



## MEMORANDUM

TO: Planning Commission  
FROM: Jana Fox, Associate Planner  
DATE: January 13, 2016  
SUBJECT: Hotel & Restaurant at 11325 SW Canyon Road Resubmittal Response (CU2015-0005 / DR2015-0062 / LO2015-0004 / PLA2015-0003 / SDM2015-0011 / TP2015-0007)

---

The Planning Commission continued the public hearing on this matter from the December 16, 2015 regular Planning Commission meeting. At that meeting, the Commission identified the following issues for the applicant team to address:

- Substantial information and design to show the DRBCP is feasible.
- Location of the restaurant loading berth.
- Screening of the restaurant loading berth from SW 114<sup>th</sup> Avenue, a Major Pedestrian Route.
- Lack of transparent windows along SW 114<sup>th</sup>.
- Articulation and Variety of the south and north elevations of the restaurant.
- The restaurant is a single story building along an MPR which is discouraged by the Design Guidelines.
- Lack of materials changes on the restaurant, particularly the upper portion of the south restaurant elevation.

The applicant has submitted revised materials dated December 30, 2015. The applicant's materials have addressed some of the issues identified by staff in the December 9, 2015 staff report. However, some of the issues previously identified by staff have not been addressed to a degree by which staff is able to revise their recommended findings. The following is staff's analysis of the revised materials submitted by the applicant on December 30, 2015 (attached at Exhibit 3.2) and staff's revised findings. Unless noted otherwise, staff continue to recommend the findings made in the December 9, 2015 staff report. The applicant submitted further revisions to the DRBCP plan and the site plan on January 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup>, these revisions are reflected herein to the extent possible.

### **Loading:**

The applicant provided the dimensions for the restaurant loading which show that the dimensional loading requirements for a Type B loading berth are met. Therefore, the restaurant loading is not subject to the loading determination. Staff concur with the numbers provided by the applicant that the minimum loading dimensions for the required Type B loading berth are met for the restaurant.

Additionally the applicant provided a revised site plan that shows the pedestrian connection from the hotel to the restaurant moved to the east to avoid the hotel loading space.

Staff provides the following revised findings related to the Loading Determination for the hotel use only since the Loading Determination is no longer necessary for the restaurant use.

**Section 40.50.15.1.C Loading Determination Approval Criteria:**

**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 proposed hotel building. The approximately 56,000 square foot building requires two (2) Type B loading berths per Section 60.25 (Off-Street Loading) of the Development Code. The applicant proposes no loading berths for the proposed hotel. The applicant's request to reduce the number of required loading spaces from 2 to 0 meets 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 finds 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 proposal will not create any adverse impacts given the intended use of the property.

The applicant states that with few exceptions deliveries to the hotel will occur generally 3-4 times per month per delivery type and primarily take place during off-peak hours. The applicant has provided a delivery schedule for each delivery to the site, including the frequency of delivery and size of delivery vehicle. The applicant proposes to utilize the space at the front entrance to the building for deliveries where the drive aisle widens to allow a drop-off for hotel patrons. The delivery vehicles would park along the landscape area, not blocking parking spaces. The applicant has provided plans showing a pedestrian connection outside of the proposed delivery location allowing safe pedestrian passage around delivery vehicles.

The delivery schedule provided by the applicant shows approximately 30 deliveries per month, or approximately one per day, ranging in time from 5 to 40 minutes with most deliveries in the 15 minute range. Approximately half of the proposed deliveries would occur in a UPS or FedEx truck which could, if needed, utilize a traditional parking space. This is a limited scope of time which the delivery vehicles will be on site. The location of the delivery vehicles allows cars to maneuver around the vehicle. Additionally the site allows for alternative paths of travel for vehicles.

In summary, staff concurs that vehicles can safely enter and exit the site and access the proposed loading area while avoiding conflicts with pedestrians and vehicles.

**Therefore, staff finds 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 respond to this criterion in detail. The applicant has provided plans showing a pedestrian connection around the proposed loading area which provides for safe pedestrian circulation within the site. The proposed hotel loading allows cars to traverse around a loading vehicle.

Therefore, staff finds that 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 the proposal provides adequate space for any required loading and deliveries due to the nature of the deliveries there is no need for permanent off-street loading associated with the hotel use. With the exception of food deliveries, other deliveries happen only three (3) to four (4) times per month and food deliveries happen twice a week. All deliveries can be accommodated through the front door of the hotel. Staff concurs that with an average of one delivery per day that deliveries can be accommodated through the proposed loading area in front of the main hotel entrance.

Therefore, staff finds that the criterion is met.

**Recommendation**

Based on the facts and findings presented, staff recommends **APPROVAL** of **LO2015-0004 (Hotel & Restaurant at 11325 SW Canyon Road)**. If the Commission concludes that the proposal meets the approval criteria, a list of conditions of approval have been identified at the conclusion of approval identified in Attachment H.

**Design Review**

**Design Review Build out Concept Plan (DRBCP)**

The applicant has provided additional narrative information including responses to the Design Review Principles as they relate to the proposed DRBCP. A revised DRBCP plan sheet has been provided showing a relocated pedestrian path around the DRBCP structure and additional design details. In response staff provides the following revised response to the approval criteria.

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 proposes a Design Review Build out Concept Plan (DRBCP) for the restaurant site in order to meet the minimum Floor Area Ratio (FAR). The applicant provides a site plan showing the future development of a commercial building and structured parking on plan sheet C1.1. The proposed restaurant building is 9,113 square feet on a proposed 74,108 square foot lot, providing an FAR of 0.12, the minimum FAR in the RC-E zoning district is 0.30. The applicant shows a future 2 story office building, totaling 14,400 square feet in additional floor area as well as a 3 story parking garage, which would increase the total floor area to 0.31.

Staff has reviewed the applicant's submitted materials and DRBCP revised drawings. The large sized drawing provided (C1.1) is to scale at the ratio of 1 inch equals 30 feet or 1:30. Scaling the drawing shows that the parking stalls have a depth of 18 feet when measured from the edge of the wall to the drive aisle, which is less than the required 18.5 foot depth required for parking stalls. Many of the parking spaces contain support pillars which further obstruct the required parking area, bringing the parking space depth to 17 feet. As such, the parking spaces provided in the garage are not sufficient to meet the standards of Section 60.30 of the Development Code (Off-Street Parking) and cannot be counted as required parking. The proposed drive aisle width within the parking structure is sufficient to provide two way traffic at 24 feet in width.

The revised DRBCP site plan shows a shaved off southeast corner of the parking structure to accommodate the necessary drive aisle width for two way traffic as well as fire and delivery vehicle access. The shaving off of this corner makes one parking space per floor not usable due to the removal of a portion of the parking space, which would reduce the total number of proposed parking spaces by 3. However the parking spaces do not currently meet depth standards and does not meet the standard dimensions for parking spaces under Section 60.30 of the Development Code.

The revised DRBCP plan shows elevator and stairwells to serve the parking garage areas. This area is included in the square footage calculations for the retail/office building. However from the layout provided doors to the elevator and stair area are accessible only to the parking garage and do not appear to serve the uses within the retail/office building. As the elevator and stair area only serve the parking garage this area should not be considered part of the square footage for the retail/office area. Staff recalculated the square footage of the DRBCP area. Staff found that with the removal of the elevator and stair area, as well as the proposed building stepped edges, the provided square footage is approximately 12,176 square feet. The 12,176 square feet of the retail/office building and the 9,054 square feet of the restaurant total 21,230 square feet of floor area on a 74,108 square foot site for a total FAR of 0.286 at final build-out, which is less than the required 0.3 FAR for the site.

The revised DRBCP plan shows the stairs for the parking garage exiting to the side of the building into landscape areas with no pedestrian connections to the public sidewalk or the hotel and restaurant. Pedestrians would not have a safe refuge once exiting the building or a safe way to travel to the uses on site who will be served by the parking structure.

In summary staff finds that the proposed DRBCP does not provide adequately sized parking spaces, sufficient FAR to meet the minimum standard, and safe pedestrian access to and from the parking structure to adjacent uses and the public sidewalk system. As such the DRBCP has not been shown to be realistically feasible.

**Therefore, staff finds the proposal does not meet the criterion.**

## **Design Review Guideline Analysis**

The applicant has provided a memorandum with additional Design Review findings related to the proposed restaurant, renderings and architectural elevations (Exhibit 3.2). The provided elevations and renderings are consistent with the drawings that staff used to write the Staff Report dated December 9, 2015. The applicant has provided plans showing translucent windows along SW 114<sup>th</sup> Avenue where previous drawings showed faux windows in that area. In response to the applicant's resubmittal, staff provide the following revised findings to the Design Review Guideline Analysis portion of the staff report (60.05.35.4.A Exterior Building Materials, 60.05.35.8 Ground Floor elevations on Commercial and Multiple Use Buildings, and 60.05.40.2.A and B Loading Area, Solid Waste Facilities and Similar Features).

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

### **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)*

*Hotel*

The applicant states that the exterior building materials used are a combination of colored fiber cement panels and reveals as well as a wood finish to articulate the entry points. Windows are provided as well as glazing along communal spaces. Staff concur that the proposed materials convey a sense of permanence and provide views into the interior of the building.

*Restaurant*

The applicant states that the primary exterior building veneer is cementitious materials which replicate board and batten wood siding. Roofing is standing seam galvanized metal with bronze finished aluminum copings at the parapet. Stone veneer is utilized around the base of the building and in columns on the east and west elevations to provide articulation. Windows are provided along the south and west elevations which allow view into the restaurant space. Faux windows are used around the east and north building elevations which are oriented along the main parking areas. Staff finds that the transparent windows along Major Pedestrian Route provide views into the interior, as intended by the guideline.

**Therefore, staff finds 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 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)*

*Hotel*

The applicant states that the ground floor elevation is treated with windows and glass doorway openings along pedestrian routes and the street. Staff recommends a condition of approval that the western entrance to the building be required to provide an awning for weather protection and pedestrian orientation for customers using that entrance along a Major Pedestrian Route. Staff concurs that the ground floor elevations are pedestrian oriented, subject to meeting the conditions of approval.

*Restaurant*

The applicant states that the restaurant is designed with translucent windows along the south and east elevations. Opaque windows are proposed along the western and northern elevations as this is where back of house operations and the retail portions are located. As SW 114<sup>th</sup> and SW Canyon Road are Major Pedestrian Routes and translucent windows are provided along the MPRs staff finds that the proposal does provides for adequate pedestrian orientation related to windows, display areas and glass doorway openings.

**Therefore, staff finds the Guideline is met.**

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

## **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 service, storage and similar activities to the extent possible are located in areas not visible from a public street. Outdoor waste and recycling areas are screened by enclosures constructed of a solid screen wall and similar exterior finishes to those utilized on the adjacent buildings. Outdoor transformer and utility vaults will be screened with landscape materials.

### *Hotel*

The proposed hotel loading is located in front of the hotel, and subject to a loading determination application. The proposed hotel loading is set back from the street, though visible, and located in the general area as the hotel check in/drop off area. The location of the hotel loading space is adequately set back from the public street as to avoid the appearance of loading as a predominant

### *Restaurant*

The applicant states that the loading area for the restaurant will be screened from pedestrian view by street trees and landscape trees along SW 114<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Staff has reviewed the landscape plan and finds that street trees will not provide screening for pedestrians as they will be walking on the inside of the street trees while on the sidewalk. The landscape trees provided are a deciduous tree, Green Vase Zelkova, which will be bare during the winter months and tall enough to allow views to the loading area. Ground cover and small shrubs are provided in the landscape planter island which would not be tall enough to provide visual screening for pedestrians. The proposed loading area for the restaurant is directly adjacent to the public street and is not adequately screened by landscaping, fence, or wall materials. The proposed loading area is directly adjacent to the main driveway entrance to the restaurant which is not screened from an abutting street and is highly visible along SW 114<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

**Therefore, staff finds the Guideline is not 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)*

### *Hotel*

The proposed hotel loading is located in front of the hotel, and subject to a loading determination application. The proposed hotel loading is set back from the street, though visible, and located in the general area as the hotel check in/drop off area. The location of the hotel loading space is adequately set back from the public street as to avoid the appearance of loading as a predominant feature.

### *Restaurant*

The applicant states that the loading area for the restaurant will be screened from pedestrian view by street trees and landscape trees along SW 114<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Staff has reviewed the landscape plan and finds that street trees will not provide screening for pedestrians as they will be walking on the inside of the street trees while on the sidewalk. The landscape trees provided are a deciduous tree, Green Vase Zelkova, which will be bare during the winter months and tall enough

to allow views under branches to the loading area that is intended to be screened from view. Ground cover and small shrubs are provided in the landscape planter island which would not be tall enough to provide visual screening for pedestrians. The proposed loading area for the restaurant is directly adjacent to the public street and is not adequately screened by landscaping, fence, or wall materials. The proposed loading area is directly adjacent to the main driveway entrance to the restaurant which is not screened from an abutting street and is highly visible along SW 114<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

**Therefore, staff finds the Guideline is not met.**

In the December 9, 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 & Variety), 60.05.35.1.E (Undifferentiated Blank Walls), and 60.05.35.7.A and B (Building Scale along Major Pedestrian Routes) have been met. The supplemental materials provided by the applicant do not contain revisions to cause staff to alter their prior recommended findings. As staff cannot make affirmative findings on these listed Design Guidelines and Design Review Build out Concept Plan (DRBCP), staff recommends Denial of the Design Review Three application (DR2015-0062).

### **Exhibits**

- Exhibit 2.2**      Email from George Hohnstein, dated January 11, 2015
  
- Exhibit 3.2**      Applicant Materials Submitted December 30, 2015
  
- Exhibit 3.3**      Applicant Materials Submitted January 12 1016 and January 13, 2016