



MEMORANDUM

City of Beaverton

Community Development Department

To: Interested Parties
From: City of Beaverton Planning Division
Date: March 14, 2018

Subject: *Notice of Decision for The Ridge Large Lot Subdivision*

Please find attached the notice of decision for **LD2017-0023 (The Ridge Large Lot Subdivision)**. Pursuant to Section 50.40.11.E of the Beaverton Development Code, the decision for LD2017-0023 (The Ridge Large Lot Subdivision) is final, unless appealed within twelve (12) calendar days following the date of the decision. The procedures for appeal of a Type 2 Decision are specified in Section 50.65 of the Beaverton Development Code. The appeal shall include the following in order for it to be accepted by the Director:

- The case file number designated by the City.
- The name and signature of each appellant.
- Reference to the written evidence provided to the decision making authority by the appellant that is contrary to the decision.
- If multiple people sign and file a single appeal, the appeal shall include verifiable evidence that each appellant provided written testimony to the decision making authority and that the decision being appealed was contrary to such testimony. The appeal shall designate one person as the contact representative for all pre-appeal hearing contact with the City. All contact with the City regarding the appeal, including notice, shall be through this contact representative.
- The specific approval criteria, condition, or both being appealed, the reasons why a finding, condition, or both is in error as a matter of fact, law or both, and the evidence relied on to allege the error.
- The appeal fee of \$250.00, as established by resolution of the City Council.

The appeal closing date for LD2017-0023 (The Ridge Large Lot Subdivision) is 4:30 p.m. Monday, March 26, 2018.

The complete case files including findings, conclusions, and conditions of approval, if any, are available for review. The case files may be reviewed at the Beaverton Planning Division, Community Development Department, 4th Floor, Beaverton Building/City Hall; 12725 SW Millikan Way between 7:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except holidays. For more information about the case file, please contact Jana Fox, at (503) 526-3710.



NOTICE OF DECISION

DECISION DATE: March 14, 2018

TO: All Interested Parties

FROM: Jana Fox, Senior Planner

PROPOSAL: **LD2017-0023 (The Ridge Large Lot Subdivision)**

LOCATION: North side of SW Scholls Ferry Road, east of SW Tile Flat Road and west of SW 175th Avenue. Tax Lots 500 and 600 on Washington County Tax Assessor's Map 2S1-06. Addressed as 18185 and 18407 SW Scholls Ferry Road.

SUMMARY: A five lot subdivision for the purpose of land acquisition and conveyance that creates a network of public utility and access easements, consistent with the location of roads and utilities identified as part of The Ridge Planned Unit Development (PUD) approved by the City on July 13, 2017 (case files identified herein).

APPLICANT/
REPRESENTATIVE: West Hills Development / Otak, Inc.
735 SW 158th Avenue 800 SW Third Avenue, Suite 300
Beaverton, OR 97006 Portland, OR 97204

PROPERTY OWNERS: Lolich Family Farms, LLC Brian and Kathleen Bellairs
11338 SW Cottonwood Ln. 18185 SW Scholls Ferry Road
Tigard, OR 97223 Beaverton, OR 97006

APPLICABLE
CRITERIA: Beaverton Development Code Section 40.03 (Facilities Review) and Section 40.45.15.5.C (Preliminary Subdivision)

ZONING: Urban High Density (R-1), Medium Density (R-2 and R-4) and City Urban Standard Density (R-5 and R-7)

NEIGHBORHOOD: Neighbors Southwest

RECOMMENDATIONS: **APPROVAL of LD2017-0023 (The Ridge Large Lot Subdivision)** subject to conditions identified at the end of this report.

VICINITY MAP / AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH



BACKGROUND FACTS

Key Application Dates

<u>Application</u>	<u>Submittal Date</u>	<u>Deemed Complete</u>	<u>120-Day*</u>	<u>365-Day**</u>
LD2017-0023	October 30, 2017	November 22, 2017	June 20, 2018	November 22, 2018

* With 90 day continuance granted

** 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	Urban High Density (R-1), Medium Density (R-2 and R-4) and City Urban Standard Density (R-5 and R-7)
Current Development	Both properties identified herein are currently developed with detached single family dwellings. Subject properties are also recognized under past land use approval for The Ridge PUD at South Cooper Mountain.
Approved Development	<p>The Ridge is a two phased PUD located in the South Cooper Mountain Community Plan Area (SCMCP). These land use case files are associated with The Ridge: CPA2017-0002, ZMA2017-0002, LD2017-0002, CU2017-0003, DR2017-0010, TP2017-0005 and DR2017-0075. The first phase of the PUD would create 111 residential lots that will range in size from 1,155 square feet to 6,489 square feet, intended for both single-family detached and attached homes. Of the 111 lots to be created in the first phase, 81 are intended for detached single-family homes and 29 are intended for attached single-family homes (townhomes).</p> <p>The first phase of development would also create one large lot for future multi-family residential development and extend necessary utilities (primarily sanitary sewer) through this lot. As part of the first phase, the applicant is to construct the entirety of all public streets internal to the development site. Street improvements of the first phase include a portion of the planned east-west Collector street identified by SCMCP Street Framework plan and construction of $\frac{3}{4}$ improvements necessary for the north-south Neighborhood Route identified by SCMCP Street Framework plan (currently named SW Strobel Road). An interim street frontage improvement to SW Scholls Ferry Road has been approved and is to be completed as part of Phase 1 construction. Phase 2 consists of two multi-family apartment buildings that will provide a total of 119 dwelling units and other improvements internal to Phase 2.</p>

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION AND TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE No.</u>
Attachment A: Facilities Review Committee Technical Review and Recommendation Report	FR 1-9
Attachment B: LD2017-0023 – Preliminary Subdivision	LD 1-5
Attachment C: Conditions of Approval	COA 1-2

Exhibit 1. Vicinity/Zoning Map

Exhibit 2. Signed Covenant between the City, Property Owners, and Developer

Exhibit 3. Applicant's Materials

Agency Comments

No agency comments received.

Public Comments

No public comments received.

**FACILITIES REVIEW COMMITTEE
TECHNICAL REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS
The Ridge at South Cooper Mountain – Large Lot Subdivision
LD2017-0023**

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.

Criteria contained in Section 40.03.1 (A through L) are applicable in review of the Preliminary Subdivision application. The applicant's response to the Facilities Review criteria are found in the narrative prepared by Otak, Inc., dated October 30, 2017, pages 3 through 8. The Committee incorporates the applicant's written response as findings in support of these criteria. Additional facts and findings are provided herein.

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.

Findings of Fact: Chapter 90 of the Development Code defines "critical facilities" to be services that include public water, public sanitary sewer, storm water drainage, storm water treatment and detention, transportation, and fire protection. The document prepared by applicant's representative provides a summary description of all critical facilities and services related to The Ridge at South Cooper Mountain, a Planned Unit Development (PUD) that received approval by the city on July 3, 2017. Staff acknowledges the facts, findings, conclusion and conditions of approval identified in Planning Commission Order No. 2542 for CU 2017-0003 to be relevant and applicable to this large lot subdivision proposal.

In response to Criterion A, the applicant's narrative identifies all critical facilities associated with PUD approval, identified as part of the facts, findings and conclusions adopted by the Planning Commission Order. For this large lot subdivision proposal, the applicant proposes to create five lots. The five lot proposal is expected to create a network of public utility and access easements, consistent with the location of roads and utilities that were identified as part of the PUD as approved in the Order. The five lot subdivision proposal does not involve physical development of or construction on the subject properties.

As the applicant's narrative explains, if the subject property is not ultimately developed per the PUD approval, the access and utilities easements granted to the city as part of this large lot subdivision will still allow the construction of critical utility and transportation facilities. These easements are intended to enable the city or its agents to extend services across the site, consistent within the adopted South Cooper

Mountain Community Plan (SCMCP). The applicant also explains how the city is to become the beneficiary of these easements. The applicant's narrative response to Criterion A explains that the large lot proposal will dedicate 48 feet of property along the street frontage of SW Scholls Ferry Road, which will allow for construction of this street to its full cross-section as planned. In providing these necessary easements and dedications, the applicant notes that this large lot subdivision does not preclude future development of the site itself or of properties outside the large lot subdivision.

In response to Criterion A, staff finds the applicant's easement proposal to be consistent with the location of utilities, streets and other infrastructure where shown on the plans approved for The Ridge PUD at South Cooper Mountain, city cases files LD2017-0002, DR2017-0010, CU2017-0003 and TP2017-0005. Staff also finds the applicant's easement proposal to be consistent with the location of utilities, streets and other infrastructure on the multi-family residential development approved for Phase 2 of The Ridge, case file DR2017-0075.

The proposed large lot subdivision application is inclusive of the area that received PUD approval minus the flag portion of the property to the immediate west, identified as Tax Lot 301 of Map 2S1-06. This review of this large lot subdivision proposal is premised on the following:

1. That the location of all infrastructure and the sequence of development specified in the previous land use approvals are not subject to change, and
2. That no changes are proposed to construction scope, use, number of lots, density or type of structures as approved.

In review of the scope work identified for the large lot subdivision proposal, and in applying the premises stated above, the city has determine that modification of the PUD approval is not required, subject to conditions of approval as identified herein. The conditions of any large lot subdivision approval will be primarily focused on the easement and covenant documents that the applicant would record as part of Final Plat approval.

The covenant is intended to address the possibility that the PUD and concurrent approvals would expire and, without the covenant, the large lots identified as part of this subdivision could be developed separately or sold into separate ownership and then developed separately. If this were to happen, certain lots of the large lot proposal would fall below the ten-acre minimum threshold required for PUD development in the SCMCP (40.15.15.4.A.4). Staff is concerned that the City would then be unable to require development of the Phase 1 area consistent with the SCMCP. Staff wishes to make certain that after the large lot subdivision the subject property will be developed consistent with the approved use, number of lots and density specified by the PUD approval and the SCMCP. Staff wishes to make certain that the infrastructure specified in The Ridge PUD approval, including location, scope and sequence (phases), will be built as contemplated by the approval. Staff also wants to make certain that the terms and conditions of the PUD approval will bind subsequent lot owners. In short, by granting permission for a large parcel subdivision, the City does not intend to permit development of PUDs smaller than the Phase 1 area even if The Ridge PUD approval expires.

To address these concerns, a covenant between the city and applicant will run with title of the land and remain binding if the PUD approval expires. The covenant must be recorded prior to recording the large lot subdivision plat. Essential components of this covenant include:

- A provision where the applicant agrees to develop the property consistent with the use, number of lots, scope, density, structure type, location of infrastructure and sequence of development identified in the reports and plans included as part of the record for CU2017-0003, consistent with conditions of approval stated in The Ridge PUD approval, Planning Commission Order No. 2542, and the additional, related approvals listed above.
- A provision where the applicant agrees that, should The Ridge PUD expire, all of the parcels in Phase 1 will be developed together as one PUD, and no lot or tract created by the large-parcel subdivision within the area recognized as Phase 1 will be sold to separate parties.
- A provision that discloses the extent of improvements expected in Phase 1 to the future owner of the multi-family parcel (Phase 2). The same provision is to disclose specific conditions that pertain to development of Phase 2, as specified in Planning Commission Order No. 2557 for case file DR2017-0075.

In summary, the Committee finds that critical facilities and services related to development can be constructed with the large lot subdivision place in concert with easement and covenant documents as directed. With these conditions, the Committee finds in support of Criterion A.

Therefore, the Committee finds that by meeting the conditions of approval, 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 (5) years of occupancy.

Findings of Fact: Chapter 90 of the Development Code defines “essential facilities” to be services that shall include schools, transit improvements, police protection, and pedestrian and bicycle facilities in the public right-of-way.

According to the applicant, essential facilities and services are either in place or will be at the time of completion of development. The applicant explains how the site will be served by the Beaverton Police Department. The applicant also identifies public schools in the vicinity and notes that the Beaverton School District has acknowledged The Ridge development plan in their letter dated January 27, 2017, which is part of the PUD record. The applicant also provides an overview of pedestrian and bicycle facilities that will be constructed as part of The Ridge development plan.

As stated in response to Criterion A, the five lot subdivision proposal is expected to create a network of public utility and access easements, consistent with the location

of roads and utilities that were identified as part of the PUD as approved by the city. The five lot subdivision proposal does not involve physical development or construction of the subject properties.

In this case, the proposed large lot subdivision application is inclusive of the area that received previous land use approval for a PUD that remains effective. The large lot subdivision is reviewed with the understanding that all required infrastructure and the sequence of development identified under previous land use approval are not subject to change and that no changes are proposed to construction scope, use, number of lots, density or type of structures as approved.

Where Criterion B identifies pedestrian and bicycle facilities in the public right-of-way, staff finds that these future improvements have been identified and addressed as part the PUD application and are expected to be constructed in the sequence of development identified under previous land use approval, and are not subject to change. In part, easements to be created as part of this large lot proposal are to incorporate the amount of space necessary to provide future pedestrian and bicycle facilities. With the condition referred to above in response to Criterion A (recording access and utility easements) the Committee finds that the proposed development will provide required essential facilities.

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 application; provided, however, if the approval of the proposed development is contingent upon one or more additional applications, and the same is not approved, then the proposed development must comply with all provisions of Chapter 20 (Land Uses).***

Findings of Fact: According to the applicant, the proposed development is consistent will all applicable provisions of Chapter 20, with specific reference to Section III of Otak narrative.

As stated herein, no changes are proposed to construction scope, use, number of lots, density or type of structures as approved for The Ridge PUD. Conditions of this large lot subdivision proposal refer to a covenant that is to be made between the developer and city. The covenant is to be recorded prior to city signing the final land plat. Key to this covenant is the understanding that all conditions of PUD approval will continue to apply without modification to the same property. If applicant seeks any modification to the application presented at the time of this approvals, including any easements to be provided, applicant is to apply for a modification of PUD approval. In that event, the proposed modification is to be evaluated against applicable provisions of Chapter 20, consistent with procedures set forth in the Beaverton Development Code.

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 proposed development.***

Findings of Fact: According to the applicant, no development is proposed with this application and many provisions of Chapter 60 are not applicable. The applicant refers to the response provided to certain provisions of Chapter 60 in Section V of Otak narrative. Staff acknowledges the applicant's large lot subdivision proposal to show easements intended to protect significant natural resources identified on the subject property. Natural resource protection was evaluated as part of PUD approval for supportive findings in response to Section 60.67 of Chapter 60, Significant Natural Resources.

As explained herein, a covenant is to be made between the developer and city. The covenant is to be recorded prior to city signing the final land plat. Key to this covenant is the understanding that all conditions of PUD approval will continue to apply without modification to the same property. If the applicant seeks any modification to the application presented at the time of this approvals, including any easements to be provided, applicant must apply for a modification of the PUD approval where the modification is evaluated against applicable provisions of Chapter 60. This modification application would be brought forward to the Planning Commission, consistent with procedures set forth in the Beaverton Development Code.

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.***

Findings of Fact: The applicant's narrative response to Criterion E explains how the large lot subdivision does not include a proposal for development and does not propose construction of the above facilities. Staff acknowledge the scope of review in this case. Staff also refer to and incorporate the findings stated above in response to Criteria A through D. With no construction of private common facilities, staff has determined that Criterion E is not applicable.

Therefore, the Committee finds the criterion of approval to be not applicable.

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

Findings of Fact: The applicant's narrative response to Criterion F explains how the large lot subdivision does not include an internal circulation system (for construction). The applicant also refers to access easements that will be provided for future location of streets of necessary circulation, including Collect Road 8B and the future Strobel Road. In review of Criterion F, staff incorporates the findings as stated in response to Criteria A through D.

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.

Findings of Fact: Similar to the statement providing in response to Criterion F, the applicant's narrative response to Criterion G explains that the large lot subdivision does not include an internal circulation system (for construction). The applicant also refers to access easements that will be provided for future location of streets of necessary circulation, including Collect Road 8B and the future Strobel Road. In review of Criterion F, staff incorporates the findings as stated in response to Criteria A through D.

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.

Findings of Fact: According to the applicant, specific details regarding fire flow and hydrant placement will be reviewed by the Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue District (TVF&R) during site development and building permit stage. Staff concurs. Staff also notes that the associated PUD application has been evaluated against the same criterion. In part, easements to be recorded with this subdivision will include an emergency vehicle access easement that will benefit the city and TVF&R for future access. In review of Criterion H, staff incorporates the findings as stated in response to Criteria A through D.

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.

Findings of Fact: According to the applicant, all streets and public facilities will be designed to Engineering Design Manual (EDM) standards. In review of Criterion I, staff incorporates the findings as stated in response to Criteria A through D.

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.

Findings of Fact: The applicant's response to Criterion J that applicant explains how the approved grading plan, via separate approval, meets the grading standards of Section 60.15.10 of the Development Code. According to the applicant, all streets and public facilities will be designed to standards in Section 60. With no grading to occur prior to recording the final plat associated with this subdivision, staff has determined Criterion J to be not applicable.

Therefore, the Committee finds Criterion J to be not applicable.

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.

Findings of Fact: The applicant explains how the street network and facilities have been designed in accordance with Beaverton's Engineering Design Manual to provide accessibility as required. Staff concurs. Staff also notes that the associated PUD application has been evaluated against the same criterion. Staff finds the easements associated with this subdivision to be of sufficient width to incorporate necessary access standards identified by the American Disabilities Act (ADA). In review of Criterion K, staff incorporates the findings as stated in response to Criteria A through D.

Therefore, the Committee finds 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.

Findings of Fact: The applicant submitted the required application, plans and materials.

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

Code Conformance Analysis

Chapter 20 Use and Site Development Requirements

CODE STANDARD	CODE REQUIREMENT	PROJECT PROPOSAL	MEETS CODE?
Development Code Section 20.25.05 – Density Calculations			
Minimum Residential Density	Minimum Density: 225 units Maximum Density: 576 units	PUD approved for 230 units. Covenant to be recorded with Large Lot proposal – addressed in Findings hereto.	Yes / with C of A
Development Code Section 20.05.20 (Uses)			
R1	Permitted Multifamily Dwellings	Large consistent with PUD	N/A
R2	Permitted Attached Single Family Dwellings	Large Lot with future land division	Yes
R4	Permitted Detached Dwellings	Large Lot with future land division	Yes
R5	Permitted Detached Dwellings	Large Lot with future land division	Yes
R7	Permitted Detached Dwellings	Large Lot with future land division	Yes
Development Code Section 20.05.15 (Site Development Standards)			
Minimum Lot Area	R1 - 1,000 sq. ft. / DU R2 - 2,000 sq. ft. / DU R4 - 4,000 sq. ft. / DU R5 - 5,000 sq. ft. / DU R7 - 7,000 sq. ft. / DU	All lots of Large Lot proposal meet minimum lot area.	Yes
Minimum Yard Setbacks	Lots created are subject to the minimum yard setbacks of the zone	Lots of Large Lot Subdivision shown to meet the setbacks for the zone.	Yes
Maximum Building Height	R1 – 60 feet R2 – 40 feet R4 – 35 feet R5 – 35 feet R7 – 35 feet	No building is associated with the Large Lot Subdivision.	N/A

**ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS FOR
PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION
THE RIDGE LARGE LOT SUBDIVISION – LD2017-0023**

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 40.45.15.5.C Approval Criteria

In order to approve a Preliminary Subdivision 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 Preliminary Subdivision application. If the parent parcel is subject to a pending Legal Lot Determination under Section 40.47., further division of the parent parcel shall not proceed until all of the provisions of Section 40.47.15.1.C. have been met.***

Findings of Fact: The applicant proposes a five (5) lot subdivision from two parcels identified hereto. No Legal Lot Determination is pending for the two parcels subject to this subdivision which are recognized as part of The Ridge Planned Unit Development (PUD) approved by the City on July 13, 2017. This proposal meets Threshold 1 for a Preliminary Subdivision, which describes:

- 1. The creation of four (4) or more new lots from at least one (1) lot of record in one (1) calendar year.*

Therefore, staff finds 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.***

Findings of Fact: The applicant has paid the required application fee for a Preliminary Subdivision application.

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

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

Findings of Fact: Staff incorporate the applicant's written response to Criterion No. 3 as stated in the document prepared by Otak, Inc., dated October 30, 2017. In part, the applicant explains how the large lot subdivision is intended to be an interim land division for financing and land acquisition purposes. The applicant further explains how the large lot subdivision proposal works in conjunction with existing city approvals for The Ridge PUD at South Cooper Mountain.

In review of existing city approvals, staff found nothing to preclude the ability to subdivide the two parcels ahead of recording the final plat required for The Ridge PUD. The five lot proposal is necessary for findings in support of Criterion 8 of Preliminary Subdivision approval that prohibits creating a lot with more than one zone. In this case, there are five separate zoning districts identified as part of The Ridge PUD (R-1, R-2, R-4, R-5 and R-7). For this reason, the number of lots proposed for this large lot subdivision is five. In response to Criterion No. 3, staff incorporate by reference, the findings of fact as stated in response to Criterion A of Facilities Review approval.

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

- 4. *Oversized parcels (oversized lots) resulting from the subdivision 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.***

Findings of Fact: The Beaverton Development Code defines an Oversized Lot as a lot which is greater than twice the required minimum lot size allowed by the subject zoning. By this definition, all lots to be created as part of the large lot proposal are oversized lots. The applicant has provided the approved PUD plan for The Ridge to demonstrate how all lots of the Large Lot Subdivision proposal can be further subdivided in the future in accordance with the requirements of the Development Code.

Therefore, staff finds that the criterion for approval is met.

- 5. *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.***

Findings of Fact: Phasing is not requested with this Large Lot Subdivision proposal.

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

6. ***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, minimizes grading impacts on adjacent properties, and where a street is proposed provides a standard street cross section with sidewalks.***

Findings of Fact: Lot averaging is not requested with this Large Lot Subdivision proposal.

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

7. ***Applications that apply the lot area averaging standards of Section 20.05.15.D. do not require further Adjustment or Variance approvals for the Land Division.***

Findings of Fact: Lot averaging is not requested with this Large Lot Subdivision proposal.

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

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

Findings of Fact: The Large Lot Subdivision proposal is intended to ensure consistency with existing zones applied to the subject properties (R-1, R-2, R-4, R-5 and R-7). No proposed lot will have more than one zoning designation.

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

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

Findings of Fact: The applicant has submitted all documents for this stage of city approval.

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

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the facts and findings presented, staff recommends **APPROVAL** of **LD2017-0023 (The Ridge Large Lot Subdivision)**, subject to the applicable conditions identified herein.

Land Division Standards Code Conformance Analysis (60.15)

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 does not include development. No grading is proposed.	N/A
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.	Grading is not proposed.	N/A
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.	Grading is not proposed.	N/A
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.	Grading is not proposed.	N/A
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.	Grading is not proposed.	N/A
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.	Grading is not proposed.	N/A
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.	Grading is not proposed.	N/A
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	Grading is not proposed.	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.	There are no significant trees or groves on site.	N/A

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
THE RIDGE LARGE LOT SUBDIVISION
LD2017-0023**

LD2017-0023 Preliminary Subdivision Application:

A. Prior to final plat approval the applicant / developer shall:

1. Apply for Final Land Division approval as described in Chapter 40, Section 40.45.15.8. of the Beaverton Development Code (Code), in addition to submitting plans and materials that demonstrate compliance with applicable Final Plat Standards identified in Section 60.15.15 of the Code. In accordance with Section 50.90 of the Code, submittal of a complete final plat application shall be made within 24 months after preliminary plat approval unless a longer period is specified in a separate approval or a request for time extension is approved. (Planning Division/JF)
2. Show granting of any required on-site easements on the subdivision plat, along with plat notes as approved by the City Engineer for area encumbered and County Surveyor as to form and nomenclature. Additionally have obtained approval to the satisfaction of the City Engineer that the location and width of proposed rights of way and easements are adequate per the overall development and City master plans; that each parcel and tract has proper access provisions; and that each parcel and tract has adequate public utility service provision availability per adopted City standards and requirements. (Site Development Div./JJD)
3. Submit a completed Land Division Agreement form to provide assurance that all the conditions of approval shall be met and that the subdivision will be constructed in accordance with City requirements. (Planning Division/JF)
4. Covenant between the City and Applicant / Developer: Agree to the essential components of a covenant document as described in the findings of Facilities Review approval hereto, and incorporated with this decision (Exhibit 2). The signed covenant must be recorded prior to, or concurrently with, recording the final plat. (Planning Division/JF)
5. Access and Utility Easement Document: Provide a draft copy of the access and utility easement consistent with the location as depicted on Sheet P1.0 of the approved plan set. This easement is to be reviewed and approved by the City Attorney and City Engineer prior to recording with the Final Plat approval. The easement is to identify the City of Beaverton as beneficiary for all utility and vehicle access. The recorded easement document is to include a graphic attachment for geographic reference. (Planning Division/JF)
6. Natural Resource Conservation Easement Document: Provide a draft copy of the natural resource easement consistent with the location as depicted on Sheet P1.0 of the approved plan set, amended to include the area identified for upland habitat preservation in the north portion of the property (in Lot 1). The

easement is to benefit the City of Beaverton and Clean Water Services. The recorded easement document is to include a graphic attachment(s) for geographic reference. (Planning Division/JF)

7. Emergency Vehicle Access Easements Document: Provide a draft copy of the emergency vehicle access easement, consistent with the location as depicted on Sheet P1.0 of the approved plan set. This easement is to be reviewed and approved by the City Attorney, Fire Marshal of TVF&R and City Engineer prior to recording with the Final Plat approval. The easement is to identify the City of Beaverton as beneficiary for all utility and vehicle access. The recorded easement document is to include a graphic attachment for geographic reference. (Planning Division/JF)
8. Ensure all easements, as approved by the City Attorney and City Engineer are recorded prior to or concurrent with the final plat. The applicant shall provide proof of recording these documents. (Planning Division/JF)
9. Ensure the final plat shows the dedication of additional right-of-way to provide an additional 48 feet from centerline of SW Scholls Ferry Road for a total of 78 feet, inclusive of the street frontages of the properties subject to land division approval (Tax Lots 500 and 600 on Washington County's Tax Assessors Map 2S1-06). The final plat shall also include a provision of a non-access reservation along the SW Scholls Ferry Road frontage of both properties. (Wash. Co / NV / Planning / JF)
10. Ensure existing dwellings identified to remain on-site meet setbacks of the base zone except where approved for reduction through PUD approval. (Planning Division/JF)