

NOTICE OF DECISION

December 4, 2015

Via Certified Mail

Greg McKenna
F & M Development Company, LLC
17786 Des Moines Memorial Dr.
Burien, WA 98148

**RE: Application No. MIS15-0005 – Estates at Hillside Gardens Senior Housing Project
Architectural and Site Design Review**

Dear Mr. McKenna:

Attached is the Community Development & Public Works Director's or designee's official decision regarding your Architectural and Site Design Review for a senior housing project within the C-1, Light Commercial zoning district. The Architectural and Site Design Review is **APPROVED** pursuant to the enclosed Staff Report.

Should you disagree with this decision, the decision may be appealed to the Hearing Examiner as identified within the attached code, ACC Section 18.70.050.

If you have any questions regarding the decision or process, please contact Thaniel Gouk, Senior Planner, at 253-804-5031 or tgouk@auburnwa.gov.

Sincerely,



Jeff Dixon
Planning Services Manager
Community Development & Public Works Department

JD/tg
CORR15-0265

Enclosures: ACC Section 14.13.010 – Administrative Appeals
ACC Section 18.70.050 – Administrative Appeals
Administrative Use Permit Application No. MIS15-0005 – Staff Report

APPEAL OF ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION

14.13.010 Administrative appeals.

Any administrative appeal of the project decision, combined with any environmental determinations, which are provided by the city, shall be filed within 14 days after the notice of the decision or after other notice that the decision has been made and is appealable. The city shall extend the appeal period for an additional seven days, if state or city rules adopted pursuant to Chapter 43.21C RCW allow public comment on a determination of nonsignificance issued as part of an appealable project permit decision. (Ord. 4835 § 1, 1996.)

18.70.050 Administrative appeals.

Appeals from any administrative decision made under this title may be appealed to the hearing examiner pursuant to Chapter 2.46 ACC.

A. Any person wishing to appeal an administrative decision shall first render in writing a request for an administrative decision from the appropriate city official. The city official shall issue in writing a decision within five working days of the written request.

B. If the requester seeks to appeal that decision to the hearing examiner, any such appeal shall be filed with the planning director within 14 days of mailing the city's written decision. The city shall extend the appeal period for an additional seven days for appeals that are accompanied by a final mitigated determination of nonsignificance or final EIS.

C. The planning director shall notify any other city official that may be affected by the appeal.

D. The appeal shall then be processed in the same manner as any other application for a hearing examiner decision pursuant to Chapter 2.46 ACC.

E. The examiner shall conduct a public hearing pursuant to ACC 18.70.040 and consider any facts pertinent to the appeal. The examiner may affirm the decision, remand for further proceedings, or reverse the decision if the decision is:

1. In violation of constitutional provisions;
2. In excess of the authority of the official;
3. Made upon an unlawful procedure;
4. Affected by other error of law;
5. Clearly erroneous; or
6. Arbitrary or capricious. (Ord. 4840 § 1, 1996; Ord. 4229 § 2, 1987.)

Any party of record who feels the administrative decision is based on error of procedure, fact or judgment, or the discovery of new evidence may file a written appeal with the Hearing Examiner no later than **December 18, 2015, by 5:00 pm** (14 days of mailing the City's written decision). Appeals should be addressed to: Hearing Examiner, c/o Community Development & Public Works Department, 25 West Main Street, Auburn, WA 98001-4998.

ARCHITECTURAL AND SITE DESIGN REVIEW – DECISION
Estates at Hillside Gardens Senior Housing Project
MIS15-0005

I. GENERAL INFORMATION:

Issue Date: December 4, 2015

Application Date: June 5, 2015

Application No.: MIS15-0005

**Associated
Application Nos.:** ADM15-0001, SEP15-0015

Description: Construction of a new 4-story 127-unit affordable senior housing project with approximately 141 surface parking stalls, a private courtyard / recreation area along the western property boundary, a small dog park near Howard Rd. in the northeast corner of the site, along with associated landscaping, walkways, and other pedestrian features. The site consists of two parcels totaling approximately 3.73 acres.

The property is zoned C-1 Light Commercial which permits “senior housing” upon issuance of an Administrative Use Permit (ADM15-0001) and Architectural and Site Design Review, (this Decision, MIS15-0005).

Location: Between Howard Rd. SE and ‘O’ Ct. SE; approximately 400 ft. northwest of the intersection of 21st St. SE and ‘R’ St. SE.

Parcel Numbers: King Co. 192105-9247 & 192105-9206

Zoning: C-1, Light Commercial

**Comprehensive
Plan Designation:** Light Commercial

Applicant: Greg McKenna
F & M Development Company, LLC
17786 Des Moines Memorial Dr.
Burien, WA 98148

Property Owner: (Same as Applicant)

Agent: Tres Kirkebo
Apex Engineering
2601 S. 35th St. Ste. 200
Tacoma, WA 98409

Other Approvals/

Permits Required: Administrative Use Permit (ADM15-0001), SEPA Environmental Review (SEP15-0015), Public Facility Extension (FAC) Approval, including grading, storm, utility extension plans, and right-of-way improvement plans.

Subject Property and Adjacent Property Comprehensive Plan Designation, Zoning, and Land Use:

	Comprehensive Plan Designation	Zoning Classification	Current Land Use
Project Site	Light Commercial	C-1 Light Commercial	Vacant
North	Light Commercial	C-1 Light Commercial	Skating Rink
South	Light Commercial and Single-Family Residential	C-1 Light Commercial, R-7 Residential	Single-Family Residences, Small Multi-Family Buildings, VRFA Fire Station 32
East	Light Commercial	C-3 Heavy Commercial	VRFA Fire Station 32
West	Single-Family Residential	R-7 Residential	Single-Family Residences

II. SEPA STATUS

A Final Determination of Non-Significance (City File No. SEP15-0015) was issued July 1, 2015 for this project. The appeal period ended July 30, 2015 with no appeal filed.

III. FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. Tres Kirkebo, Apex Engineering, Agent, on behalf of Greg McKenna, F & M Development Company, LLC, Applicant and Property Owner, submitted an application on June 5, 2015 for Administrative Architectural and Site Design Review (“Design Review”) for a 127-unit low income senior housing project. The application was deemed complete for processing on June, 24, 2015.
2. The project site is located between Howard Rd. SE and ‘O’ Ct. SE; approximately 400 ft. northwest of the intersection of 21st St. SE and ‘R’ St. SE. King County Tax Assessor Parcel Numbers 192105-9247 & 192105-9206.
3. The Comprehensive Land Use designation for the property is “Light Commercial” and has a zoning designation of “C-1, Light Commercial”, which permits senior housing upon issuance of an Administrative Use Permit (AUP).
4. This Architectural and Site Design Review application and the Administrative Use Permit (a separate land use approval process (City File # ADM15-0001)) application are processed separately, per ACC 18.31.200(E)(2), which states:

“The decision on the administrative design review shall be issued prior to issuance of the building permits and/or issuance of discretionary land use approvals / permits.” [Emphasis added]

5. Per ACC 18.31.200(B)(1)(c), “retirement apartments, congregate living facilities and **senior housing complexes** in all zones in the City **where permitted outright or as a conditional use**” [emphasis added], are subject to the “Architectural and Site Design Review Standards and Regulations” of ACC 18.31.200.
6. The project is subject to the applicable “Large Multi-Family Development” and “All Development” sections of the “Multi-Family and Mixed-Use Design Standards” document, as adopted by the City of Auburn City Council July 12, 2010. In addition to the requirements of this document, the project must also comply with the “Approval Criteria for Design Review” of the Zoning Code at ACC 18.31.200(J). The Planning Director or Designee may approve, modify and approve, or deny an application for Design Review upon written findings showing the Applicant satisfies the criteria of these standards.
7. A Notice of Application (NOA) was distributed for this project and the associated land use applications (MIS15-0005, ADM15-0001, SEP15-0015) on July 1, 2015.
8. Two public comments were received in response to the NOA and City Staff provided the commenters with written responses. See Exhibits 4 and 5.
9. The contents of the case file of this project (MIS15-0005, ADM15-0001, SEP15-0015) are hereby incorporated by reference and made part of the record of this Design Review decision. These contents include two comment letters submitted by neighboring property owners along with the City responses.

IV. CONCLUSIONS:

As indicated above, the City’s Architectural and Site Design Review regulations are detailed in ACC 18.31.200 and provide certain approval criteria. What follows are the criteria (*in italics*) and a Staff Analysis of how the proposal compares to each criterion. The features that have been shown on plans and demonstrated to comply with requirements are described as being “provided”. Where compliance is yet to be achieved, it is noted, and then are addressed as conditions of approval.

1. ACC 18.31.200(J)(1)

The plans and supplements materials submitted to support the plan meet the requirements of the specific architectural and site design documents;

STAFF ANALYSIS:

The project is subject to the City’s “Multi-Family and Mixed-Use Design Standards” document; specifically to Chapter 2, “Large Multi-Family Development” and Chapter 4, “All Development”.

Chapter 2, “Large Multi-Family Development” contains provisions governing the following design standards:

A. Architecture

1. *Roofs and Rooflines*

The project includes a flat roof with a varying parapet roofline along with various eaves and cornices.

2. *Façades*

The building façade provides appropriate modulation by way of various horizontal and vertical features such as wall offsets, projecting balconies, and front and rear building entry covers. Different materials are provided throughout the façade to create visual interest.

3. *Entryways*

A covered drop-off / pick-up area is provided at the front entrance to the building and the Applicant has indicated that a “distinctly different entry door” will be provided.

B. Site Planning

4. *Building Siting and Orientation*

A courtyard is required for this project per ACC 18.31.200(J)(4)(a), see also “Item No. 4”, below. The courtyard that has been provided meets the general requirements of this section by providing 400-plus lineal feet of seating which includes seating along walls and raised planters, ADA accessible benches with accessible “pads” for wheelchairs to rest, to the side of the adjacent walkways, and a covered patio area at the entrance to the courtyard which includes wrap-around wall seating.

Both passive (garden area) and active (dog park near front entrance to the site, and a horseshoe pit in the courtyard area) have been provided.

Extensive landscaping has been provided throughout the site and includes many different types of trees and shrubs / plants as well as lawn areas. Any lawn areas are required to be sod, not seed as shown on the plans. The use of sod is proposed as a condition of approval, see Condition No. 2, below.

Pedestrian walkways have been provided throughout the site, connecting the building with the associated amenities as well as to the public right-of-way (Howard Rd. SE and ‘O’ Ct. SE).

5. *Neighborhood Context*

The proposed project meets the requirements of this section in the following ways:

- The building is “L” shaped and has the narrowest portion facing the adjacent single-family homes to the west.
- A 15-ft. wide buffer that is a design option in these Design Standards is not feasible as a sewer easement is proposed to provide a future sewer service to the adjacent City-owned lot north of the project site (Parcel No. 192105-9337) . This sewer easement is being provided in exchange for the City vacating it’s rights to a 90-ft. x 120-ft. sewer easement that is located in the northwest corner of the project site. The location of this new sewer easement is offset 10 ft. from the western property line to allow placement of a 10-ft. wide landscape buffer which includes a 6-ft. cedar fence and a mix of evergreen and deciduous trees.
- As the building exceeds 2-stories in height (approximately 43 ft. at the highest point), a minimum 50 ft. setback is required, which is provided.

6. *Access, Circulation and Parking*

Consistent with these standards, the project is removing an existing nonconforming driveway along Howard Rd. SE and constructing a new driveway to meet current Engineering Design Standards. No vehicle access is proposed to 'O' Ct. SE.

As mentioned above, pedestrian walkways are provided throughout the site connecting the public rights-of-way with the building.

Due to the encumbrances on the site, particularly the 60-ft. width of utility easements (these are associated with the previously vacated Old Howard Rd. right-of-way) that diagonally bisects the site, the parking is situated to the front and sides of the building; as such, placing the building near the Howard Rd. SE frontage and the parking behind is not a viable option. All of the proposed parking are surface stalls. Headlights will not shine into resident windows as no parking stalls are facing the proposed building. Landscaping and solid cedar fencing is proposed to help avoid headlights shining onto adjacent single-family residential properties.

7. *Service Areas and Fencing*

A trash enclosure is proposed near the rear of the southern end of the courtyard area and will be conditioned to be of materials and colors similar to that of the building. Fencing will be provided around the perimeter using a combination of 6-ft. cedar fencing and metal vertical rail fencing. See Condition No. 3, below

C. Common Space

8. *Defensible Space (CPTED)*

Consistent with the standards, the main building entry is facing north to Howard Rd. SE and the main parking area. Parking and walkway lighting will be provided at an appropriate scale and provide sufficient illumination meeting City standards of Chapter 18.55 ACC "Outdoor Lighting".

9. *Signage*

Appropriate signage will need to be included in the building permit submittal including a lighted directory sign at the building entrance and way-finding signage throughout the development. This is proposed as a condition of approval, see Condition No. 4, below.

Chapter 4, "All Development" contains provisions governing the following design standards:

A. Architecture

1. *Green Building*

The Applicant proposes to use 10% recycled material in the construction of the building and avoid the use of materials high in pollutants.

2. *Mechanical Equipment Screening*

At this point no ground utilities are shown on the plans. The Applicant has stated that in the event above ground features are necessary and associated with ground utilities, they will be screened with 6-ft. cedar fencing and/or adequate landscaping. The rooftop mechanical equipment will be located in the center of the building and screened from public view by way of the parapet at the top of the walls. The Applicant has also stated that the elevator proposed will be a "machine roomless" elevator which does not require the typical rooftop room and should not be visible from the public view.

B. Site Planning

10. Green Site Design

For compliance with this section, the Applicant proposes to use native / drought-resistant vegetation, work to ensure that construction waste is limited, separated prior to disposal and/or recycled, utilizing highly efficient Heating/Ventilation/Air Conditioning (HVAC) and lighting systems, and, check each year to ensure irrigations systems are working efficiently and without leaks.

D. Common Space

4. Landscaping

The proposed landscaping meets the requirements of this section in the following ways:

- A variety of plantings, groundcovers, and other amenities are provided on site to provide visual interest and encourage human interaction,
- The landscaping plan will need to take into consideration the location of utilities and other infrastructure improvements to ensure compatibility and to diminish the presence of utility facilities such as meter boxes, transformers, etc.,
- Trees and a solid 6-ft. cedar fence is proposed along the property lines that abut single-family residential properties. An adjustment to the standard that limits the length of this fencing to 50% of the lineal feet of common property line is recommended. See "Section V Design Review Adjustment" below,
- The proposed plantings are of varieties that are compatible with each other and an automatic irrigation sprinkler system has been provided,
- In general, landscaping is proposed to enhance views of the site from neighboring properties and public rights-of-way.

5. Lighting

No lighting plan or details were submitted along with this application. Upon building permit and/or FAC submittal, the Applicant will be required to submit a lighting plan that meets the requirements of this section and Chapter 18.55 ACC "Outdoor Lighting". This is proposed as a condition of approval, see Condition No. 6, below.

2. ACC 18.31.200(J)(2)

The proposed development is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan;

STAFF ANALYSIS:

The proposed project appropriately implements the C-1, Light Commercial zoning district and in turn, the "Light Commercial" Comprehensive Plan Land Use Designation.

In addition, the project and design implements a number of policies in the Comprehensive Plan. Several goals, objectives, or policies promote additional residential development while providing quality design practices in order to meet both community and Washington State Growth Management Act goals. The following excerpted goals, objectives, or policies relate to this project:

GOAL 7

Residential Development

*To emphasize housing development at single family densities, in order to reestablish a mix of housing types appropriate for a family oriented community, **while recognizing the need and desire for both lower density and higher density housing appropriately located to meet the housing needs of all members of the community.** [Emphasis added]*

Objective 7.1

To establish a system of residential densities that accommodates a range of housing choices appropriate for the City.

Policy LU-13

*The City should promote the provision, preservation and maintenance of adequate housing for the city's residents by **encouraging a balanced mix of housing types and values appropriate to the income levels and lifestyles of area residents**. Auburn has always been willing to accept its "fair share" of low and moderate cost housing opportunities. However, this has translated into a great disparity in Puget Sound communities with cities such as Auburn receiving more of these types of housing than other comparable communities. This has had impacts in terms of the costs of meeting human service needs as well as some poorly maintained multifamily properties which have caused a variety of problems. Auburn will work to insure that housing units are equitably distributed across the region in terms of both physical location and cost. [Emphasis added]*

The proposal and its design contributes to the variety and quality of housing stock to serve all members of the community. In particular, the project provides greater choices for senior living, and is further supported by the relational location to the Auburn Senior Activity Center, which is located less than a mile to the north of this project. The proposal fulfills the goal of providing a range of housing styles so that residents can "age in place" and remain in the community as they advance in age, not needing to go outside the community to find suitable housing.

GOAL 12

Urban Development

To encourage redevelopment of underutilized areas to reduce sprawl and take full advantage of the City's investment in existing infrastructure.

Objective 12.1

To facilitate infill development.

Policy LU-117

***Identify areas for commercial infill development** and focus street and utility systems improvements to facilitate their development. [Emphasis added]*

The project site has suitable infrastructure including, water, sewer, access, etc. and is proposing to redevelop an underutilized site within the C-1, Light Commercial zone. The intent of the C-1 zone is to act as a transition between lower intensity uses (such as single-family residential) and higher intensity uses (such as automobile-oriented commercial) and this project successfully accomplishes this transition by providing a use that steps down in intensity from street side commercial to single-family.

3. ACC 18.31.200(J)(3)

The proposed development meets required setback, landscaping, architectural style and materials, such that the building walls have sufficient visual variety to mitigate the appearance of large façades, particularly from public rights-of-way and single-family residential zones;

STAFF ANALYSIS:

The project as demonstrated by the application materials, as revised, either meets zoning code requirements or is capable of meeting zoning code requirements as conditioned below. In addition, the project has sufficient visual interest to mitigate the appearance of large façades, particularly as viewed from public rights-of-way and surrounding single-family residential zones. See the Staff Analysis under "Item 1" above.

4. ACC 18.31.200(J)(4)

In addition to the criteria in subsections (J)(1) through (3) of this section, for multiple-family residential and retirement apartment projects, the director or designee must determine that the following key review criteria have been met:

- a. *The proposed development is arranged in a manner that either:*
 - i. ***Provides a courtyard space creating a cohesive identity for the building cluster and public open space furnished to facilitate its use; or***
 - ii. *Possesses a traditional streetscape orientation that provides clearly identifiable and visible entries from the street, views from residential units onto the street and reinforces pedestrian-oriented streetscape characteristics (e.g., building edge abutting sidewalk, entries onto the street); or*
 - iii. *Faces and facilitates views of a major open space system;*

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Consistent with "Item i", a courtyard has been provided within the center of the "L" shaped building. The courtyard is consistent with applicable items in the Design Standards, see "Item 1(B)(4)" above.

- b. *The proposed development provides a variety in architectural massing and articulation to reduce the apparent size of the buildings and to distinguish vertical and horizontal dimensions;*
- c. *The proposed development contains a combination of elements such as architectural forms, massing, assortment of materials, colors, and color bands sufficient to distinguish distinct portions and stories of the building;*

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Consistent with the Design Standards, adequate architectural features have been provided to distinguish portions and stories of the building to ensure the façade and bulk of the building are visually interesting and not incompatible with the surrounding uses. See also "Item 1(A)" above.

- d. *Residential buildings in large multiple-family projects or mixed-use projects are physically integrated into the complex possessing sufficiently different appearance or placement to be able to distinguish one building from another;*

STAFF ANALYSIS:

The project proposes only one building.

- e. *Unit entrances are individualized by use of design features that make each entrance distinct or which facilitate additional personalization by residents;*

STAFF ANALYSIS:

The building contains one main north-facing entrance that proposes to include a distinct entry door and covered drop-off area. Exterior doors are provided for each ground dwelling unit, however, the main unit entrances will be from interior hallways.

- f. *Areas dedicated to parking are sufficiently visually broken up and contain a complement of vegetative materials to project a landscaped appearance;*

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Landscaping has been provided throughout the interior of the parking lot area as well as throughout the rest of the site including around the perimeter. The C-1, Light Commercial zone requires 10% of the site to be landscaped; the proposed landscape plan shows 27.6% of the site being landscaped.

- g. *Where applicable, a transition is created that minimizes impacts from multifamily and mixed-use development projects on neighboring lower density residential dwelling units in abutting or adjacent single-family zones;*

STAFF ANALYSIS:

A 10-ft. landscape buffer and a solid 6-ft. cedar fence has been provided along common property lines with single-family properties. In addition, the building has been setback 50 ft.-plus where next to a single-family property.

- h. *Where applicable, in cases of granting density or height bonuses, the project has provided community benefits, facilities or improvements above and beyond those required in the municipal code and supports the goals, objectives and policies of the comprehensive plan.*

STAFF ANALYSIS:

No bonuses have been proposed or granted.

V. DESIGN REVIEW ADJUSTMENT

Per ACC 18.31.200(I), the Planning Director or Designee has the authority to make minor adjustments to the Design Standards upon making written findings for the criteria listed in ACC 18.31.200(I)(2). Specifically, the authority for the adjustment proposed by Staff is:

“ACC 18.31.200(I)(1)(c)

An adjustment to the architectural or site design requirements that remains consistent with the purpose and intent of the architectural design standards”

Staff is recommending an adjustment to the specific language in Section 4.4.5(3) of the “Multi-Family and Mixed-Use Design Standards” which applies to a multi-family development adjacent to single-family zones and reads as follows:

“Project shall provide:

*A combination of trees or shrubs and fencing where the **amount of fence does not exceed 50 percent of the lineal distance of the side to be buffered** as well as other plant materials, planted so that the ground will be covered within three years.” [Emphasis added]*

Staff's recommendation is to have the proposed solid 6-ft. cedar fence be constructed along the entire distance of the western and southern property lines. This extent of fencing would constitute more than 50 percent of two sides (or 100% of the western and southern perimeter). This recommendation is proposed to reduce potential impacts (real or perceived) on the neighboring single-family properties and is responsive to the public comments that were received from a few residents near this project.

What follows are the Design Review Adjustment criteria (*in italics*) and a Staff Analysis of how the proposal compares to each criterion.

1. ACC 18.31.200(I)(2)(a)

That the granting of such adjustment does not constitute a grant of special privilege inconsistent with the limitations upon uses of other properties in the vicinity and/or zone of the subject site;

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Solid fences less than 6 ft. in height are allowed within any zoning district within the City, with some restrictions regarding front setbacks and corner lots, per ACC 18.31.020. By requiring this project to install a solid 6-ft. cedar fence adjacent to all common property lines with single-family residence would not be granting a special privilege.

2. ACC 18.31.200(I)(2)(b)

That the granting of such adjustment will not adversely affect the established character of the surrounding neighborhood, discourage maintenance or upgrades on surrounding properties, nor result in perpetuation of those design qualities and conditions which the comprehensive plan intends to eliminate or avoid;

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Constructing a solid 6-ft. cedar fence along the western and southern property lines would not adversely affect the surrounding neighborhood nor discourage any maintenance or upgrades to existing properties.

3. ACC 18.31.200(I)(2)(c)

That the project incorporates alternate design characteristics that are equivalent or superior to those otherwise achieved by strict adherence to stated menu options;

STAFF ANALYSIS:

In addition to the solid 6-ft. cedar fence, 10-ft. landscaping buffers are provided per the Design Standards and include various plantings including trees, shrubs, and groundcover. Through the combination of these, the project provides equivalent or superior buffering between this project and the adjacent single-family properties.

Additional public notice per ACC 18.31.200(3) has not been provided as the fence was included in the initial documents along with the original public notice on July 1, 2015.

VI. DECISION

The Assistant Director of Community Development finds that the proposed Estates at Hillside Gardens Senior Housing project complies with the City's "Multi-Family and Mixed-Use Design Standards" document and therefore **APPROVES**, with the following conditions:

VII. CONDITIONS

1. The subsequent City construction approvals (such as, but not limited to, building and grading permits, public facility extension, etc.) must be generally consistent with the plans / documents provided as part of this Architectural and Site Design Review process and Decision. Any changes from the project description, exhibits, timing, or conditions must be reviewed and approved by the City of Auburn in advance for conformity with this approval. Any changes from these may require revision of this approval and / or environmental review.
2. Prior to issuance of building permits and approval of the public facility extension (FAC) the submittals shall be revised to address conformance with the following elements:
 - a. Any "turf areas" shall be sod, not seed, per ACC 18.50.040(C)(1)(a).
 - b. Materials used for the recycling / trash enclosure shall be of a similar color and appearing similar in material to that of the building or fencing.
 - c. Provide any necessary way-finding signage per the "Multi-Family and Mixed-Use Design Standards" 2.9.1 and 2.9.2.
 - d. Any ground utilities or mechanical units shall be screened per the "Multi-Family and Mixed-Use Design Standards" 4.2.1 through 4.2.3. A detail for such screening shall be shown, and implemented where this cannot be accomplished by landscaping alone.
 - e. A lighting plan shall be submitted meeting the requirements of the "Multi-Family and Mixed-Use Design Standards" 4.5 and Chapter 18.55 ACC, "Outdoor Lighting".
 - f. The Applicant has proposed to utilize Option 2 from the "Multi-Family and Mixed-Use Design Standards" 4.3.1 which reads "use of native and drought resistant vegetation". The Applicant's Landscape Architect shall review and confirm this requirement is being met upon future City construction approvals. The landscape plan shall indicate the proportions of native plant material to demonstrate conformance with this requirement.
 - g. The landscaping plan shall be coordinated with the civil plans to ensure compatibility and to ensure the landscaping is effectively diminishing the impact of any ground utilities or mechanical units, per the "Multi-Family and Mixed-Use Design Standards" 4.4.4.
 - h. Crushed rock is proposed for areas around the raised planters and horseshoe pit. This type of surface does not typically meet accessibility standards of the 2012 IBC Section 1103.1 and 2009 ANSI A117.1 Sections 302 and 402 due to the weather of our region. If the Applicant wishes to use crushed rock as a surface, proper details must be submitted along with future permit submittals to identify how accessibility requirements will be met. This recreational area must also meet the accessibility standards of IBC 1109.15.1 / 1190.15.3.

VIII. EXHIBITS

The Applicant has submitted the following documents pursuant to this Architectural and Site Design Review application and are hereby incorporated by reference:

3. Conceptual Site and Utility Plans, Apex Engineering, September 5, 2015.
4. Conceptual Landscaping and Irrigation Plans, Bradley Design Group, August 7, 2015.
5. Architectural Elevations, Ross Deckman & Associates, January 5, 2015.
6. Multi-Family and Mixed-Use Design Standards Compliance Summary, Ross Deckman & Associates, undated.
7. Response to City's June 24, 2015 Comment Letter, Ross Deckman & Associates, August 10, 2015.

In addition, the following documents produced by City Staff are hereby incorporated within the application:

6. Combined Notice of Application and Determination of Non-Significance, issued July 1, 2015.
7. Final Staff Evaluation for Environmental Checklist, July 1, 2015.
8. Notice of Complete Application and Request for Additional Information, sent June 24, 2015.
9. Comment Response Letter to Cheryl Creson, sent July 27, 2015.
10. Comment Response Letter to Julie Pederson, et al., sent July 23, 2015.

Prepared by: 
Thaniel Gouk, Senior Planner
Community Development & Public Works Dept.

12/4/2015
DATE

Reviewed by: 
Jeff Dixon, Planning Services Manager
Community Development & Public Works Dept.

12-4-15
DATE