



## Staff Report

STAFF REPORT DATE: December 9, 2020

HEARING DATE: December 16, 2020

TO: Interested Parties

FROM: Steve Regner, Senior Planner

PROPOSAL: **Cedar Hills Netting  
DR2020-0111**

LOCATION: The site is located North of SW Walker Road and east of SW Cedar Hills Boulevard; Tax Lot 10500 on Washington County Tax Assessor's Map 1S110BB, and Tax Lot 12000 on Washington County Tax Assessor's Map 1S110BC.

ZONING / NAC: R7 Residential Urban Standard Density District (R7) / Central Beaverton NAC

SUMMARY: The applicant requests Design Review Three approval for the installation of a sixteen-foot-tall fence in the front setback for an existing sport court.

PROPERTY OWNER/  
APPLICANT: Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District  
Tim Bonnin  
6220 SW 112<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Beaverton, OR 97008

RECOMMENDATION: **RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL of Cedar Hills Park  
Netting - DR2020-0111**

## BACKGROUND FACTS

### Key Application Dates

Application	Submittal Date	Application Deemed Complete	120-Day*	365-Day**
DR2020-0111	September 28, 2020	October 28, 2020	February 25, 2020	October 28, 2020

\* Pursuant to Section 50.25.9 of the Development Code this is the latest date, without a continuance, by which a final written decision on the proposal can be made.

\*\* This is the latest date, with a continuance, by which a final written decision on the proposal can be made

### Existing Conditions Table

<b>Zoning</b>	R7 Residential Urban Standard Density District (R7)	
<b>Current Development</b>	Public Park	
<b>Site Size &amp; Location</b>	The park site is north SW Walker Road and east of SW Cedar Hills Boulevard. The total park site is 11.88 acres.	
<b>NAC</b>	Central Beaverton	
<b>Surrounding Uses</b>	<b>Zoning:</b> <u>North:</u> Washington County R5 <u>South:</u> Washington County R5 <u>East:</u> City of Beaverton R7 Washington County R5 <u>West:</u> City of Beaverton General Commercial, Community Service.	<b>Uses:</b> <u>North:</u> Detached Residential <u>South:</u> Detached Residential <u>East:</u> Elementary School <u>West:</u> Commercial

## DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION AND TABLE OF CONTENTS

		<b>Page No.</b>
<b><u>Attachment A:</u></b>	<b>Facilities Review Committee Technical Review and Recommendation Report</b>	FR1 – FR9
<b><u>Attachment B:</u></b>	<b>DR2020-011 Design Review Three</b>	DR1 – DR8
<b><u>Attachment C:</u></b>	<b>Conditions of Approval</b>	COA1

### **Exhibits**

#### **Exhibit 1. Materials submitted by Staff**

- Exhibit 1.1 Vicinity Map (page SR-5 of this report)
- Exhibit 1.2 Aerial Map (page SR-6 of this report)

#### **Exhibit 2. Materials submitted by the Applicant**

- Exhibit 2.1 Submittal Package including plans – Received October 28, 2020

#### **Public Comment**

No public comments received as of the date of Staff Report issuance.



**Cedar Hills Park Netting  
DR2020-0111**



**FACILITIES REVIEW COMMITTEE TECHNICAL  
REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS  
Cedar Hills Park Netting  
(DR2020-0111)**

**Section 40.03.1 Facilities Review Committee:**

The Facilities Review Committee (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 are reviewed for all criteria that are applicable to the submitted application as identified below:**

- **All twelve (12) criteria are applicable to the Design Review Three (DR2020-0111).**
  - **The Facilities Review Committee recommends approval of the Design Review Three (DR2020-0019) subject to the conditions of approval.**
- A. All critical facilities and services related to the proposed development have, or can be improved to have, adequate capacity to serve the proposed development 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 sufficient improvements exist on-site and off-site to serve the site with public water, public sanitary sewer and storm water drainage facilities. The City of Beaverton (City) is the sanitary sewer, storm drainage and water service provider to the site.

**Public water**

The site is served by Beaverton Water Service and the existing capacity is adequate to serve the proposed addition.

**Public Sanitary Sewer**

The site is served by City of Beaverton and the existing capacity is adequate to serve the proposed addition.

### Stormwater Drainage, Treatment and Detention

Proposed improvements to the site are limited to the installation of two fence posts with netting, which will not trigger required improvements for stormwater or hydromodification.

### Transportation

The proposal is limited to safety improvements for an existing sport court. No additional trips are expected with the improvements. The sport court is connected to other on-site destinations and the public right of way through pedestrian pathways.

### Fire Protection

Fire protection will be provided to the site by Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue (TVF&R).

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

- B. Essential facilities and services related to the proposed development are available, or can be made available, with adequate capacity to serve the development prior to its 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.**

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 shared with Beaverton School District, Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District (THPRD), City Transportation staff and City Police Department.

### Schools

The project does not involve the addition of residential units; therefore, school capacity will not be impacted.

### Transit Improvements

The subject site is adjacent to the bus stop on SW Cedar Hills Boulevard, served by Route 20. The existing pedestrian walkways exist connecting the bus stop and sport court.

### Police

To the date of this report Beaverton Police have not provided comments or recommendations to the Committee. Beaverton Police will serve the development site and any comments will be shared with the applicant.

### Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities

The subject property has frontage on SW Cedar Hills Boulevard, which received full frontage improvements during the park redevelopment project approved through casefile DR2017-0002. All required pedestrian and bicycle facilities in the right of way are in place to serve the site.

### Parks

The site is operated by the Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District (THPRD).

The Committee has reviewed the proposal and has found that the essential facilities and services to serve the site are adequate to accommodate the proposal as conditioned.

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

- C. The proposed development 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 applicable provisions of Chapter 20 (Land Uses).**

Staff cites the Code Conformance Analysis chart at the end of the Facilities Review Report, which evaluates the project as it relates to applicable code requirements of Chapter 20 for the R7 Residential Urban Standard Density zone, as applicable to the criterion. As demonstrated in the chart, the development proposal meets all criterion.

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

- D. The proposed development is consistent with all applicable provisions of Chapter 60 (Special Requirements) and all improvements, dedications, or both, as 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 proposed development.**

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, as applicable to the above-mentioned criteria.

Staff will provide findings for the applicable Design Review Standards (Code Section 60.05) with the full staff report.

**Therefore, the Committee finds that with the condition of approvals, the proposal meets the criterion for approval.**

- 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 facilities, 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 states that this proposal is for a small improvement to an existing sport court. The park has been in place for several years and common facilities and areas are currently maintained. The proposed improvements will not preclude the owner from providing trash and recycling facilities, landscaping and parking maintenance.

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

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

In review of Criterion F, staff incorporates the findings prepared in response to A, B and D above. Safe and efficient vehicular and pedestrian circulation patterns are provided within the boundaries of the development.

The existing pedestrian and vehicle circulation will be maintained on site and the proposal will not modify the traffic patterns of the established park site.

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

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

In review of Criterion G, staff incorporates the findings prepared in response to A, B, D and F above. The proposal is limited to modifications to an existing sport court on a site with existing vehicular and pedestrian circulation systems that connect to the surrounding systems including public streets. The

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

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

- 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.**

In review of Criterion H, staff incorporates the findings prepared in response to A, above. The proposal will show compliance to the City's Building Code Standards prior to issuance of Site Development and Building permits, which includes compliance with TVF&R standards.

**Therefore, the Committee finds that with the conditions of approval the proposal meets the criterion for approval.**

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

The proposed project has been designed to meet City codes and standards for an addition to an existing building and the reconfiguration of parking in an existing parking lot and will provide adequate protection from crime and accident to the maximum extent practicable. 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 the proposal meets the criterion for approval.**

- 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 states that this proposal limited to improvements to an existing sport court on a developed site. No changes are proposed to grading are proposed.

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

- 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 development will be required to meet all applicable accessibility standards of the International Building Code, the Fire Code, and other standards as required by the American Disabilities Act (ADA). Compliance with ADA requirements are reviewed at the time of Building permit application. Conformance with the technical design standards for Code accessibility requirements are to be shown on the approved construction plans associated with and Building Permit approvals.

No renovations are proposed to the ADA facilities onsite and will be maintained. The Committee finds that as proposed, it appears that the general site layout can meet accessibility requirements.

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

- L. The application includes all required submittal materials as specified in Section 50.25.1 of the Development Code.**

The Design Review Three application was submitted on September 28, 2020. The applicant deemed the project complete on October 28, 2020. 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 that the proposal meets the criterion for approval.**

**Code Conformance Analysis**  
**Chapter 20 Use and Site Development Requirements**  
**R7 Residential Urban Standard Density (R7)**

<b>CODE STANDARD</b>	<b>CODE REQUIREMENT</b>	<b>PROJECT PROPOSAL</b>	<b>MEETS CODE?</b>
<b>Development Code 20.20.20</b>			
Use – Public Parks	Conditional Use in R7 Zone	The proposal modifies a previously approved park development with an existing Conditional Use Permit. The proposal is not anticipated to increase trips.	Yes
<b>Development Code Section 20.20.15 (Station Community - Mixed Use)</b>			
Minimum Land Area	7,000 square feet	11.52 acres	Yes
Floor Area Ratio	N/A	The proposal modifies a previously approved park development.	N/A
Lot Dimensions	Min. Width = none Min. Depth = none	Not required in this zone.	N/A
Minimum Yard Setbacks	Front Max = 17 feet Side = 5 feet Rear = 25 feet	The proposal is limited to fence height additions, which are not subject to setback requirements.	Yes
Maximum Building Height	35 feet	The proposed fence addition will be 16 feet in height.	Yes

## Chapter 60 Special Requirements

CODE STANDARD	CODE REQUIREMENT	PROJECT PROPOSAL	MEETS CODE?
<b>Development Code Section 60.05</b>			
Design Review Principles, Standards, and Guidelines	Requirements for new development, redevelopment, add additions.	The applicant has requested to be reviewed pursuant to the Design Review Standards and Guidelines.	See DR2020-0111 Section of Staff Report
<b>Development Code Section 60.10</b>			
Floodplain Regulations	Requirements for development within floodplains.	The subject lot is not located within a floodplain.	N/A
<b>Development Code Section 60.15</b>			
Land Division Standards	Grading and tree protection standards pertaining to land divisions.	The existing lot is not proposed to be altered.	N/A
<b>Development Code Section 60.30</b>			
Off-street motor vehicle parking	<b>Parks:</b> 0 spaces	No changes to the number required parking spaces or supplied parking spaces is proposed.	Yes
Required Bicycle Parking Short Term and Long Term	<b>Parks:</b> 0 spaces	No changes to the number required bicycle parking spaces or supplied bicycle parking spaces is proposed.	Yes
<b>Development Code Section 60.33</b>			
Park and Recreation Facilities and Service Provision	Annexation to THPRD	The property is located within THPRDs district therefore annexation is not necessary.	N/A
<b>Development Code Section 60.55</b>			
Transportation Facilities	Regulations pertaining to the construction or reconstruction of transportation facilities.	Refer to Facilities Review Committee findings herein.	Yes

<b>Development Code Section 60.60</b>			
Trees & Vegetation	Regulations pertaining to the removal and preservation of trees.	No Protected Trees are proposed to be impacted on the subject site.	N/A

<b>Development Code Section 60.65</b>			
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.	No existing overhead utilities exist.	N/A

<b>Development Code Section 60.67</b>			
Significant Natural Resources	Regulations pertaining to Significant Natural Resources	Significant Natural Resources are not found on site.	N/A

**DR2020-0111**  
**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 proposal will add additional fencing to an existing sport court. While the addition fencing will be integrated into the existing design, the additional fencing is subject to a Design Review Three because the applicant has requested approval under the applicable Guidelines, meeting threshold 7.

The following thresholds are met:

*7. A project meeting the Design Review Compliance Letter thresholds which does not meet an applicable design standard.*

**Therefore, staff finds 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 has provided all applicable fees.

**Therefore, staff finds 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).**

The proposal does not meet the Design Review Three application thresholds numbers 1 through 6. The application meets the thresholds number 7.

**Therefore, staff finds the criterion is not applicable.**

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 with 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 proposed site was approved through a previous Design Review Three (DR2017-0002), and staff has not identified any non-compliant design elements of the existing improvements. Where the proposed project cannot satisfy the Development Standards, the applicant requests approval under the corresponding Design Guidelines, as allowed by Criterion 6 below.

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

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 the Development Code or greater, can be realistically achieved at ultimate build out of the DRBCP.

A DRBCP is not proposed with this project.

**Therefore, staff finds 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).

The proposed Tire Center expansion meets Design Review Three application threshold 7. The findings below demonstrate compliance with Design Standards or, where necessary, Design Guidelines.

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

7. **For proposals meeting Design Review Three application Threshold numbers 7 or 8, where the applicant has decided to address Design Guidelines only, the proposal is consistent with the applicable provisions of Sections 60.05.35 through 60.05.50 (Design Guidelines).**

The proposed addition meets the Design Review Three Application Threshold number 7. However, the applicant seeks to address a combination of both the Design Standards and Design Guidelines.

**Therefore, staff finds 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.**

All required application materials and documents related to the Design Review Three request have been submitted to the City in the property sequence.

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

#### **Recommendation**

Based on the facts and findings presented, staff recommend **APPROVAL** of **DR2020-0111 Cedar Hills Park Netting**, subject to the applicable conditions identified in Attachment C.

**Design Standards Analysis**  
**Section 60.05.15 Building Design and Orientation**

DESIGN STANDARD	PROJECT PROPOSAL	MEETS STANDARD
<b>Building Articulation and Variety</b>		
<b>60.05.15.1.A</b> Max length of attached residential buildings in residential zones	The proposal is limited to a fencing addition.	N/A
<b>60.05.15.1.B</b> Min 30% articulation	The proposal is limited to a fencing addition.	N/A
<b>60.05.15.1.C</b> Max 40' between architectural features	The proposal is limited to a fencing addition.	N/A
<b>60.05.15.1.D</b> Max 150 sq. ft. undifferentiated blank walls facing streets	The proposal is limited to a fencing addition.	N/A
<b>Roof Forms</b>		
<b>60.05.15.2.A - B</b> Min roof pitch = 4:12 for sloped roofs	The proposal is limited to a fencing addition.	N/A
<b>60.05.15.2.C</b> Flat roofs need parapets	The proposal is limited to a fencing addition.	N/A
<b>60.05.15.2.D</b> New structures in existing development be similar to existing development roof	The proposal is limited to a fencing addition.	N/A
<b>60.05.15.2.E</b> 4:12 roof standard is not applicable to smaller feature roofs	The proposal is limited to a fencing addition.	N/A
<b>Primary Building Entrances</b>		
<b>60.05.15.3</b> Weather protection for primary entrance	The proposal is limited to a fencing addition.	N/A
<b>Exterior Building Materials</b>		
<b>60.05.15.4.A</b> Residential double wall construction	The proposal is limited to a fencing addition.	N/A
<b>60.05.15.4.B</b> Maximum 30% of primary elevation to be made of unfinished concrete block	The proposal is limited to a fencing addition.	N/A
<b>60.05.15.4.C</b> Foundations	The proposal is limited to a fencing addition.	N/A
<b>Roof-Mounted Equipment</b>		
<b>60.05.15.5.A through C</b> Roof-mounted equipment	No roof-mounted equipment is proposed as part of this proposal.	N/A

DESIGN STANDARD	PROJECT PROPOSAL	MEETS STANDARD
screening. Solar panels, dishes/antennas, pipes, vents, and chimneys are exempt from this standard.		
<b>Building Location and Orientation along Streets in MU and Com. Districts</b>		
<b>60.05.15.6.A - F</b> Buildings in Commercial and Multiple Use zones shall occupy a minimum public Street along Major Pedestrian Routes.	The subject site is not located in a Commercial or Multiple Use Zone	N/A
<b>Building Scale along Major Pedestrian Routes</b>		
<b>60.05.15.7.A through C</b> 22' Height Minimum 60' Height Maximum	The proposal is limited to a fencing addition.	N/A
<b>Ground Floor Elevation on Commercial and Multiple Use Buildings</b>		
<b>60.05.15.8.A-B</b> Glazing Requirements	The proposal is limited to a fencing addition.	N/A
<b>Compact Detached Housing Design</b>		
<b>60.05.15.9.A-K</b>	Compact Detached Housing is not proposed.	N/A

### Section 60.05.20 Circulation and Parking Design

DESIGN STANDARD	PROJECT PROPOSAL	MEETS STANDARD
<b>Connections to the public street system</b>		
<b>60.05.20.1</b> Connect on-site circulation to existing and planned street system	The proposed fencing addition will not inhibit the existing on-site circulation system or access to the adjacent street, SW Cedar Hills Boulevard. The addition will be consistent with the existing onsite pedestrian circulation.	Yes
<b>Loading Areas, solid waste facilities and similar improvements</b>		
<b>60.05.20.2.A - E</b> Screen from public view	The proposed fencing addition will not change the loading area or solid waste facilities associated with the existing Cedar Hills Park. The existing sport court is not considered a service area or similar, and thus no screening is required.	N/A
<b>Pedestrian Circulation</b>		
<b>60.05.20.3.A - C</b> Link to adjacent pedestrian facilities	The proposal is limited to a fencing addition. The existing connections to SW Cedar Hills Boulevard will be maintained for pedestrian access.	Yes
<b>60.05.20.3.D-F</b> Pedestrian paths through parking lots	The proposal is limited to a fencing addition. Existing pathways through parking lots will be maintained.	Yes

DESIGN STANDARD	PROJECT PROPOSAL	MEETS STANDARD
<b>60.05.20.4.A</b> Street Frontages and parking areas	There is an existing planting strip separating the parking from the property line that varies in width; no changes are proposed to this setback. This standard does not apply to the changes proposed in the existing parking area.	N/A
<b>60.05.20.5.A - D</b> Parking Area Landscaping	The proposal is limited to a fencing addition. Existing Parking area landscaping will remain.	N/A
<b>Off-Street parking frontages in Commercial and Multiple Use Zones</b>		
<b>60.05.20.6.A</b> Maximum parking along frontage	The project site is not located in a Multiple Use Zone.	N/A
<b>60.05.20.7.A-C</b> Sidewalk and Walkways	The project site is not located in a Commercial or Multiple Use Zone.	N/A
<b>Connect on-site buildings, parking, and other improvements with identifiable streets and drive aisles in Residential, Multiple-Use, and Commercial Districts</b>		
<b>60.05.20.8.A - B</b> Drive aisles to be designed as public streets, if applicable	No private streets, common greens or shared courts are present or are proposed.	N/A
<b>Ground Floor uses in parking structures</b>		
<b>60.05.20.9</b> Parking Structures	No parking structures are proposed.	N/A

### Section 60.05.25 Landscape, Open Space, and Natural Areas Design Standards

DESIGN STANDARD	PROJECT PROPOSAL	MEETS STANDARD
<b>Minimum Landscaping</b>		
<b>60.05.25.5.A - D</b> Minimum Landscape Area (10%)	The proposal is limited to a fencing addition. The existing landscaping and plantings will be maintained.	Yes
<b>Retaining Walls</b>		
<b>60.05.25.6</b> Common Greens	No common greens are proposed.	N/A
<b>Shared Courts</b>		
<b>60.05.25.7</b> Retaining Walls	No shared courts are proposed.	N/A
<b>Retaining Walls</b>		
<b>60.05.25.8</b> Retaining Walls	No retaining walls are proposed.	N/A

DESIGN STANDARD	PROJECT PROPOSAL	MEETS STANDARD
<b>Fences and Walls</b>		
<b>60.05.25.9.A through E</b> Materials	The applicant proposes additional fencing for an existing sport court that is located within the site's front setback. The fencing will be sixteen feet tall to prevent balls from the sport court landing in Cedar Hills Boulevard. The applicant has requested to be evaluated against the corresponding guidelines.	<b>See Guideline 06.05.45.7 Fences and Walls</b>
<b>Minimize Significant Changes to Existing On-Site Surface Contours At Residential Property Lines</b>		
<b>60.05.25.10.A - C</b> Minimize grade changes	No change in grading is proposed.	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Integrate water quality, quantity, or both facilities</b>		
<b>60.05.25.11</b> Location of stormwater facilities	No additional integrated water quality/quantity facilities are proposed as part of this application.	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Natural Areas</b>		
<b>60.05.25.12</b> No encroachment into buffer areas.	The proposed fencing is located outside of the Significant Grove located onsite.	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Landscape Buffering Requirements</b>		
<b>60.05.25.13</b> Landscape buffering between contrasting zoning districts	Due to the minor extent of development, the applicant has not proposed new landscape areas.	<b>N/A</b>

### Section 60.05.30 Lighting Design Standards

DESIGN STANDARD	PROJECT PROPOSAL	MEETS STANDARD
<b>Adequate on-site lighting and minimize glare on adjoining properties</b>		
<b>60.05.30.1.A - E</b> Lighting complies with the City's Technical Lighting Standards	The existing site lighting will be maintained. No new lighting is proposed.	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Pedestrian-scale on-site lighting</b>		
<b>60.05.30.2.A – C</b> Pedestrian Lighting	The existing site lighting will be maintained. No new lighting is proposed.	<b>N/A</b>

## 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.

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

### 7. Fences and Walls.

- A. *Fences and walls should be constructed of attractive, durable materials. (Standard 60.05.25.9)*

The applicant proposes additional fencing along an existing sport court to prevent balls being hit out of play into the adjacent SW Cedar Hills Boulevard, which is classified as an arterial and typically has high traffic volumes. The fencing is proposed along the face of the sport court closest to SW Cedar Hills Boulevard, above the existing 10-foot-tall chain link fence. The fencing will consist of posts at either end of the sport court, with polyester netting material strung between the posts. Documentation provided by the applicant indicate that the lifespan of this material is seven years, at minimum. Both the posts and netting will be black, consistent with the existing chain link fencing around the sport court. Staff concurs with the applicant that the materials proposed are durable and attractive.

**Therefore, staff finds that 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. [ORD 4531; April 2010]*

The proposed fence is located along the face of the sport court closest to SW Cedar Hills Boulevard, within the front setback of the site. The existing 10-foot tall fence is chain link without slats, providing views into and through the sport court. While the proposed fence will be located above the existing fence, the netting will have a similarly high level of transparency and will not obscure or screen any views from the street into the site.

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

**RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL  
Cedar Hill Park Netting  
(DR2020-0111)**

The Facilities Review Committee finds that the proposal has demonstrated compliance will applicable technical approval criteria, and therefore, the Committee recommends that the decision-making authority **APPROVE** the proposal. The committee recommends the following conditions of approval:

**Design Review Three (DR2020-0019)**

1. In accordance with Section 50.90.1 of the Development Code, Design Review approval shall expire after one year from the date of approval unless prior to that time a construction permit has been issued and substantial construction pursuant thereto has taken place, or an application for extension is filed pursuant to Section 50.93, or that authorized development has otherwise commenced in accordance with Section 50.90.3.B.

**A. Prior to final inspection and final occupancy permit issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall:**

2. Ensure all site improvements, are completed in accordance with plans marked "Exhibit A", except as modified and approved by the decision-making authority. (On file at City Hall). (Planning/SR)