

ATTACHMENT B

TABLE 16.49.040 SITE DESIGN REVIEW MENU – STAFF RESPONSES

Note: when a new structure within an existing site is proposed, Staff apply the design matrix to pertain only to the proposed changes on the site. Therefore, no points are lost or gained for an existing condition that isn't within the project scope. When matrix items are not applicable, they do not count towards points earned or possible points earned. This differs from the applicant's approach to the matrix (found in the Applicant's Narrative, Attachment A.2).

Design Criteria	Possible Points					Points Scored/Possible Points	Staff Response
Parking	0	1	2	3	4		
Screening of parking and/or loading facilities from public right-of-way	Not screened	Partially screened	Fully screened	-	-	2/2	Given the distance from the street and the existing structures between NE 4 th Ave, the two proposed ADA parking spaces are fully screened. Two (2) points are awarded.
Parking lot lighting provided	No	Yes	-	-	-	N/A	No changes to the existing parking lots are proposed. The criterion is not applicable.
Parking location (behind building is best)	Front	Side	Behind	-	-	1/2	Two (2) new ADA parking will be on the side of the building. One point is awarded.
Number of parking spaces provided (% of minimum required)	>120%	101-120%	100%	-	-	2/2	The applicant's Parking Analysis (Attachment A.5.c) determined the existing parking for the site is sufficient. Two (2) points are awarded.
Screening of Storage Areas and Utility Boxes	0	1	2	3	4		
Trash storage is screened from view by solid wood fence, masonry wall or landscaping.	No	Yes	-	-	-	1/1	According to the applicant the trash storage will be fully screened. The location of the trash storage and screening plan is not shown on the submitted plans.
Trash storage is located away from adjacent property lines.	0 - 10 feet from adjacent property	11 - 25 feet from adjacent property	>25 feet from adjacent property	-	-	2/2	One (1) point is awarded for screening and two (2) points are awarded for location, with the condition that the applicant provide the location and the location of the trash storage in the final plans.
Utility equipment, including rooftop equipment, is screened from view.	Not screened	Partially screened	Fully screened	-	-	0/2	The exterior mechanical equipment on the north and west facades, extending up to 25 feet tall, is not fully screened. Without slats the chain link fencing provides minimal screening. Rooftop equipment is also visible. No points are awarded.

ATTACHMENT B
TABLE 16.49.040 SITE DESIGN REVIEW MENU – STAFF RESPONSES

Access	0	1	2	3	4		
Distance of access to nearest intersection.	≤70 feet	71 - 100 feet	>100 feet	-	-	N/A	No changes to existing accesses are proposed. The criterion is not applicable.
Pedestrian walkways from public street/sidewalks to building entrances.	One entrance connected.	-	Walkways connecting all public streets/sidewalks to building entrances.	-	-	2/2	The proposed building will have pedestrian connections from the entrances to the existing pedestrian walkway system that connects to adjacent public sidewalks. Two (2) points awarded.
Pedestrian walkways from parking lot to building entrance.	No walkways	Walkway next to building only	Walkways connecting all parking areas to building entrances	-	-	2/2	The proposed building will have pedestrian connections to the existing walkways that connect to the parking lots. Two (2) points awarded.
Tree Retention	0	1	2	3	4		
Percentage of trees retained	<10%	10-50%	51-75%	>75%	-	3/3	One fir tree north of the building will be removed during construction (see Attachment A.10). There are approximately five trees within the project area (the other four are located south of the building along the pedestrian walkway). Therefore, 80% of the trees are being retained. Three (3) points are awarded.
Replacement of trees removed	<50%	≥50%	-	-	-	1/1	The new landscaping will have seven trees, resulting in over 50% replacement of the one existing trees in the project area being removed. One (1) point is awarded.
Signs	0	1	2	3	4		
Dimensional size of sign (% of maximum permitted)	>75%	50-75%	<50%	-	-	N/A	Not applicable, no information on signage has been provided as a part of this application.
Similarity of sign color to building color	Not similar	Somewhat similar	Similar	-	-	N/A	
Pole sign used	Yes	No	-	-	-	N/A	
Building Appearance	0	1	2	3	4		
Style (similar to surroundings)	Not similar	Somewhat similar (1 or 2 points possible depending on level of similarity)		-	-	2/2	The proposed building style and color is similar to the other buildings at the Fairgrounds site, it is a metal structure with white coloring. This is

ATTACHMENT B

TABLE 16.49.040 SITE DESIGN REVIEW MENU – STAFF RESPONSES

Color (subdued and similar to surroundings is better)	Neither	Similar or subdued	Both	-	-	2/2	similar to many of the industrial buildings neighboring the site across NE 4 th Avenue. There is diversity of colors found in the residential properties around the site. The building's materials differ from adjacent residential uses. However, it is at a far distance away and heavily screened from these uses (see Finding 31 of the Staff Report for more information). Two (2) points awarded for style and two (2) points awarded for color.
Material (concrete, wood and brick are best)	Either 1 or 2 points may assigned at the discretion of the Site and Design Review Board					0/2	The building is entirely a metal structure. It does not incorporate any of the listed materials qualified as best. No points are awarded.
Size of building (smaller is better)	>20,000 square feet	≤20,000 square feet	-	-	-	0/1	The building is over 20,000 square feet. No points are awarded.
Provision of public art (i.e. murals, statues, fountains, decorative bike racks, etc.)	No	-	-	-	Yes	4/4	The applicant will install a mural on the south facade of Horning Hall, providing public art visible from the public right-of-way. Four (4) points are awarded. The mural plans are not included in the applicant's plan set (Attachment A.6). Per the COAs, it will be included for subsequent reviews.
Landscaping	0	1	2	3	4		
Number of non-required trees provided	-	At least one tree per 500 square feet of landscaping.	-	-	-	0/1	New landscaping areas has seven trees for 3,900 square feet of landscaping (including the rain garden). Zero points awarded.
Amount of grass (less grass is better) (% of total landscaped area)	>50%	25-50%	<25%	-	-	0/2	The rain garden makes up approximately 50% of the total new landscaping proposed and is entirely grass. A notable portion of the new landscape area northeast of the building is also comprised of grass. Greater than 50% of the new landscaping will be grass. Zero points awarded.

ATTACHMENT B
TABLE 16.49.040 SITE DESIGN REVIEW MENU – STAFF RESPONSES

Low Impact Development (LID)	0	1	2	3	4		
Use of pervious paving materials (% of total paved area)	<10%	-	10-50%	51-75%	>75%	0/2	No pervious pavement is proposed. Zero points awarded.
Provision of park or open space area	None	-	Open space (generally not for public use)	-	Park (public or privately owned for public use)	2/4	The Fairgrounds is a semi-private open space and is generally open to the public with admission fees. The proposed building will enhance and complement the use of the Fairgrounds open space areas. Two (2) of four points awarded.
Use of drought tolerant species in landscaping (% of total plants)	<25% drought tolerant	-	25-50% drought tolerant	51-75% drought tolerant	>75% drought tolerant	2/4	45% of the total number of new plantings will be drought tolerant. In the rain garden, Sawbeak Sedge and Small Fruited Bulrush are not drought tolerant. See more information on the Landscaping Plans (Attachment A.6). Two (2) points awarded.
Provision of additional interior parking lot landscaping (% of minimum required)	100%	101-110%	111-120%	>120%	-	N/A	No additional parking lots are proposed. The only new parking proposed are two ADA parking spaces adjacent to the new building. The criterion is not applicable.
Provision of an eco-roof or rooftop garden (% of total roof area)	<10%	-	-	10-50%	>50%	0/4	No eco-roof or rooftop garden proposed. Zero points awarded.
Parking integrated within building footprint (below-grade, structured parking, or tuck-under parking) (% of total on-site parking)	<10%	-	-	10-50%	>50%	N/A	Considering only two new ADA parking spaces are being proposed for this project to meet the parking standards, Staff have determined it is unreasonable to consider this standard a viable option for the proposed development. The criterion is not applicable.
Disconnecting downspouts from city stormwater facilities	None	Some downspouts disconnected	All downspouts disconnected	-	-	2/2	All downspouts will be disconnect from City stormwater facilities. Two (2) points awarded.

ATTACHMENT B**TABLE 16.49.040 SITE DESIGN REVIEW MENU – STAFF RESPONSES**

Shared parking with adjacent uses or public parking structure (% of total required parking spaces)	None	<50%	≥50%	-	-	N/A	The new parking proposed is only two (2) spaces for ADA parking. Given the location and type of parking it is not possible to share the new ADA spaces with adjacent uses. The criterion is not applicable.
Provision of rain gardens/bioretention areas for stormwater runoff (% of total landscaped area)	None	-	10-50%	51-75%	>75%	2/4	The 1,948-square-foot rain garden is 50% of the total new landscape area proposed (a total of 3,900 square feet). Two (2) points awarded.
Total LID Points							10 LID points achieved 18.8% of total possible points
Total Points							32 points achieved of 53 possible points 60.4% of possible points achieved