



MEMORANDUM

TO: Planning Commission

FROM: Jana Fox, Associate Planner; Steve Regner, Associate Planner

DATE: May 25, 2016

SUBJECT: Cedar Hills Crossing II Resubmittal Response (CU2015-0012 / CU2015-0013 / DR2015-0121 / LD2015-0025 / LO2016-0001)

The Planning Commission continued the public hearing on this matter from the April 27, 2016 regular Planning Commission meeting. Staff identified the following issues that led to a recommendation of denial:

- Lack of pedestrian connections from SW Cedar Hills Boulevard and SW Jenkins Road.
- Lack of articulation and variety of the west elevation of Building 1, and the south and west elevations of Building 15.
- Lack of variety in roof forms.
- Lack of emphasis of primary building entrances for second story tenants in Building 1.
- Limited building frontage along SW Jenkins Road, resulting in parking and landscaping as a prominent feature along a public street.
- Excessive use of running bond masonry on Building 1 and Building 15.

Additionally, at the public hearing, the Commission identified the following issues for the applicant team to address:

- Insufficient landscape screening along the west property line.
- Loading and trash enclosures along west edge of the property, especially late night use of these facilities.
- Use of cables along the façades of parking structure as opposed to walls to block vehicle headlights in the structure.
- Trash enclosure located adjacent to SW Jenkins Road.

The applicant has submitted revised materials dated May 23, 2016 (Exhibit 3.2). The applicant's materials address the above listed items. The analysis below is in response to the additional information provided by the applicant and in response to discussions at the April 27, 2016 Planning Commission hearing. Revised findings are provided below.

Facilities Review

The applicant has provided a revised site plan, Sheet C2.0, showing two additional pedestrian connections from Cedar Hills Boulevard, one at the southern end of Existing Retail Building 2, and one at the northern end of Existing Retail Building 2. Additionally, the applicant has revised the pedestrian walkway linking Proposed Building 15 to Proposed Building 1, creating more a direct route.

Staff provides the following revised findings related to Facilities Review Criteria F.

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

The on-site circulation system provides three new pedestrian pathways from SW Cedar Hills Boulevard, and three new pedestrian pathways from SW Jenkins Road. While Buildings 1 and 2 are centrally located on site, the pedestrian paths provide direct links to the buildings from the public streets. Where pedestrian paths cross vehicle drive aisles, concrete is proposed to delineate the crossing. Furthermore, the applicant proposes to construct a striped, at grade asphalt path to connect the redevelopment area to SW Walker Road. This will function as a temporary pedestrian connection until future phases are constructed. The proposed vehicular and pedestrian connections provide safe and efficient circulation patterns.

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

Conditional Use CU2015-0012

Staff found that the applicant's original proposal did not meet the Facilities Review Criteria F, as such, staff was unable to recommend approval for the Conditional Use Permit request to operate a Medical Clinic in the Community Service Zone. The applicant's revised submittal has provided additional pedestrian connections, as described above, which has resulted in revised staff findings for Facilities Review Criteria F. In response staff provides the following revised response to the Conditional Use approval criteria.

Section 40.03.1 Facilities Review Approval Criteria:

The applicant for development must establish that the application complies with all relevant standards in conformance with Section 50.25.1.B and all the following criteria have been met:

Facilities Review Approval Criteria Section 40.03.1.A-L

Staff has reviewed the applicable Facilities Review criteria in Attachment A to this report. Staff cites the findings presented in Attachment A in response to the Facilities Review approval criteria. As identified in Attachment A, above, the proposal meets Criteria A-L, and therefore meets the criterion for approval.

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

Recommendation

Based on the facts and findings presented, staff recommends **APPROVAL** of **CU2015-0012 (Cedar Hills Crossing II Partial Redevelopment)**. Should the Planning Commission find that the application meets the approval criteria, staff has recommended conditions of approval in Attachment G.

Conditional Use CU2015-0013

Staff found that the applicant's original proposal did not meet the Facilities Review Criteria F, as such, staff was unable to recommend approval for the Conditional Use Permit request for extended hours of operation for several tenant spaces. The applicant's revised submittal has provided additional pedestrian connections, as described above, which has resulted in revised staff findings for Facilities Review Criteria F. In response staff provides the following revised response to the Conditional Use approval criteria.

Section 40.03.1 Facilities Review Approval Criteria:

The applicant for development must establish that the application complies with all relevant standards in conformance with Section 50.25.1.B and all the following criteria have been met:

Facilities Review Approval Criteria Section 40.03.1.A-L

Staff has reviewed the applicable Facilities Review criteria in Attachment A to this report. Staff cites the findings presented in Attachment A in response to the Facilities Review approval criteria. As identified in Attachment A, above, the proposal meets Criteria A-L, and therefore meets the criterion for approval.

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

Recommendation

Based on the facts and findings presented, staff recommends **APPROVAL** of **CU2015-0013 (Cedar Hills Crossing II Partial Redevelopment)**. Should the Planning Commission find that the application meets the approval criteria, staff has recommended conditions of approval in Attachment G.

Land Division LD2015-0025

Staff found that the applicant's original proposal did not meet the Facilities Review Criteria F, as such, staff was unable to recommend approval for the Land Division. The applicant's revised submittal has provided additional pedestrian connections, as described above, which has resulted in revised staff findings for Facilities Review Criteria F. In response staff provides the following revised response to the Land Division approval criteria.

Section 40.03.1 Facilities Review Approval Criteria:

The applicant for development must establish that the application complies with all relevant standards in conformance with Section 50.25.1.B and all the following criteria have been met:

Facilities Review Approval Criteria Section 40.03.1.A-L

Staff has reviewed the applicable Facilities Review criteria in Attachment A to this report. Staff cites the findings presented in Attachment A in response to the Facilities Review approval criteria. As identified in Attachment A, above, the proposal meets Criteria A-L, and therefore meets the criterion for approval.

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

Recommendation

Based on the facts and findings presented, staff recommends **APPROVAL** of **LD2015-0025 (Cedar Hills Crossing II Partial Redevelopment)**. Should the Planning Commission find that the application meets the approval criteria, staff has recommended conditions of approval in Attachment G.

Loading Determination LD2016-0001

Staff found that the applicant's original proposal did not meet the approval criteria 4, as such, staff was unable to recommend approval for the Loading Determination. The applicant's revised submittal has provided additional pedestrian connections, as described above, which has resulted in revised staff findings for approval criteria 4. In addition staff provided revised findings in response to Planning Commission discussion related to loading hours. In response staff provides the following revised response to the Loading Determination approval criteria.

Section 40.50.15.1.C Loading Determination Approval Criteria:

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 medical clinic and retail uses in proposed Building 1 will operate between 7 a.m. and 10 p.m. The recreational facility, bowling alley, and restaurant in Building 1 will operate before 7 a.m. and/or after 10 p.m. A Conditional Use for hours of operation has been applied for and is under consideration concurrently with this application. Loading for the retail uses in Building 1 will occur via small trucks and delivered through the front door of the business. The applicant contends that small delivery trucks can fit within standard parking spaces. The applicant has provided revised narrative findings which propose the loading berth west of Building 1 only be utilized for loading only between the hours of 8:00 am and 5:00 pm. Staff concurs that the proposed loading hours are reasonable to minimize disruptions to the adjacent residential uses. Staff recommends a condition of approval that signage limiting the hours of loading be installed prior to occupancy.

Building 15 is a proposed restaurant which will provide loading during non-peak hours within standard parking spaces. The proposed restaurant is under 7,000 square feet in area and the applicant contends can be served adequately with the proposed loading in standard parking spaces.

The applicant states that while loading is provided along the west property line, which is adjacent to residentially zoned property. The applicant provides a vegetated buffer between the residential property and the development which screens the loading area. The proposed loading area is screened from adjacent residential uses. Staff recommend a condition of approval that the pedestrian path along the west end of Building 1 be continued to the parking area to provide safe loading and unloading of vehicles outside of the drive aisle.

Staff concurs that given the unit makeup of the facility the proposed loading spaces can adequately serve the proposed development without adverse impacts.

Therefore, staff finds that, by meeting the conditions of approval 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 Criteria F which respond to this criterion in detail. Staff finds that the application provides safe and efficient vehicular and pedestrian circulation patterns.

Therefore, staff finds that the proposal meets the criterion.

Recommendation

Based on the facts and findings presented, staff recommends **APPROVAL** of **LO2016-001 (Cedar Hills Crossing II Partial Redevelopment)**. Should the Planning Commission find that the application meets the approval criteria, staff has recommended conditions of approval in Attachment G and this memorandum.

Revised Condition of Approval for LO2016-0001:

2. Prior to occupancy the applicant shall provide temporary loading zone signage to the 10 parking spaces west of Building 1 which limit the loading, including waste removal, to between the hours of 8:00 am and 5:00 pm. (Planning/JF & SR)

Design Review DR2015-0121

Staff found that the applicant's original proposal did not meet several Design Review Guidelines relating to building articulation and building location, nor did the proposal meet Facilities Review Criteria F relating to on-site circulation. As such, staff recommended Denial of the Design Review request. The applicant's revised submittal has provided elevations showing additional building articulation, drive aisle a farmer's market structure along SW Jenkins Boulevard, and additional pedestrian connections. In response staff provides the following revised responses to the Design Review approval criteria and Design Guidelines.

Section 40.03.1 Facilities Review Approval Criteria:

The applicant for development must establish that the application complies with all relevant standards in conformance with Section 50.25.1.B and all the following criteria have been met:

Facilities Review Approval Criteria Section 40.03.1.A-L

Staff has reviewed the applicable Facilities Review criteria in Attachment A to this report. Staff cites the findings presented in Attachment A in response to the Facilities Review approval criteria. As identified in Attachment A, above, the proposal meets Criteria A-L, and therefore meets the criterion for approval.

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

Section 40.20.15.3.C Design Review Approval Criteria:

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 below. Staff has no recommendation on the following design guidelines: 60.05.35.2.A (Roof Forms), 60.05.35.3.B (Primary Entrances), 60.05.35.4.B (Running Bond Discouraged), and 60.05.35.63A (Location Along Streets). The Commission should evaluate the merit of the applicant's proposal as it relates to these Guidelines.

Staff has no recommendation.

60.05.35 Building Design and Orientation Guidelines.

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)*

Building 1 (Multi-tenant)

The applicant states that the elevations are pedestrian in nature, the south and east elevations are given visual interest and articulation with materials and color changes, plane offsets at pilasters and columns, glazed storefronts, steel headers, decorative concrete wall bases and sills, projecting canopies, and massing and parapet height variations. The applicant states that the west and north elevations use landscaping to provide visual interest in addition to architectural features. Staff concurs that the south and east elevations provide varied architectural treatments. The north elevation is generally outside the public view and located between the parking structure and Building 1, which are in close proximity. The applicant has provided revised west elevations which show the use of trellis wall panels in which Star Jasmine plants are proposed to provide architectural interest to the residential properties to the west. Staff find that Building 1 provides sufficient articulation and variety to meet the guideline.

Building 15 (Restaurant)

The applicant states that Building 15 is highly articulated through material changes, storefront windows, massing changes, canopies and a pitched roof exposing timber framing. The applicant has provided revised plans showing increased articulation and materials changes for Building 15, staff concurs with the applicant that Building 15 provides sufficient articulation and variety to meet the guideline. Staff concur that the east, north and a portion of the south elevation are adequately architecturally treated.

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)*

Building 15 (Restaurant)

The applicant states that the outdoor seating terrace at the east end of the building abuts the public sidewalk and is intended to activate the internal entrance from SW Jenkins Road. The north elevation, which contains the primary entrance also contains awnings to provide pedestrian cover. The south and west elevations incorporate murals, windows, and materials changes are visually interesting for pedestrians. Staff concurs that the building promotes a comfortable pedestrian scale.

Therefore, by meeting the conditions of approval, staff finds 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)*

Building 15 (Restaurant)

The applicant states that design features include an exterior fireplace, a gabled roof, a sheltering canopy, a variety of materials and masses as well as murals and a glazed storefront system. Staff concurs that all elevations are adequately emphasized.

Therefore, by meeting the conditions of approval, staff finds 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)*

Building 1 (Multi-tenant)

The applicant has provided additional narrative findings that state that the south elevation of Building 1 is visually separated into five distinct areas using materials, color, articulation, and height variations with modulation to provide the variety and detail intended. The applicant has not proposed any changes to the roof forms, with the exception of the addition of recessed soldier coursing at the parapet which will provide some shadow and visual interest to the parapet. As such, the Planning Commission should evaluate whether the proposed roof forms comply with the Guideline.

Staff has no recommendation.

3. Primary building entrances

- 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)*

Building 1 (Multi-tenant)

The applicant provides additional narrative findings that state that the second level entrances of Building 1 are directly accessible from the second level of the parking structure which is efficient and convenient for the medical clinic and office suites on the second floor. Additionally the applicant states that the majority of clients will arrive by vehicle on the second floor of the parking structure but careful and thorough wayfinding signs will be provided throughout the project and at major intersections to ensure visitors who arrive by foot can find the clinic via the stairs and elevator. The second floor entrances are not clearly delineated or visible to those entering the site from the north, south or east who may see signs for businesses but no clear path to the businesses. The applicant has stated that wayfinding will be provided in order to direct pedestrians to these tenant spaces. As such, the Planning Commission should evaluate whether the proposed primary building entrances comply with the Guideline.

Staff has no recommendation.

4. Exterior Building Materials

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)

Building 1 (Multi-tenant) & Building 15 (Restaurant)

The applicant provides additional narrative findings which state that brick soldier coursing which define the building parapets are recessed slightly to create a shadow line. The applicant points out that Norman sized bricks are longer than traditional bricks which create a more horizontal linear appearance than traditional brick. The applicant also points out that large areas of brick are intentionally left in order to allow for murals. Staff notes that outside the mural areas brick in running bond pattern is used in the majority of areas as a primary exterior finish without many changes to the running bond pattern, except at the parapet and around the windows where soldier coursing is proposed. As such, the Planning Commission should evaluate whether the proposed exterior building materials comply with the Guideline.

Staff has no recommendation.

6. Building Location and Orientation in Commercial and Multiple Use Zones.

A. Buildings should be oriented toward 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 applicant has provided revised narratives and plans addressing this Guideline. The revised plans show angled parking along the private drive aisle the applicant refers to as Charles Bernard Drive adjacent to Building 1. The applicant also provides plans for a covered open market structure along SW Jenkins Road to provide architecture along the street.

The applicant contends that the addition of angled parking in lieu of 90 degree parking along Charles Bernard Drive ensures that the drive functions as a public street and therefore the building is oriented along a drive that functions as a public street. Staff is concerned that the drive aisle is not a public street as intended by the guideline. If Charles Bernard Drive were a public street Building 1 would be oriented toward a public street.

Additionally, the applicant provides plans showing an open sided covered structure referred to as a market area along SW Jenkins Road in order to bring architecture to the public street frontage. While the structures are well designed, the parking fields and landscaping are still predominant features that can be viewed through the open air structure, particularly when it is not in use. The applicant notes that if the market structure is included in street frontage coverage would be 39% which would meet the Design Standard of 35%. Staff notes that open air structures are not counted in street frontage calculations as they do not contain floor

area. As such, the Planning Commission should evaluate whether the proposed building locations comply with the Guideline.

Staff has no recommendation.

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

- A. *Excluding residential only development, ground floor building elevations should be pedestrian oriented and treated with windows, display areas or glass doorway openings to the extent possible and where appropriate to the design and use of the building. This guideline particularly applies to ground floor building elevations situated along Major Pedestrian Routes. (Standard 60.05.15.8.A)*

Building 15 (Restaurant)

The applicant states that the glazed area of the building is appropriate to its use as a restaurant. The south elevation along SW Jenkins Road has several murals and windows to break up the running bond masonry. Staff concurs that the ground floor elevations are pedestrian oriented and treated with windows and display areas.

Therefore, staff finds the Guideline is met.

60.05.50 Lighting Design Guidelines

1. ***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 lighting is provided in all required areas of the site. The lighting plan shows areas of light shed over 0.5 at the property lines to the west. Staff recommends a condition of approval that prior to Site Development permit issuance the applicant provide a revised lighting plan showing compliance with the Technical Lighting Standards. Additionally the applicant has provided conflicting plans, some of which show solid screening to block headlight glare on the parking structure, on others the solid screening is not provided. Staff recommends a condition of approval that solid screening be provided around each level of the parking garage to ensure that headlights do not shine into adjacent properties or portions of the site. In order to reduce the glare of the pole mounted luminaries on the top of the parking structure which are a significant height above the adjacent residential properties staff recommends a condition of approval all lights on the roof of the parking structure be set back a minimum of 18.5 feet from the external walls of the structure.

Therefore, staff finds that by meeting the conditions of approval the Guideline is met.

Summary

In the April 20, 2015 staff report for the Design Review application, staff provided recommended findings for denial on the application's failure to provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate that Design Guidelines 60.05.35.1.B (Articulation and Variety), 60.05.35.1.D (Pedestrian Orientation), 60.05.35.1.E (Undifferentiated Blank Walls), 60.05.35.2.A (Roof Forms), 60.05.35.3.B (Primary Entrances), 60.05.35.4.B (Running Bond Discouraged), 60.05.35.63A (Location Along Streets), and 60.05.35.8.A (Glazing on Ground Floors) have been met. The applicant provided supplemental materials, including revised drawings and narrative responses on May 23, 2016. In review of the revised materials staff finds

that the proposal now meets the following Design Guidelines, 60.05.35.1.B (Articulation and Variety), 60.05.35.1.D (Pedestrian Orientation), 60.05.35.1.E (Undifferentiated Blank Walls), and 60.05.35.8.A (Glazing on Ground Floors). Staff has no recommendation on the following Design Guidelines, 60.05.35.2.A (Roof Forms), 60.05.35.3.B (Primary Entrances), 60.05.35.4.B (Running Bond Discouraged), and 60.05.35.63A (Location Along Streets).

Recommendation

Based on the facts and findings presented, staff has **NO RECOMMENDATION** on **DR2015-0121 (Cedar Hills Crossing II Partial Redevelopment)**. Should the Planning Commission find that the application meets the approval criteria, staff has recommended conditions of approval in Attachment G and this memorandum.

Additional Conditions of Approval for DR2015-0121

- Hours of operation for trash compaction on the site shall be limited to between the hours of 7:00 am and 10:00 pm. (Planning/JF & SR)

Prior to Site Development Permit Issuance:

- Provide a plan showing that solid screening for headlights is provided around the exterior of each floor of the parking structure. (Planning/JF & SR)
- Provide a plan showing all lights on the parking deck of the roof of the parking structure set back no less than 18.5 feet from the external walls of the building. (Planning/JF & SR)

Exhibits

Exhibit 3.2 Applicant Materials Submitted May 23, 2016