



MEMORANDUM

TO: Planning Commission

FROM: Elena Sasin, Associate Planner

DATE: April 27, 2020

SUBJECT: Hawaii Kai Multi-Family (CU2019-0001 / DR2019-0012 / LD2019-0003 / PLA2020-0001 / TP2019-0001) Supplemental Memorandum

Errors in Staff Report

On page FR-13 of the April 8, 2020 Staff Report, staff erroneously states 17 parking spaces are required. The correct number of required parking spaces is 16.

On page DR-12 in the April 8, 2020 Staff Report the footer incorrectly states the following:

Staff Report: June 19, 2019
The Mary Ann Multi-Family

DR-12

The correct footer should state:

Staff Report: April 8, 2020
Hawaii Kai Multi-Family

DR-8

General Staff Comments

At the April 15, 2020 Planning Commission hearing, the applicant requested a continuance for the opportunity to address outstanding items and correct inconsistent information in the materials. The Planning Commission granted the applicant an additional week with a deadline of 5:00pm on April 22, 2020. At that April 15th Planning Commission hearing, staff provided directions to the applicant for the resubmittal. Staff requested that the applicant submit a complete package, not only the revised materials, but all the materials necessary for staff to determine the proposal's compliance with all applicable criteria, accompanied by a memorandum outlining all of the changes made. On April 22, 2020, the applicant submitted revised materials but not the whole application package.

Within these submitted materials, the applicant provides written responses to the same criteria in multiple documents and not all of the responses are the same. Staff also notes that the revised Utility Plan shows only approximately half of the subject site, which is insufficient for review. Other project drawings submitted, such as the Landscape Plan and the Trash Enclosure elevations are blurry and challenging to read. In some cases the plans have been made more unclear, for example the 10-foot

setback from the southern property line is now pointing to an incorrect location. Additionally, the plans include symbols and numbers that have no explanation or indication of what they represent, for example two circles east of the ADA stall with the measurement “2.5” inside of them.

The applicant submitted a revised Chapter 20 narrative but did not update the response to the maximum height and still states, “The proposed development has 34.6 foot high structure including the needed parapet wall (for flat roofs)”. The applicant’s elevations submitted on April 22, 2020 show a maximum height of 33.56 feet. While both heights are within the permitted height in the NS zone, the information remains inconsistent. In review of the applicant’s revised materials, staff also noticed that the front setback on the plans is actually 26 feet rather than the 20 feet stated by the applicant in the Chapter 20 written narrative. Again, although the stated setback and the setback shown on the plans meet the development standard, the applicant has not corrected conflicting information.

The following findings are not a result of a comprehensive re-evaluation of the proposal. The applicant’s memorandum, submitted on April 22, 2020, states:

“The focus of these additional documents, other than to clarify and make consistent where needed and make the horizontal plans more readable, is to respond to specific items that are listed in the Staff Report/Memo as non-approved. Those items approved, approved with conditions or not applicable are not the focus of the additional documents.”

Therefore, staff’s revised findings are primarily limited to the issues addressed by the applicant.

FACILITIES REVIEW; SECTION 40.03

Page FR-5:

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.

Staff Finding in April 15, 2020 Supplemental Memo:

The proposal includes 90-degree parking stalls with a dead end. Drawings provided in Section 60.30.15 of the Development Code outline the parking lot design requirements. Two-way, 90-degree, dead-end parking lots must provide a five-foot deep backing area at the dead-end to allow vehicles to exit the parking lot. The applicant’s plans show that the proposed backing area is approximately 3.5 feet in depth and therefore does not meet the standard. Any change from the numerical requirements contained in Section 60.30. (Off-street Parking) are subject to review under the Major Adjustment application, which the applicant has not submitted.

Therefore, staff find the criterion has not been met.

Revised Staff Finding for April 27, 2020 Supplemental Memo:

The applicant’s revised plans, received April 22, 2020, show a five-foot deep backing area.

Therefore, staff find the criterion has been met.

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.

Staff Finding in April 8, 2020 Staff Report:

The applicant states that the proposed facilities will be owned and maintained by the apartment complex owners. The applicant's plans indicate that a retaining wall is proposed to cross property lines between the subject site and the lot to the east (1S114BA01501). The Facilities Review Committee recommend a condition of approval requiring the applicant to submit a maintenance agreement specifying the maintenance responsibility of the proposed retaining wall, prior to final plat.

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

Staff Finding for April 27, 2020 Supplemental Memo:

The applicant states that the proposed facilities will be owned and maintained by the apartment complex owners. The applicant's plans indicate that a retaining wall is proposed to cross property lines between the subject site and the lot to the east (1S114BA01501). The Facilities Review Committee recommend a condition of approval requiring the applicant to submit a maintenance agreement specifying the maintenance responsibility of the proposed retaining wall, prior to final plat.

However, the applicant's plans do not show the boundaries of a required 15-foot wide easement near the northern property line. Per staff's measurements, the trash enclosure appears to encroach in on the easement by about 3 feet. This part of the trash enclosure would have to be removed. With this removal of a portion of the trash enclosure, it is unclear whether or not the remaining area is sufficient to serve the development. Alternatively, the applicant could move the enclosure but without knowing where the enclosure would be moved to, affirmative findings regarding the maintenance of the facility cannot be made.

Therefore, staff find the criterion has not been met.

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.

Staff Finding in April 8, 2020 Staff Report:

The applicant states that the proposed improvements meld into existing adjacent improvements improving storm drainage conditions, flood plain issues of grading and traffic conditions where possible and add waterline improvements to the West Slope Water District.

The applicant's grading plan is difficult to read and therefore compliance with Facilities Review criterion J and other grading standards cannot be determined. Without the ability to determine if the proposed grading complies with Development Code standards, affirmative findings cannot be made.

Therefore, the Committee finds that the proposal does not meet the criterion for approval.

Revised Staff Finding for April 27, 2020 Supplemental Memo:

The applicant has provided a revised grading plan (received on April 22, 2020). Although changes have been made to the applicant's grading plan, the applicant's grading plans remain unclear. Proposed contours appear to be disconnected in areas and the applicant does not show existing grades directly north, east or south of the site. This information is necessary to understand how the proposed grades may affect the neighboring properties. As the plans are still difficult to read, compliance with Facilities Review criterion J and other grading standards cannot be determined.

Therefore, the Committee finds that the proposal does not meet the criterion for approval.

Page FR-10

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

Staff Finding in April 8, 2020 Staff Report:

The application was submitted on January 31, 2019. The applicant deemed the application complete on July 30, 2019. 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 not contained within this proposal. The applicant has not provided sufficient and/or consistent evidence in the application materials needed to determine compliance with applicable criteria, such as setbacks and grading.

Revised Staff Finding for April 27, 2020 Supplemental Memo:

The applicant's revised materials, submitted on April 22, 2020, are insufficient and/or inconsistent, therefore the applicant has not provided all required materials as specified in Section 50.25.1 of the Development Code.

Therefore, the Committee finds that the proposal does not meet the criterion for approval.

NEW CONDITIONAL USE APPROVAL CRITERIA; SECTION 40.15.15.3.C

Page 9 of the April 15, 2020 Staff Supplemental Memo

Staff Finding in April 15, 2020 Memo: Staff notes that while the applicant has been able to show compliance with Criteria 3, 5 and 6 they have not shown compliance with the Facilities Review approval criterion to which the Conditional Use request is also subject. Staff's recommendation of Denial of CU2019-0001 has not been modified.

Revised Staff Finding for April 27, 2020 Memo: The applicant did not provide revised responses to any of the Conditional Use approval Criteria, nor did the applicant resubmit the written responses to the Comprehensive Plan goals and policies. The applicant did however, make edits to the April 8, 2020 staff report, received on April 22, 2020, in which the applicant refer to staff's revised findings for criteria 3, 5 and 6 in staff's April 15, 2020 memo. The applicant did not address staff's finding in the April 15, 2020 memo that the Conditional Use is also subject to the Facilities Review criteria. Therefore, because the applicant has not been able to demonstrate compliance with all applicable Facilities Review criteria, as previously mentioned herein, staff's recommendation of Denial of CU2019-0001 has not been modified.

DESIGN REVIEW THREE; SECTION 40.20.15.3.C

Page DR-2:

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

Staff Finding in April 8, 2020 Staff Report:

The proposal meets Design Review Three threshold number 8. Staff cites the Design Review and Guidelines Analysis at the end of this Design Review section, which evaluates the project as it relates the applicable Design Review Standards and Guidelines found in Section 60.05 of the Development Code. Staff reviews each Standard and Guideline with respect to the applicability of the Standard or Guideline to the project, the applicant's response, and illustrative representation of the proposal. Staff provides an evaluation of the proposal in relation to the Standard or Guideline and a statement as to whether the Standard or Guideline is met below. Staff finds that the proposal does not meet the following Design Standards and a corresponding Design Guideline has not been addressed:

- 60.05.15.3 (Weather Protection)
- 60.05.20.2.A-D (Screening)
- 60.05.20.3.F (Minimum Paving Width)
- 60.05.25.3.A (Landscape Area)
- 60.05.25.3.B (Active Open Space)
- 60.05.25.3.J (Alternative Active Features)
- 60.05.25.10 (Grading)
- 60.05.25.13 (Landscape Buffer Width)

The applicant has requested certain Design Guidelines be addressed since their correlating Design Standard could not be met. Based on the evaluation of the proposal and the supporting information provided by the applicant, staff find that the proposal does not meet the following design guidelines:

- 60.05.35.1.B (Articulation & Variety – Visual Interest)
- 60.05.35.1.C (Articulation & Variety – Vertical Elements)
- 60.05.35.1.D (Articulation & Variety – Pedestrian Scale & Orientation)
- 60.05.35.1.E (Articulation & Variety – Architectural Features)
- 60.05.45.7.A (Fences & Walls – Durable Materials)

Therefore, staff finds that the criterion is not met.

DESIGN REVIEW STANDARDS:

Section 60.05.15.3 Weather protection for primary entrance.

Staff Finding in April 8, 2020 Staff Report:

The applicant states that the primary entrances are covered and treated as a permanent architectural feature with shed roofs that are 4 feet deep and 8.5 to 10.75 feet wide. However, the applicant's submitted architectural elevations or site plan do not show any weather protection for primary entrances. The applicant's exterior materials board includes an image of the proposed buildings, however this image does not include dimensions or a scale of this covered area, therefore staff is unable to evaluate compliance with the standard and therefore cannot provide an affirmative finding in response.

Meets Standard: No

Revised Staff Finding for April 27, 2020 Supplemental Memo:

The applicant's revised response states that a scale has been provided on the Site Plan and Grading Plan for the covered entrances and that the weather protection is as follows: North 5 feet by 16.5 feet and South 4 feet x 11 feet. The applicant submitted two elevation sheets which appear to be identical. By staff's measurements, the proposed weather protection is 5 feet deep and 11 feet wide. Although these dimensions do meet the minimum requirements, the applicant refers to two different buildings ("north" and "south") with two different sets to dimensions (North 5 feet by 16.5 feet and South 4 feet x 11 feet), but only provides elevations showing weather protection that is 5 feet deep by 11 feet wide, and inconsistent with the applicant's written response.

Meets Standard: No

60.05.20.2.A-D Screening from public view.

Staff Finding in April 8, 2020 Staff Report:

The applicant states that the waste storage and recycling containers are enclosed with Hardie plank siding and wood gate to match building. The applicant also explains that screening shall be one foot higher than the object being screened. However, the applicant's materials do not include elevations or dimensions of the proposed enclosure therefore staff is unable to determine compliance with dimensional requirements or design elements. The applicant further states that a transformer and above ground utility services shall be screened and shown on construction drawings to keep from

view from the public street. However, staff is unable to determine where above ground utilities are located or how they are to be screened.

Meets Standard: No

Revised Staff Finding for April 27, 2020 Supplemental Memo:

The applicant states that the Landscape Plan and Site Plan have been revised to meet requirements and that slider door elevation and materials are provided. The resolution of the applicant's revised Landscaping Plan and the amount of information simultaneously displayed on the Landscaping Plans make it difficult to discern what kind of plant species is proposed for screening the onsite transformer and whether or not the requirements outlined in Section 60.05.20.2.C. have been met. The applicant provided trash enclosure elevations, however, a scale was not provided and the details provided on the plans are indiscernible. Therefore, staff is unable to make affirmative findings.

Meets Standard: No

60.05.20.3.F 5' minimum walkway width.

Staff Finding in April 8, 2020 Staff Report:

The applicant states and the submitted plans show that the walkways between the two buildings are less than 5 feet. The Design Standard is not met and the applicant has not addressed the corresponding Design Guideline and it is not clear that the site can accommodate wider walkways in all locations.

Meets Standard: No

Revised Staff Finding for April 27, 2020 Supplemental Memo:

The applicant states that the Site Plan have been revised to show 5 foot wide walks. The applicant's plans have been revised to show a 5 foot wide walkway between the two proposed buildings. However, the applicant's plans also show revisions to the pedestrian connection between the ADA parking space and the rest of the onsite pedestrian circulation system and the width of the walkway is abstruse. Therefore, staff is unable to make affirmative findings.

Meets Standard: No

60.05.25.3.A – Minimum Landscape Area (15%).

Staff Finding in April 8, 2020 Staff Report:

The subject site is 18,862 square feet, requiring a minimum of 2,829 square feet of landscaping area. The applicant states 21% of the gross area is landscaped, however, the submitted landscaping plans indicate that approximately 10% (or 1,916 square feet) of the gross site is landscaped. The proposal does not meet this standard and the applicant has not addressed the corresponding Design Guidelines.

Meets Standard: No

Revised Staff Finding for April 27, 2020 Supplemental Memo:

The applicant states that, “the revised Landscape Plan shows ground cover on all areas that do not have shrubs and trees, creating a percentage 3,885 sq. ft.” The applicant further explains that all soil shows ground cover and ground cover, trees and shrubs create the landscape and that the ground cover lines don't show over the entire plans because it would be unreadable on the plans. Staff finds that the revised Landscape Plan is still difficult to read and is unable to determine exactly which areas are proposed to be landscaped. Therefore, staff is unable to make affirmative findings.

Meets Standard: No

60.05.25.3.B – Active Open Space (25% of the required open space)

Staff Finding in April 8, 2020 Staff Report:

The standard required open space for the site is 2,829 square feet, 25% of which is 707 square feet. The applicant states 718 square feet of active open space is proposed in the “barbeque and sunning area”. Beaverton Development Code defines Active Open Space as, “Open space where human activities include recreational and social opportunities, such as play fields, playgrounds, swimming pools, plazas and other recreational facilities.”

The applicant’s plans do not show the boundaries of the proposed active open spaces, however, the area with the picnic table and barbeque on the applicant’s plans appears to be enclosed by evergreen shrubs, limiting the open area to approximately 310 square feet by staff measurements. The applicant proposes a second open space area designated as the “children’s play area” which the applicant states is 348 square feet. The applicant does not identify where the “children’s play area” is to be located. The only other open area appears to be a 384 square foot area between the two buildings that is heavily landscaped around its perimeter. The non-densely landscaped area contains a paved area with four (4) benches. Staff’s calculations show that the non-densely landscaped area is approximately 200 square feet of the 384 square foot area calculated by staff. The total active area between the 310 square foot picnic area and the 384 square foot area between buildings is 694 square feet, which is less than the 707 square feet required. Staff finds the proposal does not meet this standard and the applicant has not addressed the corresponding Design Guidelines.

Meets Standard: No

Revised Staff Finding for April 27, 2020 Supplemental Memo:

Beaverton Development Code defines Active Open Space as, “Open space where human activities include recreational and social opportunities, such as play fields, playgrounds, swimming pools, plazas and other recreational facilities.” The standard required open space for the site is 2,829 square feet, 25% of which is 707 square feet. The applicant’s revised narrative in response to 60.05.25.3.G states that the revised plans now contain a contiguous area of 707.67 square feet, which is the minimum required active open space amount for the site. The applicant’s revised landscape plan shows the area in the northwest portion of the site as a small hardscaped area with a sidewalk that extends east into the landscape buffer area between the adjacent property and the parking area and terminates after approximately 18 feet. The applicant’s landscape plan is blurry so it is difficult to discern the exact boundary of the plaza/active open space area on the landscape plan. Using the revised site plan provided and counting the area labeled as scored concrete staff measures 729 square feet of active open space plaza area.

Staff notes that the active open space plaza area encroaches into the required 10 foot landscape buffer in which non-landscape areas are not permitted. When the hardscape area that is within the required landscape buffer is removed the plaza measures 445 square feet. While the area in total is sufficient to meet the standard it includes the area in the buffer and then violates Design Standard 60.05.25.13. In describing what can be in the landscape buffer area, Design Standard 60.05.25.13 states; "Only landscaping shall be allowed in the landscape buffer area." The addition of a sidewalk and paved area for the active use by persons is not consistent with the requirements or intent of the landscape buffer area which are intended to provide a visual and noise buffer between adjacent uses.

Therefore the area within the landscape buffer should be removed from the calculations or an exception to the buffer standards should be provided under the Design Guidelines. The applicant has not requested to provide a narrower buffer standard under the Design Guidelines, so staff removes the area from the active open space calculations.

Staff also notes that without the encroachment into the landscape buffer area, the active open space is reduced to 445 square feet, which is below the 640 square feet required by Standard 60.05.25.3.G for which the applicant has not provided a revised response to.

Meets Standard: No

60.05.25.3.J – Other improvements providing similar levels of activity.

Staff Finding in April 8, 2020 Staff Report:

The applicant states that there is no alternative review proposed under this section, however the applicant does not provide two items from each list in the each active open space area and does not address the corresponding Design Guideline.

Meets Standard: No

Revised Staff Finding for April 27, 2020 Supplemental Memo:

The applicant states that a 'mister' and barbeque are shown on the revised plans. However, the applicant does not provide details for these features including how the active open space is intended to function. Therefore, staff is unable to determine whether or not these are permanent features and how the proposed features fit into the area.

Meets Standard: No

60.05.25.10 – Minimize grade changes.

Staff Finding in April 8, 2020 Staff Report:

The applicant's grading plan is difficult to read, only the 220 contour line is labeled, existing and proposed grading are not labeled in the legend or on the plan, and it is unclear how the proposed walls and structures tie into the surrounding grading. Therefore compliance with grading standards cannot be determined by staff. Without the ability to determine if the proposed grading complies with Development Code standards, affirmative findings cannot be made.

Meets Standard: No

Revised Staff Finding for April 27, 2020 Supplemental Memo:

As previously mentioned in response to Facilities Review criterion J, the applicant's revised grading plan (received on April 22, 2020) remains unclear. Proposed contours appear to be disconnected in areas and the applicant does not show existing grades directly north, east or south of the site. This information is necessary to understand how the proposed grades may affect the neighboring properties. As the plans are still difficult to read, compliance with Facilities Review criterion J and Standard 60.05.25.10 cannot be determined.

Meets Standard: No

60.05.25.13 – A landscape buffer is required along the side and rear of properties between different zoning district designations and the width of the buffer cannot exceed the standard yard setback.

Staff Finding in April 8, 2020 Staff Report:

The subject site is zoned NS and abuts a parcel zoned R2 to the north, therefore a 10 foot wide B3 buffer is required. The side setback in the NS zone is 10 feet therefore the required landscape buffer does not exceed the setback dimension. However, the applicant's plans show that the proposed landscape buffer along the northern property line ranges in width from 8 feet to 10 feet. Therefore, as proposed the standard is not met. The applicant has not requested to address the corresponding Design Guideline.

Meets Standard: No

Revised Staff Finding for April 27, 2020 Supplemental Memo:

The applicant states that the north buffer is now 10' as shown on the Site Plan. The applicant explains that one previously provided parking spot was removed to provide room for this change. However, as staff has previously noted, the proposed active open space plaza area encroaches into the required 10 foot landscape buffer in which non-landscape areas are not permitted. When the hardscape area that is within the required landscape buffer is removed the plaza measures 445 square feet. While the area in total is sufficient to meet the standard when the area in the buffer is included the active open space area then violates Design Standard 60.05.25.13. Design Standard 60.05.25.13 in describing what can be in a landscape buffer states; "Only landscaping shall be allowed in the landscape buffer area." The addition of a sidewalk and paved area for the active use by persons is not consistent with the requirements or intent of the landscape buffer area which are intended to provide a visual and noise buffer between adjacent uses. Therefore the area within the landscape buffer should be removed from the calculations. With the removal of the active open space area the proposal meets the buffer standard width of 10 feet. Staff recommend a condition of approval requiring the applicant to submit revised plans showing nothing but landscaping within the required landscape buffer, consistent with Section 60.05.25.13.

Meets Standard: Yes, with Condition of Approval

60.05.25.13.D – B3-High screen buffer vegetation requirements.

Staff Finding in April 8, 2020 Staff Report:

The applicant's plans show a 6 foot tall fence along the northern property line and three eastern redbud trees proposed in the buffer area, as required. However, the applicant does not indicate the planting height, which is required to be a minimum of 6 feet. Staff recommend

a condition of approval requiring the applicant to submit plans demonstrating compliance with all applicable provisions of 60.05.25.13.D. The applicant's plans show viburnum davidii, an evergreen shrub, is proposed between the trees. The applicant's plans show the use of rubus calycinoides as ground cover in the landscape buffer area

Meets Standard: Yes, with Condition of Approval

Revised Staff Finding for April 27, 2020 Supplemental Memo:

As previously mentioned, the applicant's revised plans submitted on April 22, 2020 show the extension of the Active Open Space area into the required landscape buffer area, in which non-landscape areas are not permitted. Therefore, the area within the landscape buffer should be removed from the buffer. With the removal of the active open space area the proposal meets the buffer standard width of 10 feet but compliance with the planting requirements outlined in Section 60.05.25.13.D cannot be determined. Therefore, staff recommend a condition of approval requiring the applicant to submit revised plans demonstrating compliance with all applicable provisions of Section 60.05.25.13.D.

Meets Standard: Yes, with Condition of Approval

DESIGN REVIEW GUIDELINES

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

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

Staff Finding in April 8, 2020 Staff Report:

The applicant has not provided a response to Design Guideline 60.05.35.1.B, which is applicable to Design Standard 60.05.15.1.B to which the applicant responded that the Design Guideline would be addressed. As the applicant has not provided any evidence to support the compliance with the Design Guideline staff does not have sufficient evidence to make affirmative findings.

Therefore, staff finds that the Guideline is not met.

Revised Staff Finding for April 27, 2020 Supplemental Memo:

The applicant states that the buildings have three colors, decks on each unit, front entrances with deck/roofs and have faux brick and various sizes of Hardyboard siding placed both vertically and horizontally and adds that windows are large and all have trim. Staff finds that variation is provided by the use of Hardyboard, veneer brick, and glazing. The applicant's plans show that articulation is provided by the proposed weather protection feature over the primary entrances and recessed walls in the balcony area.

However, the applicant has only provided building elevations for one of the two buildings, and based on the applicant's written response, the two buildings do differ, therefore, staff is unable to make affirmative findings. Furthermore, the labels on the elevations are not clear. Instead of labeling the

elevations with the cardinal direction they are facing, the applicant uses descriptions such as “Building – Left Looking Elevation at Front” and “Building – Right Looking Elevation at Front”.

Therefore, staff finds that the Guideline is not met.

C. To balance horizontal features on long building elevations, vertical building elements, such as building entries, should be emphasized. (Standards 60.05.15.1.A and B)

Staff Finding in April 8, 2020 Staff Report:

The applicant has not provided a response to Design Guideline 60.05.35.1.C, which is applicable to Design Standard 60.05.15.1.B to which the applicant responded that the Design Guideline would be addressed. As the applicant has not provided any evidence to support the compliance with the Design Guideline staff does not have sufficient evidence to make affirmative findings.

Therefore, staff finds that the Guideline is not met.

Revised Staff Finding for April 27, 2020 Supplemental Memo:

The applicant states that the building entrances are centered in the buildings, with all sidewalks, landscaping, etc. designed around them and that they are large and have covered roofs. The applicant further explains that the buildings are midsized (76') and the two buildings are sited at a right angle to break up any potential 'combined' look of the two buildings. Staff finds that the applicant's plans indicate entrances will be centrally located, and covered, breaking up the longest building elevations.

Therefore, staff finds that the Guideline is met.

D. Buildings should promote and enhance a comfortable pedestrian scale and orientation. This guideline does not apply to buildings in Industrial districts where the principal use of the building is manufacturing, assembly, fabricating, processing, packing, storage, wholesale or distribution activities. (Standards 60.05.15.1.B)

Staff Finding in April 8, 2020 Staff Report:

The applicant states that the north building front (west) wall that faces the street has 169.77 square feet of undifferentiated blank wall but that a different width and direction of hardie plank siding is proposed to break up the façade. The north building front elevation provides pedestrian level windows and material treatments that differentiate the floors of the building, providing visual relief to pedestrians.

The applicant states that the west side elevation of the southern building has an areas of 246.45 square feet of undifferentiated blank wall, the narrative states that a different pattern of hardie plank is used to provide visual relief, however the applicant's elevations do not reflect this materials change, it is unclear to staff what is proposed in this area as the narrative and plans do not match. As such, staff has insufficient information to determine what is proposed by the applicant and cannot make affirmative findings that the Guideline is met.

Therefore, staff finds that the Guideline is not met.

Revised Staff Finding for April 27, 2020 Supplemental Memo:

Applicant states that the narrative and building elevations have been revised to match and that now the buildings promote and enhance a comfortable pedestrian scale and orientation. The applicant further explains that the Site Plan was specifically designed for this purpose with the two buildings sited at right angles and sidewalks, trees, parking designed to break up all planes and straight lines. The applicant's plans show that the southern building is within close proximity to the adjacent public sidewalk and that the proposed height of the buildings is consistent with the standard in the NS zoning district. The applicant's plans also so that the varying orientation of the buildings provide some variety and interest.

Therefore, staff finds that the Guideline is met.

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

Staff Finding in April 8, 2020 Staff Report:

The applicant has not provided a response to Design Guideline 60.05.35.1.E, which is applicable to Design Standard 60.05.15.1.E to which the applicant responded that the Design Guideline would be addressed. As the applicant has not provided any evidence to support the compliance with the Design Guideline staff does not have sufficient evidence to make affirmative findings.

Therefore, staff finds that the Guideline is not met.

Revised Staff Finding for April 27, 2020 Supplemental Memo:

The applicant states that all building elevations visible from and within 200 feet of SW 96th Avenue and the parking areas have architectural features such as large windows, with trim off-set front entrance, three types of siding (installed both vertically and horizontally, balconies (portion seen from front), faux brick. The applicant further explains that two buildings, rather than one, were chosen to break up the bulk of one large building.

The applicant's submitted materials do show that building elevations are treated with windows, balconies, small feature roofs (weather protection) and changes to materials types. However, as previously mentioned, the applicant has only provided building elevations for one of the two buildings, and based on the applicant's written response, the two buildings do differ, therefore, staff is unable to make affirmative findings.

Therefore, staff finds that the Guideline is not met.

60.05.45. Landscape, Open Space and Natural Areas 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)

Staff Finding in April 8, 2020 Staff Report:

The applicant has not provided a response to Design Guideline 60.05.45.7.A, which is applicable to Design Standard 60.05.25.9.E to which the applicant responded that the Design Guideline would be addressed. As the applicant has not provided any evidence to support the compliance with the Design Guideline staff does not have sufficient evidence to make affirmative findings.

Therefore, staff finds that the Guideline is not met.

Revised Staff Finding for April 27, 2020 Supplemental Memo:

The applicant states that the fences and walls are made out of chain link fence with slats. The applicant did not specify what materials the retaining wall would be constructed of, and only identified the chain link fence material. A detail was not provided for either the fence or wall, nor a material identified for the wall construction, therefore staff cannot determine compliance with the Design Guideline.

Therefore, staff finds that the Guideline is not met.

TREE PLAN TWO APPROVAL CRITERIA; SECTION 40.90.15.2

11. Grading and contouring of the 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.

Staff Finding in April 8, 2020 Staff Report:

This approval criterion is identical to Facilities Review approval criterion J found within Attachment A above. Staff incorporate the finding as stated therein.

Therefore, staff find the proposal does not meet the criterion for approval.

Revised Staff Finding for April 27, 2020 Supplemental Memo:

As previously mentioned, the applicant has provided a revised grading plan (received on April 22, 2020) but the grading plans remain unclear. Proposed contours appear to be disconnected in areas and the applicant does not show existing grades directly north, east or south of the site. This information is necessary to understand how the proposed grades may affect the neighboring properties. As the plans are still difficult to read, compliance with Criterion 11 cannot be determined.

Therefore, staff find the proposal does not meet the criterion for approval.

DECISION:

RECOMMENDATION OF DENIAL of Hawaii Kai Multi-Family CU2019-0001 / DR2019-0012 / TP2019-0001

RECOMMENDATION OF APPROAL of Hawaii Kai Multi-Family LD2019-0003 / PLA2020-0001