment. The TC-MU has a maximum building height of 60'. The applicant requests an adjustment to the maximum FAR in the TC-HDR zone. With a PUD the TC-HDR allows up to 1.0 FAR, the TC-MU zone allows up to 2.0 FAR. The applicant proposes an FAR of 1.27, a 27% adjustment.

Therefore, staff find that the criterion is met.

2. *The application complies with all applicable submittal requirements as specified in Section 50.25.1 and includes all applicable City application fees.*

The City of Beaverton received the appropriate fee for a Major Adjustment application.

Therefore, staff find that the criterion is met.

3. *Special conditions exist on the site that make it physically difficult or impossible to meet the applicable development standard for an otherwise acceptable proposal.*

The applicant states that the primary issue affecting the site is the significant sloping topography across the property. The total grade change is 29' from NW Cedar Falls Drive to NW Timberview Lane. The City calculates the finished grades using a grade plane calculation which is the average of the elevation at 6 feet out from the four building corners. Given the significant grade change over the site, the grade plane calculation is 11 feet below the finished grade on the north side of the building, which would limit the height of the building to 39 feet above the finished grade at the north, but would allow the

building to project significantly more than 50' above the finished grade in the southwest corner. The buildings to the north of the site are greater in massing and scale than the detached dwellings to the south. The proposed Adjustment would allow the height to be greater at the north of the site adjacent to the multi-family buildings. The TC-MU zoning district allowed up to 60 feet in height, however, it is the TC-HDR portion of the site which requires the adjustment.

The applicant has designed the building to step down with the slope of the site to maintain in most areas a 4 story building which would be allowed under both zoning districts.

That applicant proposes an overall FAR for the site of 1.27. The TC-MU zoning designation has a maximum FAR of 2.0 while the TC-HDR zoning designation has a maximum FAR of 1.0. The FAR complies with the TC-MU requirement and is significantly below the maximum FAR in that zone. The split zoning on the site makes it difficult to comply with the intent of both zoning districts when the FAR requirements for one zone is twice as high as the other. While the proposed FAR is higher than the maximum in the TC-HDR zone it is significantly lower than the TC-MU maximum, a compromise between both zoning districts on the site.

Staff concurs that the topography of the site and the split zoning designations create a special condition which is unique to the site which make strict compliance with the maximum height and maximum FAR difficult across both zoning designations.

Therefore, staff find that the criterion is met.

4. *The special conditions or circumstances do not result from the actions of the applicant and such conditions and circumstances do not merely constitute financial hardship or inconvenience.*

The applicant states that the proposal respects the intended massing and scale for the TC-HDR zone, and works to take up the slope variation by stepping the building up with the slope to maintain a general four story height. The applicant states that the building could comply with the height requirement by providing a flat roof but that style would not be consistent with the style and architecture of the other buildings in the development which utilize a pitched roof design.

The request to exceed the maximum FAR in the TC-HDR zoning designation results from the split zoning designation of the site. The split zoning of the site predates this application and would affect any proposed development on that site.

Staff concurs that the slope and split zoning of the site are not the result of the actions of the applicant and do not merely constitute a financial hardship or convenience.

Therefore, staff find that the criterion is met.

5. *Granting the adjustment as part of the overall proposal will not obstruct pedestrian or vehicular movement.*

The applicant requests adjustment to maximum height and FAR, no vehicular or pedestrian accesses or movements are affected.

Therefore, staff find that the criterion is met.

6. *City-designated significant trees and/or historic resources, if present, will be preserved.*

There are no City-designated significant trees and/or historic resources on the subject site.

Therefore, staff finds that this approval criterion is not applicable.

7. *If more than one (1) adjustment is being requested concurrently, the cumulative effect of the adjustments will result in a project which is still consistent with the overall purpose of the applicable zoning district.*

The subject site is a split zoned property, TC-HDR and TC-MU. The proposed height and FAR are allowed in the TC-MU zone, however they require adjustment in the TC-HDR. Given the steep slopes on the site the height and FAR adjustments will still be consistent with the purpose of the zoning districts to provide high density residential neighborhoods and multiple use developments.

Therefore, staff find that the criterion is met.

8. *Any adjustment granted shall be the minimum necessary to permit a reasonable use of land, buildings, and structures.*

The applicant states that the requested variances to height and FAR are the absolute minimum necessary to create a building design that is unique and varied, achieves the desired architectural character and scale relationship o adjacent development, and meets the design and density objectives of the Town Center districts given the split zoning and sloping topography of the site.

Staff finds that the applicant has demonstrated that the Major Adjustment is the minimum that will make possible a reasonable use of land and the proposed structures.

Therefore, staff find that the criterion is met.

9. *Either it can be demonstrated that the modification equally or better meets the intent of the standard to be modified or the proposal incorporates building, structure, or site design features or some combination thereof that compensate for the requested adjustment.*

In response to Criterion 9, the applicant states that the proposed design incorporates building massing and elevations that are varied to provide visual interest. The architectural design, which includes articulation to reduce the mass of the building results in a comfortable pedestrian scale and appropriate relationship to adjacent development, as is intended in the Town Center zoning districts.

Staff concurs that the proposed development meets the intent of the TC-MU and TC-HDR zones to provide dense mixed use developments which are pedestrian friendly.

Therefore, staff find that the criterion is met.

- 10. *The proposal is consistent with all applicable provisions of Chapter 20 (Land Uses) unless the applicable provisions are modified by means of one or more application that have been approved or are considered concurrently with the subject proposal.***

Staff cites the Code Conformance Analysis chart at the end of the Facilities Review section of this report, which evaluates the project as it relates the applicable Code requirements of Chapter 20 for the TC-HDR and TC-MU zones as applicable to the above mentioned criteria. As demonstrated on the chart, the development proposal meets the site development standards, with the exception of the maximum height and FAR in the TC-HDR zone, for which a Major Adjustment is requested. Staff will provide findings for the Design Review Two, Replat One, Loading Determination, and Sidewalk Design Modification, which are being reviewed concurrently with the subject request for Major Adjustment, within this report.

Therefore, staff find the proposal will meet the criterion for approval by meeting the conditions of approval.

- 11. *The proposal is consistent with all applicable provisions of Chapter 60 (Special Requirements) and that all improvements, dedications, or both required by the applicable provisions of Chapter 60 (Special Requirements) are provided or can be provided in rough proportion to the identified impact(s) of the proposal.***

Staff cites the findings in the Code Conformance Analysis chart at the end of the facilities review report, which demonstrates that subject to approval of the Major Adjustment and related Design Review Two, Replat One, Loading Determination and Sidewalk Design Modification applications, the proposal will be in conformance with the applicable Code requirements of Chapter 60 (Special Requirements).

Therefore, staff find the proposal will meet the criterion for approval by meeting the conditions of approval.

- 12. *Adequate means are provided or can be provided to ensure continued periodic maintenance and necessary normal replacement of the following private common facilities and areas: drainage ditches, roads and other improved rights-of-way,***

structures, recreation facilities, landscaping, fill and excavation areas, screening and fencing, ground cover, garbage and recycling storage areas and other facilities, not subject to periodic maintenance by the City or other public agency.

The applicant's identifies that private common facilities such as plazas, expanded sidewalks, enhanced pavement treatments and additional amenities will be maintained by the owners of the development or their management agency. Staff finds nothing in the design or layout of the common facilities that would preclude adequate maintenance of the site.

Therefore, staff find that the criterion is met.

- 13. *The proposal does not include any lot area averaging as specified in Section 20.05.50.1.B or include any lot dimension reductions as specified in Sections 20.05.50.2.A.2 and .4 or 20.05.50.2.B.2 and .4.***

The proposal does not include any lot area averaging.

Therefore, staff find the criterion is not applicable.

- 14. *Applications and documents related to the request, which will require further City approval, shall be submitted to the City in the proper sequence.***

The applicant has submitted all documents related to this request for Major Adjustment approval. Design Review Two, Replat One, Loading Determination and Sidewalk Design Modification applications are being processed concurrently with the subject request for Major Adjustment. The Major Adjustment application is dependent upon approval of the Design Review Two application. Staff recommends a condition of approval which states that approval of the Major Adjustment application is subject to upon approval of the Design Review Two application.

Therefore, staff find the proposal will meet the criterion for approval by meeting the conditions of approval.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the facts and findings presented, staff recommends **APPROVAL** of **ADJ2014-0001 (Timberland Senior Housing)** subject to the applicable conditions identified in Attachment G.

**DR2014-0055
ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS FOR
DESIGN REVIEW THREE APPROVAL**

Planning Commission Standards for Approval:

Section 40.20.15.3.C of the Development Code provides standards to govern the decisions of the Commission as they evaluate and render decisions on Design Review Applications. The Commission will determine whether the application as presented, meets the Design Review Three approval criteria. The Commission may choose to adopt, not adopt or modify the Committee's findings. In this portion of the report, staff evaluates the application in accordance with the criteria for Type 3 Design Review.

Section 40.20.15.3.C Approval Criteria: In order to approve a Design Review Three application, the decision making authority shall make findings of fact based on evidence provided by the applicant demonstrating that all the following criteria are satisfied:

1. *The proposal satisfies the threshold requirements for a Design Review Three application.*

The applicant proposes to construct a new, 164,978 square foot, senior living development which includes independent living apartments as well as more specialized care facilities. Therefore the applicant meets Threshold 1 of a Design Review Three.

1. *New construction of more than 50,000 gross square feet of non-residential floor area where the development does not abut any Residential District.*

Therefore, staff find that the criterion is met.

2. *All City application fees related to the application under consideration by the decision making authority have been submitted.*

The applicant paid the required fees for a Design Review Three application.

Therefore, staff find that the criterion is met.

3. *For proposals meeting Design Review Three application thresholds numbers 1 through 6, the proposal is consistent with all applicable provisions of Sections 60.05.35 through 60.05.50 (Design Guidelines).*

Staff cites the Design Guidelines Analysis at the end of this Design Review section, which evaluates the project as it relates the applicable Design Review Guidelines found in Section 60.05 of the Development Code. Staff reviews each Guideline with respect to the applicability of the Guideline to the project, the applicant's response and illustrative representation of the proposal. Staff provides an evaluation of the proposal in relation to the Guideline and a statement as to whether the Guideline is met.

Therefore, staff find the proposal will meet the criterion for approval by meeting

the conditions of approval.

4. ***For additions to or modifications of existing development, the proposal is consistent with all applicable provisions of Sections 60.05.35 through 60.05.50 (Design Guidelines) or can demonstrate that the additions or modifications are moving towards compliance of specific Design Guidelines if any of the following conditions exist:***
- a. ***A physical obstacle such as topography or natural feature exists and prevents the full implementation of the applicable guideline; or***
 - b. ***The location of existing structural improvements prevent the full implementation of the applicable guideline; or***
 - c. ***The location of the existing structure to be modified is more than 300 feet from a public street.***

The project proposal is a new Commercial Development. Therefore this criterion which pertains to additions or modification of existing development does not apply.

Therefore, staff find the criterion is not applicable.

5. ***For DRBCP proposals which involve the phasing of required floor area, the proposed project shall demonstrate how future development of the site, to the minimum development standards established in this Code or greater, can be realistically achieved at ultimate build out of the DRBCP.***

The applicant does not propose a DRBCP.

Therefore, staff find the criterion is not applicable.

6. ***For proposals meeting Design Review Three application Threshold numbers 7 or 8, where the applicant has decided to address a combination of standards and guidelines, the proposal is consistent with all applicable provisions of Sections 60.05.15 through 60.05.30 (Design Standards) except for the Design Standard(s) where the proposal is instead subject to the applicable corresponding Design Guideline(s). [ORD 4531; March 2010]***

The project proposal meets application Threshold #1 and, accordingly, is not subject to Design Standards.

Therefore, staff find the criterion is not applicable.

7. ***For proposals meeting Design Review Three application Threshold numbers 7 or 8, the proposal is consistent with all applicable provisions of Sections 60.05.15 through 60.05.30 (Design Standards) except for the Design Standard(s) where the proposal is applying to instead meet the applicable Design Guideline(s).***

The project proposal meets application Threshold #1 and, accordingly, is not subject to Design Standards.

Therefore, staff find the criterion is not applicable.

8. *Applications and documents related to the request, which will require further City approval, shall be submitted to the City in the proper sequence.*

The applicant has submitted all documents related to this request for Design Review Three approval. Major Adjustment, Replat One, Loading Determination and Sidewalk Design Modification applications are being processed concurrently with the subject request for Design Review Three. The Design Review Three application is dependent upon approval of the Major Adjustment, Replat One, Loading Determination and Sidewalk Design Modification applications. Staff recommend a condition of approval which states that approval of the Design Review Three application is subject to approval of the previously mentioned applications.

Therefore, staff find that by meeting the conditions of approval the criterion is met.

DESIGN REVIEW GUIDELINES ANALYSIS

In the following analysis, staff have only identified the Design Guidelines which are relevant to the subject development proposal. Non-relevant Guidelines have been omitted.

60.05.35 *Building Design and Orientation Guidelines.* *Unless otherwise noted, all guidelines apply in all zoning districts.*

1. *Building Elevation Design Through Articulation and Variety*

B. *Building elevations should be varied and articulated to provide visual interest to pedestrians. Within larger projects, variations in architectural elements such as: building elevations, roof levels, architectural features, and exterior finishes should be provided. (Standard 60.05.15.1.A and B)*

The applicant states that the building design is well articulated and varied throughout, using a range of techniques executed at different scales. The overall massing steps up in height as the building steps up the sloping site and is further broken into smaller masses by creating a series of pitched roof forms separated by small flat roof areas. Wall surfaces are recessed with contrasting colors and accent siding materials. Horizontal facades are broken down with projecting bay forms. Additionally the applicant states that the building design also includes articulation of the base, mid-section and top through the use of brick masonry and other large scale accent siding at the base, two types of siding materials in contrasting colors and deep pitched-roof overhang at the top.

Staff concur that the applicant does utilize a variety of window treatments, building materials, roof heights, differentiated entrances and other visual elements to provide articulation, variety and visual interest to the buildings.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.

C. *To balance horizontal features on longer building elevations, vertical building elements, such as building entries, should be emphasized. (Standard 60.05.15.1.B)*

The applicant states that vertical elements are incorporated throughout the development, including vertically proportioned bays, sets of windows and alternating siding types. Staff concur that vertical elements are adequately emphasized.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.

D. *Buildings should promote and enhance a comfortable pedestrian scale and orientation. This guideline does not apply to buildings in industrial districts where the principal use of the building is manufacturing, assembly, fabricating, processing, packing, storage, wholesale or distribution activities. (Standard 60.05.15.1.B) [ORD 4531; March 2010]*

The applicant states that the development is designed to be very approachable and pedestrian friendly. The design has comfortable residential character and a welcoming attitude created by well-proportioned and detailed entries, porches and trellises as well as a large courtyard. Staff concurs that the buildings are of a comfortable pedestrian scale and are provided in close proximity to the street creating a street enclosure.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.

E. Building elevations visible from and within 200 feet of an adjacent street or major parking area should be articulated with architectural features such as windows, dormers, off-setting walls, alcoves, balconies or bays, or by other design features that reflect the building's structural system. Undifferentiated blank walls facing a street, common green, shared court, or major parking area should be avoided. (Standards 60.05.15.1.B, C, and D) [ORD 4542; May 2010]

The applicant states that all building elevations incorporate architectural features such as windows, off-setting walls and other design features. No undifferentiated blank walls face streets, common areas or parking areas. Staff concur with the applicant that the variety of building materials to be used will mitigate larger building walls and meet the design aspiration of avoiding the use of undifferentiated blank walls facing streets or major parking areas.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.

2. Roof Forms as Unifying Elements

A. Roof forms should be distinctive and include variety and detail when viewed from the street. Sloped roofs should have a significant pitch and building focal points should be highlighted. (Standards 60.05.15.2.A and B)

The applicant states that the roof of the building is varied and distinctive, including a series of hipped roofs with 4:12 pitch which are separated by small flat roof areas to articulate the overall massing. The building steps up in height from south to north, adding further interest to the roofline. At the end of the building the hipped roof ends are articulated over projecting façade elements to create focal points. Staff concur that the use of differentiated roof features provides visual interest and focal points.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.

B. Flat roofs should include distinctive cornice treatments. (Standard 60.05.15.2.C)

The applicant states that the small flat roof areas will have parapets which include a trim detail at the top. Staff concur that the small flat roof areas provide cornice treatments.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.

3. Primary building entrances

- A. *Excluding manufacturing, assembly, fabricating, processing, packing, storage and wholesale and distribution activities which are the principle use of a building in industrial districts, the design of buildings should incorporate features such as arcades, roofs, porches, alcoves, porticoes, awnings, and canopies to protect pedestrians from the rain and sun. (Standard 60.05.15.3.A)*

The applicant states that the building includes articulated entries, porches and covered dining terrace and seating areas, trellises, and a porte-cochere feature at the main entry. All main entries include pedestrian covers.

Staff have reviewed the primary building entrance design and concur with the applicant that the design of the entrances is differentiated and provides weather protection for pedestrians.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.

- B. *Special attention should be given to designing a primary building entrance that is both attractive and functional. Primary entrances should incorporate changes in mass, surface, or finish to emphasize the entrance. (Standard 60.05.15.3.B)*

The applicant states that the primary building entry is highly emphasized with a large double-height porte-cochere with large brick-clad columns and archways. The main pedestrian entry from NW 118th Avenue is accentuated with a porch, the third main entry on the east façade is emphasized with a porch. Staff concur with the applicant that the primary building entrances are attractive and emphasized.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.

4. Exterior Building Materials

- A. *Exterior building materials and finishes should convey an impression of permanence and durability. Materials such as masonry, stone, wood, terra cotta, and tile are encouraged. Windows are also encouraged, where they allow views to interior activity areas or displays. (Standard 60.05.15.4.A)*

The applicant states that the design uses brick masonry at the base of the building as well as three types of fiber cement siding for the main body of the building. Typical windows are high performance vinyl windows with commercial aluminum storefront windows at key accent areas. The roof utilizes composite shingles. Staff concurs with the applicant that the proposed materials convey a sense of durability and adequate windows are provided.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.

B. *Where masonry is used for exterior finish, decorative patterns (other than running bond pattern) should be considered, especially at entrances, building corners and at the pedestrian level. These decorative patterns may include multi-colored masonry units, such as brick, tile, stone, or cast stone, in a layered or geometric pattern, or multi-colored ceramic tile bands used in conjunction with materials such as concrete. This guideline does not apply to developments in Industrial zones, where masonry is used for exterior finishes.* (Standards 60.05.15.4.B and C)

The applicant states that where brick is proposed, the design includes reveal courses at regular intervals with raised accent courses near the top and a special soldier course with row-lock cap along the top of the brick, providing a transition to the siding materials. Staff concurs that the exterior masonry is differentiated with changes in materials, textures and scoring.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.

5. **Screening of Equipment.** *All roof, surface, and wall-mounted mechanical, electrical, communications, and service equipment should be screened from view from adjacent public streets by the use of parapets, walls, fences, enclosures, dense evergreen foliage, or by other suitable means.* (Standards 60.05.15.5.A through C)

The applicant states that the rooftop equipment will be screened by the use of wells at the center of the pitched roof to screen the units.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.

6. **Building Location and Orientation in Multiple Use and Commercial districts.**

A. *Buildings should be oriented and located within close proximity to public streets and public street intersections. The overall impression, particularly on Class 1 Major Pedestrian Routes, should be that architecture is the predominant design element over parking areas and landscaping. Property size, shape and topographical conditions should also be considered, together with existing and proposed uses of the building and site, when determining the appropriate location and orientation of buildings.* (Standard 60.05.15.6.A and B)

The site abuts NW 118th Avenue which is a Major Pedestrian Route. The building is a U shape with one of the primary facades adjacent to NW 118th Avenue. The building steps up the slope along NW 118th Avenue and is four stories in height at most locations along eth frontage, creating a sense of enclosure on that side of the street. The area between the building and the street is landscaped.

The parking for the development is located away from NW 118th Avenue.

Staff concurs that the applicant has oriented the buildings to meet the objectives of a major pedestrian route by providing buildings close the street and placing parking

behind buildings.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.

B. *On Class 1 Major Pedestrian Routes, the design of buildings located at the intersection of two streets should consider the use of a corner entrance to the building.* (Standard 60.05.15.6.B and D)

The site is abutted by only one Major Pedestrian Route. The building however is located at the corner of NW 118th Avenue and NW Timberview Lane.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is not applicable.

C. *On Class 1 Major Pedestrian Routes, building entrances should be oriented to streets, or have reasonably direct connections to street and pedestrian and transit facilities.* (Standard 60.05.15.6.C and D)

Building entrances are provided adjacent to NW 118th Avenue as well as the main entrance which faces NW Cedar Falls Drive. Both entrances provide direct pedestrian connections to the adjacent streets. The entrance on NW 118th is directly adjacent to the sidewalk with a small path leading to the access. The entrance on NW Cedar Falls is set back from the sidewalk with a plaza and landscape area, access is provided with numerous pedestrian paths from the adjacent sidewalk system.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.

7. *Building Scale Along Major Pedestrian Routes.*

A. *Architecture helps define the character and quality of a street. Along Major Pedestrian Routes, low height, single story buildings located at the right-of-way edge are discouraged except where detached single family dwellings are permitted.* (Standard 60.05.15.7.A and B)

The applicant states that the west façade of the building closely aligns with NW 118th Avenue at four stories in height and set back 10 feet to 15 feet from the right-of-way. The massing steps up with the sloping grade to maintain the four story height. No single story buildings are proposed.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.

B. *Building heights at or near the street should help form a sense of enclosure, but should not create an undifferentiated height wall out of scale with pedestrians. Building heights at the street edge should be no higher than sixty (60) feet without the upper portions of the building being set back from the vertical building line of the lower building stories.* (Standard 60.05.15.7.A)

The applicant states that buildings at the right-of-way edge vary in height from 35 feet to 46 feet above the adjacent right of way and the pitched roofs extend an additional 9 feet above the wall to the ridgeline but the highest point is set back more than 20 feet from the façade. The applicant has applied for a Major Adjustment to building height to allow up to 59 feet 6 inches from grade plane. Even if the Major Adjustment is granted maximum building height will be less than 60 feet in height.

Staff concurs that the buildings create a sense of enclosure and pedestrian scale.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.

8. Ground Floor Elevations on Commercial and Multiple Use Buildings.

A. *Excluding residential only development, ground floor building elevations should be pedestrian oriented and provide views into retail, office or lobby space, pedestrian entrances or retail display windows. (Standard 60.05.15.8.A)*

The applicant states that the ground floor elevations are entirely activated with windows, entries, porches and other special features on all sides of the building. There are no large blank wall areas on any portion of the building, including the ground floor. Staff concur that views into the space are provided and entryways are accentuated with glazing.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.

B. *Except those used exclusively for residential use, ground floor elevations that are located on a Major Pedestrian Route, sidewalk, or other space where pedestrians are allowed to walk should provide weather protection for pedestrians on building elevations. (Standard 60.05.15.8.B)*

The applicant states that the west wing of the building fronting NW 118th Avenue is entirely residential in nature, but also includes a main pedestrian entry with a substantial porch providing weather protection. The west façade is set back 10 to 15 feet from the sidewalk to help accommodate for the significant slope along the frontage and provide some separation for the residential units on the ground floor. Due to the long steep slope on this façade and the residential units along the ground floor this slope does not lend itself to a more commercial frontage with awnings. Staff concur that given the unique features of the site, such as slope and residential units on the ground floor that weather protection along the entire façade is not practical. Weather protection is provided at building entrances.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.

60.05.40. Circulation and Parking Design Guidelines. *Unless otherwise noted, all guidelines apply in all zoning districts.*

1. **Connections to public street system.** *The on-site circulation system and the abutting street system should provide for efficient access and circulation, and should connect the project to abutting streets. (Standard 60.05.40.1)*

The applicant states that the proposed development includes a well-designed on-site pedestrian and vehicle circulation system designed in accordance with City standards. Appropriate connections are made to the surrounding public street system. The applicant provides pedestrian connections to all adjacent public streets in a safe and efficient manner. The proposal can be found to adequately connect to the public transportation system.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.

2. **Loading area, solid waste facilities, and similar improvements.**

- A. *On-site service, storage and similar activities should be designed and located so that these facilities are screened from an abutting public street. (Standard 60.05.20.2)*

The applicant states that on-site loading areas and trash enclosure are located within a concealed garage area in the least prominent location on the site. Staff concurs that the loading area and trash enclosure is appropriately located and adequately screened from public view.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.

- B. *Except in Industrial districts, loading areas should be designed and located so that these facilities are screened from an abutting public street, or are shown to be compatible with local business operations. (Standard 60.05.20.2)*

The proposed loading area is within an enclosed garage. The site is surrounded by public streets on all sides. The proposed loading area is not adjacent to or visible from the Major Pedestrian Route and is internal to the building.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.

3. **Pedestrian circulation.**

- A. *Pedestrian connections should be made between on-site buildings, parking areas, and open spaces. (Standard 60.05.20.3.A)*

The applicant provides a series of pedestrian connections and paths throughout the site connecting open space, building entrances, and parking areas to each other and to the public street system. The pedestrian connections through the development and to adjacent streets are sufficient.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.

B. *Pedestrian connections should connect on-site facilities to abutting pedestrian facilities and streets unless separated by barriers such as natural features, topographical conditions, or structures. (Standard 60.05.20.3.A)*

The applicant provides connections to all adjacent public streets which are direct and logical given the slopes of the site. Staff concurs with the applicant that sufficient pedestrian connections to adjacent streets and pedestrian facilities.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.

C. *Pedestrian connections should link building entrances to nearby streets and other pedestrian destinations. (Standard 60.05.20.3.B)*

The applicant provides direct pedestrian connections from streets to building entrances with paved pathways. Staff concur that pedestrian connections are provided to adjacent public streets.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.

D. *Pedestrian connections to streets through parking areas should be evenly spaced and separated from vehicles (Standard 60.05.20.3.C through E)*

The applicant provides pedestrian connections that are generally separated from drive isles and parking areas with the exception of one pedestrian access from NW Cedar Falls Drive to the main building entrance which crosses the drive isle. The walkway is proposed to be of a differentiated paving material. Staff concurs that adequate pedestrian connections are provided.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.

E. *Excluding manufacturing, assembly, fabricating, processing, packing, storage and wholesale and distribution activities which are the principle use of a building in industrial districts, pedestrian connections designed for high levels of pedestrian activity should be provided along all streets. (Standard 60.05.20.3.A through H)*

The applicant states that 5 foot to 6 foot sidewalks are proposed along NW Cedar Falls Drive which is anticipated to be the highest area of pedestrian activity and sidewalks are located on both sides of all streets within the development.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.

F. *Pedestrian connections should be designed for safe pedestrian movement and constructed of hard durable surfaces. (Standards 60.05.20.3.F through G)*

Pedestrian ways are designed for safe movement and constructed with hard surface materials. Where pedestrian access crosses streets or drive aisles different materials, such as concrete or pavers are used to differentiate the driving surface to ensure pedestrian safety. Staff concurs that the applicant has proposed hard durable differentiated surfaces for pedestrian connections.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.

- 4. *Street frontages and parking areas.*** *Landscape or other screening should be provided when surface parking areas are located along public streets. (Standard 60.05.20.4)*

The applicant states that parking areas are located behind or to the sides of building to screen them from view of major streets. Where it is necessary to locate parking along public streets a landscape buffer of 5 to ten feet in depth is provided with evergreen shrubs and other plant materials to provide screening.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.

- 5. *Parking area landscaping.*** *Landscape islands and a tree canopy should be provided to minimize the visual impact of large parking areas. (Standard 60.05.20.5.A through D)*

The applicant proposes landscape islands containing trees and ground cover. The applicant states that parking areas are designed with landscape islands dividing larger rows of parking spaces and providing trees to soften and shade the parking lots.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.

- 6. *Off-Street parking area frontage in Multiple-Use zones.***

- A. *Surface parking should occur to the side or rear of buildings and should not occur at the corner of two Major Pedestrian Routes. (Standard 60.05.20.6)*

The applicant proposes surface parking between buildings. Parking is not proposed at the intersections of Major Pedestrian Routes.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.

- B. *Surface parking areas should not be the predominant design element along Major Pedestrian Routes and should be located on the site to safely and conveniently serve the intended users of the development, without precluding future site intensification. (Standard 60.05.20.6)*

The applicant does not proposing parking along Major Pedestrian Routes.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.

7. Sidewalks along streets and primary building elevations in Multiple Use and Commercial districts.

A. *Pedestrian connections designed for high levels of pedestrian activity should be provided along all streets. (Standard 60.05.20.7.A)*

The applicant states that extra wide sidewalks are proposed on NW Cedar Falls Drive which is anticipated to be the highest area of pedestrian activity. The applicant provides pedestrian connections from building entry points to public streets.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.

B. *Pedestrian connections should be provided along primary building elevations having building and tenant entrances. (Standard 60.05.20.7.B)*

The applicant states that pedestrian connections link building entrances to nearby streets and other pedestrian designations. Accesses to the site provide pedestrian connections to building entrances.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.

8. Connect on-site buildings, parking, and other improvements with identifiable streets and drive aisles in Residential, Multiple Use, and Commercial districts.

A. *On-site circulation should be easily recognized and identified, and include a higher level of improvements such as curbs, sidewalks, and landscaping compared to parking lot aisles. (Standard 60.05.20.8)*

The proposal connects to public streets and sidewalk system in an easily recognized manner. Curbs, sidewalks, and landscaping are all included in the design. All crosswalks will be concrete or other paving treatments to differentiate from the vehicular pavement.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.

B. *Long, continuous parking aisles should be avoided if possible, and landscaped as necessary to minimize the visual impact. (Standard 60.05.20.8)*

The applicant states that by breaking up the necessary parking into smaller parking areas, long continuous parking aisles have been avoided. The parking aisles are broken up with landscape islands between stalls. The number of parking spalls per aisle is also kept to a minimum to further break up the parking areas while providing the necessary

number of required parking stalls. Staff concurs that the applicant provides adequate landscaping to minimize the visual impact of the proposed parking facilities.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.

60.05.45. Landscape, Open Space and Natural Areas Design Guidelines. *Unless otherwise noted, all guidelines apply in all zoning districts.*

3. Minimum landscaping for conditional uses in Residential districts and for developments in Multiple Use, Commercial, and Industrial Districts.

A. *Landscaping should soften the edges of buildings and parking areas, add aesthetic interest and generally increase the attractiveness of a development and its surroundings.* (Standard 60.05.25.3.A, B, and D)

The applicant states that a generous square footage of landscape areas, along with the use of a variety of plant materials will soften and anchor the building and parking areas. Various sizes of trees will help integrate the scale of the building and parking areas to the site.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.

B. *Plazas and common areas designed for pedestrian traffic should be surfaced with a combination of landscape and decorative pavers or decorative concrete.* (Standard 60.05.25.3.C)

The applicant states that the plaza and common areas will be primarily surfaced with scored concrete and landscape areas are integrated throughout. Staff concur that the pedestrian plaza meets the Guideline.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.

C. *Use of native vegetation should be emphasized for compatibility with local and regional climatic conditions.* (Standard 60.05.25.3.A and B)

The applicant states that native vegetation will be utilized when possible, however the plant materials will reflect the condition of the built environment which may be different than those that are compatible with native plants.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.

D. *Existing mature trees and vegetation should be retained and incorporated, when possible, into the site design of a development.* (Standard 60.05.25.3.A and B)

The applicant states that there are no existing or mature trees on the site.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is not applicable.

E. *A diversity of tree and shrub species should be provided in required landscaped areas. (Standard 60.05.25.3)*

The applicant states that the landscaping plan demonstrates a diversity of tree and shrub species.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.

6. ***Retaining Walls.*** *Retaining walls over six (6) feet in height or greater than fifty (50) feet in length should be architecturally treated, incorporated into the overall landscape plan, or screened by landscape material. (Standard 60.05.25.5)*

The applicant proposes retaining walls at numerous places in the development. Proposed retaining walls are architecturally treated and integrated into the landscaping. Larger retaining walls are terraced to reduce the scale of the wall. Vegetation is proposed to screen retaining walls where necessary.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.

7. ***Fences and Walls***

A. *Fences and walls should be constructed of attractive, durable materials. (Standard 60.05.25.6)*

The applicant proposes metal rail fencing along the tops of the taller retaining walls which allows views through the fencing and matches existing fencing within other phases of the Timberland development. Fences are proposed for safety on top of tall retaining walls. The proposed fence is constructed of durable and attractive materials.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.

B. *Fences and walls constructed in front yards adjacent to public streets should provide the opportunity to view into the setback from the street unless high traffic volumes or other conflicts warrant greater security and protection. (Standard 60.05.25.6)*

Structural retaining walls are proposed and may require safety fencing. Fencing will be metal rail fencing to match that in other portions of the Timberland development. The proposed fencing will allow views into the site.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.

60.05.50. Lighting Design Guidelines. *Unless otherwise noted, all guidelines apply in all zoning districts. (Standard 60.05.30.1 and 2)*

1. *Lighting should be utilized to maximize safety within a development through strategic placement of pole-mounted, non-pole mounted and bollard luminaries.*

The applicant states that coverage in the vehicle travel and parking areas is achieved by pole-mounted fixtures which provide uniform lighting. Bollard luminaries are utilized along pedestrian pathways.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.

2. *Pedestrian scale lighting should be an integral part of the design concept except for industrial projects. Poles and fixtures for pole-mounted lighting should be of a consistent type throughout the project. The design of wall-mounted lighting should be appropriate to the architectural design features of the building.*

The applicant states that pedestrian scale lighting fixtures are proposed at 20 feet in height in parking areas and bollard lightings are proposed at 3.5 feet in height in pedestrian areas and will be utilized to highlight the pedestrian circulation areas.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.

3. *Lighting should minimize direct and indirect glare impacts to abutting and adjacent properties and streets by incorporating lens-shields, shades or other measures to screen the view of light sources from residences and streets.*

The applicant states that all egress and parking lot lighting is full cutoff, bollard lighting is louvered to control glare, walkways below canopies utilize recessed lighting and decorative wall mounted fixtures incorporate lens shields or shades.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.

4. *On-site lighting should comply with the City's Technical Lighting Standards.*

The applicant provides a photometric plan which shows minimal areas of light shed of greater than 0.5 foot candles over the property line. Where light sheds over the property line, it sheds only into public rights-of-way and not adjacent properties.

Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.

Recommendation

Based on the facts and findings presented, staff recommend **APPROVAL** of **DR2014-0055 (Timberland Senior Housing)**, subject to the applicable conditions identified in Attachment G.

**LD2014-0007
ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS FOR
REPLAT ONE**

Section 40.45.05 Land Division Applications; Purpose

The purpose of the Land Division applications is to establish regulations, procedures, and standards for the division or reconfiguration of land within the City of Beaverton.

Section 40.45.15.2.C Approval Criteria

In order to approve a Replat One application, the decision making authority shall make findings of fact based on evidence provided by the applicant demonstrating that all the following criteria are satisfied:

1. *The application satisfies the threshold requirements for a Replat One.*

The applicant proposes to consolidate three parcels into two parcels, meeting the threshold for a Replat One for Lot Consolidation below.

- 1. The reconfiguration of lots, parcels, or tracts within a single existing plat that decreases or consolidates the number of lots, parcels, or tracts in the plat.*

Therefore, staff find that the proposal meets the criterion for approval.

2. *All City application fees related to the application under consideration by the decision making authority have been submitted.*

The applicant has paid the required application fee for a Replat One application.

Therefore, staff find that the proposal meets the criterion for approval.

3. *The proposed Replat does not conflict with any existing City approval, except the City may modify prior approvals through the Replat process to comply with current Code standards and requirements.*

The subject site is currently vacant. The applicant proposes an entirely new senior housing development. The site is part of the Tuefel PUD. The lot consolidation will allow the entire site to become one parcel. The proposed application will not affect or modify any current or previous land use approvals.

Therefore, staff find that the proposal meets the criterion for approval.

4. *Oversized parcels (oversized lots) resulting from the Replat shall have a size and shape which will facilitate the future potential partitioning or subdividing of such oversized lots in accordance with the requirements of the Development Code. In addition, streets, driveways, and utilities shall be sufficient to serve the proposed*

lots and future potential development on oversized lots. Easements and rights-of-way shall either exist or be provided to be created such that future partitioning or subdividing is not precluded or hindered, for either the oversized lot or any affected adjacent lot.

Oversized lots are defined by the Beaverton Development Code as lots which are greater than twice the minimum lot size allowed by the subject zoning district. The TC-HDR and TC-MU zoning districts do not have minimum or maximum lot sizes, as such no oversized lots are proposed. Please refer to the Facilities Review section of this report for utility provision information (Attachment A).

Therefore, staff find that the proposal meets the criterion for approval.

- 5. *Applications that apply the lot area averaging standards of Section 20.05.15.D shall demonstrate that the resulting land division facilitates the following:***
- a) Preserves a designated Historic Resource or Significant Natural Resource (Tree, Grove, Riparian Area, Wetland, or similar resource); or,***
 - b) Complies with minimum density requirements of [the Development] Code, provides appropriate lot size transitions adjacent to differently zoned properties, and where a street is proposed provides a standards street cross section with sidewalks.***

The proposal does not apply the lot area averaging standards.

Therefore, staff find that the criterion for approval does not apply.

- 6. *Applications that apply the lot area averaging standards of Section 20.05.15.D do not require further Adjustments or Variance for the Land Division.***

The proposal does not apply the lot area averaging standards.

Therefore, staff find that the criterion for approval does not apply.

- 7. *If phasing is requested by the applicant, the requested phasing plan meets all applicable City standards and provides for necessary public improvements for each phase as the project develops.***

The applicant does not propose to phase the development

Therefore, staff find that the criterion for approval does not apply.

- 8. *The proposal will not eliminate pedestrian, utility service, or vehicle access to the affected properties.***

The applicant states that the proposal will not eliminate pedestrian, utility service, or vehicle access to the affected properties. The existing sidewalk system will remain and be improved in areas. Additionally, staff cites the Facilities Review findings in Attachment A as they relate to this criterion.

Therefore, staff find that the proposal meets the criterion for approval.

9. *The proposal does not create a parcel which will have more than one (1) zoning designation.*

Tax Lot 200 is current a split zoned property, zoned TC-HDR and TC-MU. Tax Lot 500 is zoned TC-HDR. In order to place one building on the site, which would cross existing property lines the applicant proposes to consolidate Tax Lot 200 and Tax Lot 500 through this Replat One application. The proposal does not create a new parcel with split zoning as Tax Lot 200 already contains two zoning districts. The area of Tax Lot 500 will be added together to Tax Lot 200 to create one parcel which retains the existing zoning district limits.

Therefore, staff find that the proposal meets the criterion for approval.

10. *Applications and documents related to the request requiring further City approval, shall be submitted to the City in the proper sequence.*

The applicant has submitted this Replat One application and the Major Adjustment, Design Review Three, Loading Determination and Sidewalk Design Modification Applications for this project. Concurrent review of the applications satisfies this criterion. No other applications are required of the applicant for this stage of City approvals. Because the applications were submitted concurrently staff will review all five (5) applications at once.

Therefore, staff find that the proposal meets the criterion for approval.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the facts and findings presented, staff recommends **APPROVAL** of LD2014-0007 (Timberland Senior Housing), subject to the applicable conditions identified in Attachment G.

Land Division Standards Code Conformance Analysis

CODE STANDARD	CODE REQUIREMENT	PROJECT PROPOSAL	MEETS CODE?
Grading Standards			
60.15.10.1 Applicability	Grading standards apply to all land divisions where grading is proposed but do not supersede Section 60.05.25 Design Review.	The proposal is subject to the grading standards contained herein.	Yes
60.15.10.2.A-C Exemptions	Exemptions include: Public right-of-way, storm water detention facilities, grading adjacent to an existing public-right of way which results in a finished grade below the elevation of the adjacent right-of-way.	The entire development is adjacent to existing public streets. Portions of the proposed finished grades are below the finished grades of the existing right of way.	Yes
60.15.10.3.A 0-5 Feet From Property Line	Maximum of two (2) foot slope differential from the existing or finished slope of the abutting property.	All grading not exempt by 60.15.10.2 will comply with this standard.	Yes
60.15.10.3.B 5-10 Feet From Property Line	Maximum of four (4) foot slope differential from the existing or finished slope of the abutting property.	All grading not exempt by 60.15.10.2 will comply with this standard.	Yes
60.15.10.3.C 10-15 Feet From Property Line	Maximum of six (6) foot slope differential from the existing or finished slope of the abutting property.	All grading not exempt by 60.15.10.2 will comply with this standard.	Yes
60.15.10.3.D 15-20 Feet From Property Line	Maximum eight (8) foot slope differential from the existing or finished slope of the abutting property.	All grading not exempt by 60.15.10.2 will comply with this standard.	Yes
60.15.10.3.E 20-25 Feet From Property Line	Maximum ten (10) foot slope differential from the existing or finished slope of the abutting property.	All grading not exempt by 60.15.10.2 will comply with this standard.	Yes
60.15.10.3.F Pre-development slope	Where a pre-development slope exceeds one or more of the standards in subsections 60.15.10.3.A-E, the slope after grading shall not exceed the pre-development slope	The applicant does not propose to exceed the standards of 60.15.10.3.A-E.	N/A
Significant Trees and Groves			
60.15.10.4 Significant Trees and Groves	Standards for grading within 25 feet of significant trees or groves.	The existing significant trees on site are proposed to be removed with the associated Tree Plan Two application.	N/A

**LO2014-0001
ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS FOR
LOADING DETERMINATION APPROVAL**

Section 40.50.05 Loading Determination Application; Purpose

The purpose of a Loading Determination is to establish mechanism to determine or modify the required number of off-street loading spaces or modify the off-street loading space dimensions in advance of, or concurrent with, applying for approval of an application, development, permit, or other action.

Section 40.50.15.1.C Loading Determination Approval Criteria:

In order to approve a Loading Determination application, the decision making authority shall make findings of fact based on evidence provided by the applicant demonstrating that all the following criteria are satisfied:

- 1. The proposal satisfies the threshold requirements for a Loading Determination application.***

The applicant proposes to reduce the number of loading berths required for the Timberland Senior Housing development. Two type B loading berths are required for the development. The applicant proposes one loading berth which exceeds the Type B dimensions, meeting Threshold 2 for a Loading Determination application:

Threshold 2: A request to modify the total number of off-street loading spaces from the required number listed in Section 60.25 (Off-Street Loading) of this code.

Therefore, staff find that the criterion is met.

- 2. All City application fees related to the application under consideration by the decision making authority have been submitted.***

The applicant paid the required fee associated with a Loading Determination application.

Therefore, staff find that the criterion is met.

- 3. The determination will not create adverse impacts, taking into account the total gross floor area and the hours of operation of the use.***

The applicant states that the loading berth proposed will accommodate the typical Sysco trucks that serve this type of development as well as larger 40' trucks and step vans. The proposed loading berth is internal to the building which will allow for a less visibly intrusive loading space for adjacent properties. The applicant states that the proposed loading berth is adequate to accommodate the

needs of the facility. A portion of the facility will be dedicated to independent living facilities which do not require loading facilities

Staff concurs that given the unit makeup of the facility and size of the proposed berth that one berth can adequately serve the proposed development without adverse impacts.

Therefore, staff find that the criterion is met.

4. *There are safe and efficient vehicular and pedestrian circulation patterns within the boundaries of the site and in connecting with the surrounding circulation system.*

Staff cite the Facilities Review approval Criteria F and G which responds to this criterion in detail. Staff finds that the application provides safe and efficient vehicular and pedestrian circulation patterns.

Therefore, staff find that by meeting the conditions of approval the criterion is met.

5. *The proposal will be able to reasonably accommodate the off-street loading needs of the structure.*

The applicant states that full maneuverability and movements for all trucks required is demonstrated. The building is well served and all turning movements for all trucks including hauling, emergency, and delivery can be accommodated within the off-street parking aisles without interfering with private parking or blocking public streets. The applicant provided a letter from Sysco Corporation who will provide food service deliveries to the site which states that they can serve the site with 30 foot trucks and will do so. The applicant has also provided a letter from the waste hauler stating that the waste hauler can serve the site as designed.

As only a portion of the total building will be served by common food services and the food service provider, Sysco, is satisfied with the loading spaces as provided staff finds that the proposal can be reasonably served by the proposed single loading berth.

Therefore, staff find that by meeting the conditions of approval the criterion is met.

6. *The proposal is consistent with all applicable provisions of Chapter 60 (Special Requirements) and that the improvements, dedications, or both required by the applicable provisions of Chapter 60 (Special Requirements) are provided or can be provided in rough proportion to the identified impact(s) of the proposal.*

Staff cite the Facilities Review approval Criterion D which responds to this criterion in detail. Staff finds that the application complies with Chapter 60 or can be made to comply through conditions of approval which are roughly proportional to the identified impacts of the proposal.

Therefore, staff find that by meeting the conditions of approval the criterion is met.

- 7. *Adequate means are provided or can be provided to ensure continued periodic maintenance and necessary normal replacement of the following private common facilities and areas: drainage ditches, roads and other improved rights-of-way, structures, recreation facilities, landscaping, fill and excavation areas, screening and fencing, ground cover, garbage and recycling storage areas and other facilities not subject to periodic maintenance by the City or other public agency.***

The applicant's identifies that private common facilities such as plazas, expanded sidewalks, enhanced pavement treatments and additional amenities will be maintained by the owners of the development or their management agency. Staff finds nothing in the design or layout of the common facilities that would preclude adequate maintenance of the site.

Therefore, staff find that the criterion is met.

- 8. *The proposal contains all applicable application submittal requirements as specified in Section 50.25.1 of the Development Code.***

The applicant has submitted all documents related to this request for Loading Determination approval. The application was submitted on May 7, 2014 and deemed complete on June 25, 2014.

Therefore, staff find that the criterion is met.

- 9. *Applications and documents related to the request, which will require further City approval, shall be submitted to the City in proper sequence.***

The applicant has submitted all documents related to this request for Loading Determination approval. Major Adjustment, Design Review Three, Replat One and Sidewalk Design Modifications applications are being processed concurrently with the subject request for a Loading Determination. The Loading Determination application is dependent upon approval of the Design Review Three application. Staff recommend a condition of approval which states that approval of the Loading Determination application is subject to upon approval of the Design Review Three application.

Therefore, staff find that by meeting the conditions of approval the criterion is met.

Recommendation

Based on the facts and findings presented, staff recommend **APPROVAL** of **LO2014-0001 (Timberland Senior Living)**, subject to the applicable conditions identified in Attachment G.

**SDM2014-0005
ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS FOR
SIDEWALK DESIGN MODIFICATION**

Section 40.58.05. Sidewalk Design Modification Application; Purpose

The purpose of the Sidewalk Design Modification application is to provide a mechanism whereby the City's street design standards relating to the locations and dimensions of sidewalks or required street landscaping can be modified to address existing conditions and constraints as a specific application. For purposes of this section, sidewalk ramps constructed with or without contiguous sidewalk panels leading to and away from the ramp shall be considered sidewalks. This section is implemented by the approval criteria listed herein.

Section 40.58.15.1.C. Approval Criteria

In order to approve a Sidewalk Design Modification application, the decision making authority shall make findings of fact based on evidence provided by the applicant demonstrating that the following criteria are satisfied:

1. ***The proposal satisfies the threshold requirements for a Sidewalk Design Modification application.***

Section 40.58.15.1.A.1 Threshold: *An application for Sidewalk Design Modification shall be required when the following threshold applies:*

1. The sidewalk width, planter strip width, or both minimum standards specified in the Engineering Design Manual are proposed to be modified.

The applicant requests a sidewalk design modification for the sidewalks along NW Cedar Falls Drive and NW 117th Avenue. The applicant proposes varying six foot with five foot planters to 11 foot wide sidewalks with trees in tree wells. The applicants exhibit EX-09 shows the cross sections and locations of requested sidewalks. The application meets threshold 1 for a Sidewalk Design Modification.

Therefore, staff find the proposal meets the criterion for approval.

2. ***All City application fees related to the application under consideration by the decision making authority have been submitted.***

The City of Beaverton received the appropriate fee for the Sidewalk Design Modification application.

Therefore, staff finds the proposal meets the criterion for approval.

3. ***One or more of the following criteria are satisfied:***

- a. ***That there exist local topographic conditions, which would result in any of the following:***

- i. A sidewalk that is located above or below the top surface of a finished curb.*
- ii. A situation in which construction of the Engineering Design Manual standard street cross-section would require a steep slope or retaining wall that would prevent vehicular access to the adjoining property.*
- b. That there exist local physical conditions such as:*
 - i. An existing structure prevents the construction of a standard sidewalk.*
 - ii. An existing utility device prevents the construction of a standard sidewalk.*
 - iii. Rock outcroppings prevent the construction of a standard sidewalk without blasting.*
- c. That there exist environmental conditions such as a Significant Natural Resource Area, Jurisdictional Wetland, Clean Water Services Water Quality Sensitive Area, Clean Water Services required Vegetative Corridor, or Significant Tree Grove.*
- d. That additional right of way is required to construct the Engineering Design Manual standard and the adjoining property is not controlled by the applicant.*

The applicant states that there are significant environmental conditions on the site, including Significant Natural Resource Areas, wetlands, wetland buffers, Significant Individual Trees and steep slopes within the Timberland Master Plan area which are limited the developable area of site. These constraints, combined with the PUD required dwelling units and square footage result in the need for modifications to sidewalk and planter width requirements.

The applicant would like to promote the pedestrian oriented town center theme of the development which will be accomplished by creating sidewalks in some locations that are wider than the City's standard by providing on-street parking where appropriate and providing curb extensions where appropriate. The developed areas of the site have sidewalks of similar design as the proposal. Staff concurs with the applicants findings.

Therefore, staff finds the proposal meets the criterion for approval.

4. *The proposal complies with provisions of Section 60.55.25 Street and Bicycle and Pedestrian Connection Requirements and 60.55.30 Minimum Street Widths.*

The applicant states that the proposal complies with provisions of Section 60.55.25 as demonstrated in the narrative provided to this Section (Chap. 60). Staff refers to the Facilities Review findings for approval criterion C in reference to compliance with 60.55. The applicant must show compliance with the Conditions of Approval prior to issuance of a Site Development Permit for the proposed transportation facilities.

Therefore, staff finds that by meeting the conditions of approval, the proposal meets the criterion for approval.

5. ***Applications and documents related to the request, which will require further City approval, shall be submitted to the City in the proper sequence.***

The applicant has submitted this Sidewalk Design Modification application and the associated Major Adjustment, Design Review Three, Replat One, and Loading Determination applications for this project. Concurrent review of the applications satisfies this criterion. No other applications are required of the applicant for this stage of City approvals.

Therefore, staff finds the proposal meets the criterion for approval.

6. ***The proposed Sidewalk Design Modification provides safe and efficient pedestrian circulation in the site vicinity.***

Staff cites the finding prepared herein in response to Criteria F and G of Facilities Review approval as adequate for supportive findings in response to Criterion No. 6 of SDM approval.

Therefore, staff finds the proposal meets the criterion for approval.

Recommendation

Based on the facts and findings presented, staff recommend **APPROVAL** of **SDM2014-0005 (Timberland Senior Housing)** subject to the applicable conditions identified in Attachment G.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**ADJ2014-0001 Major Adjustment Application:**

1. Approval of ADJ2014-0001 is subject to approval of DR2014-0055.

DR2014-0055 Design Review Three Application:**A. Prior to any work beginning on-site beyond grading, retaining wall construction, and issuance of the full site development permit, the applicant shall:**

1. Submit the required plans, application form, fee, and other items needed for a complete site development permit application per the applicable review checklist. (Site Development Div./JJD)
2. Contract with a professional engineer to design and monitor the construction for any work governed by Beaverton Municipal Code 9.05.020, as set forth in Ordinance 4417 (City Engineering Design Manual and Standard Drawings), Beaverton Development Code (Ordinance 2050, 4010 +rev.), the Clean Water Services District Design and Construction Standards (June 2007, Resolution and Ordinance 2007-020), and the City Standard Agreement to Construct and Retain Design Professionals in Oregon. (Site Development Div./JJD)
3. Submit a completed and executed City Standard Agreement to Construct Improvements and Retain Design Professional(s) Registered in Oregon. After the site development permit is issued, the City Engineer and the Planning Director must approve all revisions as set out in Ordinances 2050, 4010+rev., and 4417; however, any required land use action shall be final prior to City staff approval of the engineering plan revision and work commencing as revised. (Site Development Div./JJD)
4. Have the ownership of the subject property guarantee all public improvements, site grading, storm water management (quality and quantity) facilities, private streets, and emergency vehicle access driveway paving by submittal of a City-approved security. The security approval by the City consists of a review by the City Attorney for form and the City Engineer for amount, equivalent to 100 percent or more of estimated construction costs. (Site Development Div./JJD)
5. Submit any required off-site easements, executed and ready for recording, to the City after approval by the City Engineer for legal description of the area encumbered and City Attorney as to form. (Site Development Div./JJD)
6. Have obtained the Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue District Fire Marshal's approval of the site development plans as part of the City's plan review process. (Site Development Div./JJD)
7. Submit a detailed water demand analysis (fire flow calculations) in accordance with the requirements of the Fire Code as adopted by the Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue. If determined to be needed by the City Building Official, this analysis shall be supplemented by an actual flow test and evaluation by a professional engineer (meeting the standards set by the City Engineer as specified in the Engineering

Design Manual Chapter 6, 610.L). The analysis shall provide the available water volume (GPM) at 20 psi residual pressure from the fire hydrant nearest to the proposed project. (Site Development Div./JJD)

8. Submit a copy of issued permits or other approvals needed from the Tualatin Valley Water District for public water system construction, backflow prevention facilities, and service extensions. (Site Development Div./JJD)
9. Have obtained approvals needed from the Clean Water Services District for storm system connections as a part of the City's plan review process. (Site Development Div./JJD)
10. Submit plans for erosion control per 1200-CN General Permit (DEQ/CWS/City Erosion Control Joint Permit) requirements to the City. The applicant shall use the 2006 plan format per requirements for sites between 1 and 4.99 acres adopted by DEQ and Clean Water Services. (Site Development Div./JJD)
11. Provide a detailed drainage analysis of the subject site and prepare a report prepared by a professional engineer meeting the standards set by the City Engineer. The analysis shall identify all contributing drainage areas and plumbing systems on and adjacent to the site with the site development permit application. The analysis shall also delineate all areas on the site that are inundated during a 100-year storm event in addition to any mapped FEMA flood plains and flood ways. (Site Development Div./JJD)
12. Pay a storm water system development charge (overall system conveyance) for the net new impervious area proposed that is not part of a fully-improved public street. (Site Development Div./JJD) (Site Development Div./JJD)
13. Provide plans for LED street lights (Illumination levels to be evaluated per City Design Manual, Option C requirements unless otherwise approved by the City Public Works Director) for all impacted public streets. (Site Development Div./JJD)
14. Provide plans showing a City standard commercial driveway apron at the intersection of any private, common driveway and a public street. (Site Development Div./JJD)
15. Provide plans showing a minimum two-way parking lot drive-aisle width, which meets the minimum dimensional requirements of Section 60.30.15 of the Development Code. (Transportation/LP)
16. Provide plans showing a 26' wide aerial fire apparatus access parallel to the building on NW 118th Avenue. The access must be signed and marked as a fire lane. (TVF&R/JF)
17. Provide plans showing the courtyard area is within 150 feet to the fire department access roadway, measured as the hose will lie on the ground. (TVF&R/JF)
18. Provide a plan showing the lobby canopy a minimum height of 13 feet 6 inches to accommodate fire apparatus access. (TVF&R/JF)
19. Provide a plan showing no parking signage along the fire lane on the NW Cedar Falls Drive side as well as the aerial fire department access along WN 118th Avenue. (TVF&R/JF)

20. Provide a plan showing fire access apparatus turning radius of no less than 28 feet and 48 feet respectively to allow fire apparatus to enter and exit the parking lot on NW Cedar Falls. Angle of departure may not exceed 8 degrees. (TVF&R/JF)
21. Resolve design and/or conflicts with refuse disposal/recycling hauler that would preclude adequate service of refuse and recycling containers for all units of the development. (Planning Division/JF)
22. Ensure that all associated applications, including Major Adjustment, Design Review, Replat, Loading Determination and Sidewalk Design Modification have been approved and are consistent with the submitted plans. (Planning Division/JF)

B. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall:

27. Submit a complete site development permit application and obtain the issuance of site development permit from the Site Development Division. (Site Development Div./JJD)
28. Make provisions for installation of all mandated erosion control measures to achieve City inspector approval at least 24 hours prior to call for foundation footing form inspection from the Building Division. (Site Development Div./JJD)
29. Have submitted the paper copies of the draft final plat needed for City review and to the County Surveyor to begin processing. (Site Development Div./JJD)

C. Prior to final inspection of any building permit, the applicant shall:

30. Have substantially completed the site development improvements as determined by the City Engineer. (Site Development Div./JJD)
31. Have recorded the final plat in County records and submitted a recorded copy to the City. (Site Development Div./JJD)
32. Have the landscaping completely installed or provide for erosion control measures around any disturbed or exposed areas per Clean Water Services standards. (Site Development Div./JJD)
33. Have placed underground all new utility service lines within the project as determined at permit issuance. (Site Development Div./JJD)
34. Install or replace, to City specifications, all sidewalks which are missing, damaged, deteriorated, or removed by construction. (Site Development Div./JJD)
35. Have obtained a Source Control Sewage Permit from the Clean Water Services District (CWS) and submitted a copy to the City Building Official if an Industrial Sewage permit is required, as determined by CWS. (Site Development Div./JJD)
36. Have completed all proposed on-site work and all proposed street frontage improvements and public access easements in conformance with the Beaverton Engineering Design Manual, Standard Drawings and the Beaverton Development Code, including:
 - a. Sidewalk, curb and planter along NW Cedar Falls Drive and NW 117th Avenue.
 - b. Street trees installed along NW Cedar Falls Drive, NW 117th Avenue, and NW Timberview Lane.

37. Ensure all site improvements, including grading and landscaping are completed in accordance with plans marked "Exhibit A", except as modified by the decision making authority in conditions of approval. (On file at City Hall). (Planning Div./JF)
38. Ensure construction of all buildings, walls, fences and other structures are completed in accordance with the elevations and plans marked "Exhibit A", except as modified by the decision making authority in conditions of approval. (Planning Div./JF)
39. Ensure all landscaping approved by the decision making authority is installed. (Planning Div./JF)
40. Ensure all landscape areas are served by an underground landscape irrigation system. For approved xeriscape (drought-tolerant) landscape designs and for the installation of native or riparian plantings, underground irrigation is not required provided that temporary above-ground irrigation is provided for the establishment period. (Planning Div./JF)
41. Ensure that the planting of all approved deciduous trees, except for street trees or vegetation approved in the public right-of-way, has occurred. Deciduous trees shall have straight trunks and be fully branched, with a minimum caliper of 1-1/4 inches and a minimum height of 8 feet at the time of planting, except that dwarf and compact varieties may be approved at any size. Deciduous trees may be supplied bare root provided the roots are protected against damage. Each tree is to be adequately staked. (Planning Div./JF)
42. All mechanical units, roof or ground mounted, must be screened from view of public streets and adjacent properties. (Planning Div./JF)

D. Prior to release of performance security, the applicant shall:

43. Have completed the site development improvements as determined by the City Engineer and met all outstanding conditions of approval as determined by the City Engineer and Planning Director. Additionally, the applicant and professional(s) of record shall have met all obligations under the City Standard Agreement to Construct Improvements and Retain Design Professional Registered in Oregon, as determined by the City Engineer. (Site Development Div./JJD) Have recorded the final plat in County records and submitted a recorded copy to the City. (Site Development Div./JJD)

LD2014-0007 Replat One Application:

1. Prior to recording of the final plat, have commenced construction of the site development improvements to provide minimum critical public services to each proposed lot (access graded, cored and rocked; wet utilities installed) as determined by the City Engineer and to allow for verification that the location and width of proposed rights of way and easements are adequate for the completed infrastructure, per adopted City standards. (Site Development Div./JJD)
2. On the final plat show granting of any required on-site easements on the partition plat, along with plat notes as approved by the City Engineer for area encumbered and County Surveyor as to form and nomenclature. The applicant's engineer or surveyor shall verify all pre-existing and proposed easements are of sufficient width to meet current City

standards in relation to the physical location of existing site improvements. (Site Development Div./JJD)

3. Provide a 6.5 foot wide public access easement for the street trees not located within the public right of way on the final plat. (Transportation/LP)
4. Prior to building permit issuance, record a plat with Washington County for the consolidation of the two existing lots of record. (Planning/JF)

LO2014-0001 Loading Determination Application:

1. Approval of LOJ2014-0001 is subject to approval of DR2014-0055.

SDM2014-0005 Sidewalk Design Modification Application:

1. Approval of SDM2014-0005 is subject to approval of DR2014-0055.