

**Application and Findings
for
Architectural Review
for
Todd Village Apartments
Tree Removal and Replacement**

Property Owner: Todd Village-285 LLC
9500 SW Barbur Blvd., #300
Portland, OR 97219

Applicant: Tim Gleason
CTL Management, Inc.
9500 SW Barbur Blvd., #300
Portland, OR 97219

Applicant's Representative: Van Loo² Associates, LLC
Kirsten Van Loo
30495 SW Buckhaven Road
Hillsboro, OR 97123
503-956-4180
kirstenvanloo@netzero.net

Location: 2S124CC TL 200 & 300
8325 SW Mohawk St.

Area: +/-16 Acres

Zoning: RH - Residential High Density

Requested Land Use Reviews: Architectural Review for Tree Removal and Replacement

Proposal: The application requests Architectural Review approval to remove and replace trees in the landscape that have caused extensive damage to infrastructure on the site or are diseased/dying/dead trees. No new development is proposed.

Site and Vicinity: The project site is approximately 16 acres on the north side of SW Mohawk Street between Martinazzi Avenue and Boones Ferry Road. The site is zoned RH and contains the Todd Village apartments, which were built decades ago. Adjacent parcels to the north are zoned CC and contain existing businesses that front onto and take access from SW Warm Springs Street. Parcels across Martinazzi to the east are zoned CO and are fully developed with commercial uses. Across Mohawk to the south is RML zoned land and across Boones Ferry to the west is zoned RH, all of which contain existing apartments and townhomes.

Project Description: The project consists of removing 48 mature landscape trees and replacing them with more appropriate species. Tree roots have grown under and over in-ground pipes, causing movement and/or flattening of pipes which has resulted in restricting or completely blocking flow. Additionally, tree roots have lifted walkways and adjacent paved parking areas on the site creating pedestrian trip hazards.

Tualatin Development Code

Chapter 33 - Applications and Approval Criteria

Section 33.020 - Architectural Review

3. Types of Architectural Review Applications - Procedure Type.

- e. Minor Architectural Review
 - (iii) The modification is listed in 33.020(7)(a).

Response: According to 33.020.7.a.ix, removing trees originally required to be retained or planted by a previously approved AR proposal requires a Minor Architectural Review, which is a Type I process.

- 4. **Application Materials.** *The application must be on forms provided by the City. In addition to the application materials required by TDC 32.140 (Application Submittal), the following application materials are also required:*
 - (a) *The project name and the names, addresses, and telephone numbers of the architect, landscape architect, and engineer on the project;*
 - (b) *Existing conditions plan, site plan, grading plan, utility plan, landscape plan, and lighting plan all drawn to scale;*
 - (c) *A materials board that includes example building materials and textures;*
 - (d) *Title report; and*
 - (e) *A Service Provider Letter from Clean Water Services.*

Response: The proposal is for tree removal and replacement only. The applicable items are included with the application materials.

5. Approval Criteria.

- (c) **Large Commercial, Industrial, and Multifamily Development.** Applications for Large Commercial, Industrial, and Multifamily Development must comply with the applicable standards and objectives in TDC Chapter 73A through 73G.

Response: No new development is proposed. Chapters 73A through 73G are addressed in this document.

Section 33.110 - Tree Removal Permit/Review

4. Specific Submittal Requirements

- (a) Tree Preservation Plan

Response: The Tree Preservation Plan, Sheet L2, shows the pertinent information.

- (b) Tree Assessment Report

Response: All of the trees on site have been assessed by ArborPro Tree Experts, their reports are included with the application materials.

- (c) Tree Tags

Response: The arborist has tagged the trees in the field.

5. Approval Criteria

- (a) An applicant must satisfactorily demonstrate that at least one of the following criteria is met:

- (i) The tree is diseased and:

- (A) The disease threatens the structural integrity of the tree; or
(B) The disease permanently and severely diminishes the esthetic value of the tree; or
(C) The continued retention of the tree could result in other trees being infected with a disease that threatens either their structural integrity or esthetic value.

- (ii) The tree represents a hazard which may include but not be limited to:

- (A) The tree is in danger of falling; or
(B) Substantial portions of the tree are in danger of falling.

- (iii) It is necessary to remove the tree to construct proposed improvements based on Architectural Review approval, building permit, or approval of a Subdivision or Partition Review.

Response: As detailed in the Tree Removal Report prepared by ArborPro Tree Experts, numerous trees on site that are proposed for removal are dead or dying, including, but not limited to, many birch trees that have bronze birch borer disease, which can quickly create a hazard due to falling in whole or part, and also spread to other birch trees in the area. The arborist has concluded that removal is necessary as those trees are not sustainable in their current locations and it is not feasible to move them. As the problems will only get worse over time, removal/replacement is the only arboricultural solution. Other trees must be removed due to damage they have caused to site infrastructure, including sidewalks, parking areas and underground utilities. Damage is severe enough in some areas to prevent underground utility systems from functioning properly and has created severe pedestrian trip hazards by raising sidewalks and pavement. Forty-eight trees are proposed for removal, 51 replacement trees will be

planted in approximately the same locations as the removed trees, as appropriate, with varieties that are more urban development friendly.

Chapter 73A - Site Design

Response: No new development or alteration to the existing apartment complex buildings or parking area is proposed. The proposal is for removal/replacement of dead and dying trees and trees that are causing damage to infrastructure and creating safety hazards on the site.

Chapter 73B - Landscaping Standards

73B.020 Landscape Area Standards Minimum Areas by Use and Zone

Response: According to the table, there is no minimum area requirement in the RH zone.

73B.030 Additional Minimum Landscaping Requirements for Common Wall Residential Uses

Response: No new development is proposed. All areas of the site that are not occupied by buildings or site infrastructure and amenities are landscaped.

73B.070 Minimum Landscaping Standards for All Zones

3. Tree Preservation

Response: No new grading or development is proposed. There are a total of 244 landscape trees over 8" dbh on the site, 48 trees are proposed for removal, as shown on the Tree Preservation Plan, Sheet L2. Fifty-one replacement trees are proposed, as shown on the Landscape Plan, Sheet L3. Trees proposed for removal include mostly varieties of birch, pine, maple, and sweetgum. Replacement trees are proposed to be varieties that are more compatible with urban development, for this site the Landscape Architect has chosen Amur Maple, Trident Maple and Japanese Tree Lilac.

73B.080 Minimum Standards Trees and Plants

Response: Replacement trees are proposed to be 1 3/4" - 2" caliper in size. Amur Maple, Trident Maple and Japanese Tree Lilac were chosen by the Landscape Architect as they are consistent with the criteria in this section.

Chapter 73C - Parking Standards

Response: The proposal is for removal/replacement of dead/dying trees and trees damaging infrastructure and creating safety hazards on the site. No alteration to site parking, or reduction in parking area landscaping is proposed. Replacement trees will be similarly located as the prior trees, as appropriate.

Chapter 73D - Waste and Recyclables Management Standards

Response: No new development or alteration to the existing apartment complex is proposed. The proposal is for removal/replacement of dead and dying trees and trees that are causing damage to infrastructure and creating safety hazards on the site.

Chapter 73E - Central Design District Design Guidelines

Response: The site is not within the Central Design District.

Chapter 73F - Wireless Communications Facilities

Response: The proposal is for tree removal/replacement on the grounds of an existing apartment complex. No new wireless communications facilities are proposed at this time.

Chapter 73G - Masonry Wall Standards

Response: The proposal is for tree removal/replacement on the grounds of an existing apartment complex. No new masonry walls are proposed.

Conclusion:

This application for Architectural Review for removal and replacement of landscape trees meets the statutory requirements. Findings have been made in support of the project and the City of Tualatin Planning staff can approve the application.