

## APPLCIANTS SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

On April 1, 2015 the City provided the Applicant with a short list of questions/comments relating to the Applicant's PRD application. The Applicant appreciates the City's early review of the application and provides the following clarifications.

- *The TIS presumes that there will be two access points out onto Ingle Road with the Phase I improvements (+/- 203 lots). The plans show only one access point. The applicant should review the report and its recommendations and submit a revised TIS or an addendum letter addressing what impacts if any this may have on the study, timing of off-site improvements/turn lanes, other report recommendations, etc.*

Kittleson and Associates has reviewed and analyzed this issue and has prepared a supplement to the Traffic Impact Analysis to address this issue. The supplement is being submitted concurrently with this response. The Kittelson analysis finds that the intersection of the access for Phase 1 and Ingle Road operates at a level of service well within the City's level of service standards; and finds that no material safety issues are presented with the Applicant's proposed design of phase 1.

- *Pod "F1b" in the north part of the project appears to be totally isolated from the rest of the development, the roadway network and the trail system.*

This Pod is a narrow portion of the Applicant's property that lies between the Coombs property to the north and an open space area to the south. It abuts Pod F1c to the east. This Pod will likely be accessed directly off of Ingle road due to the critical areas to the south. The precise access location will be determined at the time of the Pod's development in conjunction with a preliminary plat approval process through the City.

Pod F1b has been part of the cumulative analysis for the entire PRD and will be governed by the master Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions governing the PRD. While legally permissible to permit this pod independently of the PRD as a stand-alone subdivision, there would be no public purpose served by doing so. By having Pod F1b part of the PRD, it will be governed by the rules of the PRD, share compatible architecture with other areas of the PRD and have access over the trails and rights to other amenities of the PRD. It will also share in any dues or assessments uniformly assessed upon the homes in the PRD to enhance and maintain the common areas, landscaping and community center. All of the pods identified in the PRD application are identical to the PODs identified in the master plan incorporated into the Development Agreement approved by the City Council.

- *Along with the previously mentioned MF pods B1 and B2 not being interior to the development, pods B4 and B5 are also not located to the interior of the development.*

The City's code, specifically CMC 18.23.030(F), provides that the multi-family component of the PRD be "*ideally developed toward the interior*" of the PRD "*to ensure compatibility with existing single family residences*" that border the PRD. The vast majority, (in excess of 90%) of the multi-family units of the PRD are located in the interior of the PRD, most notably in the urban village. There are no "*existing single family residences*" that border either Pod B4 or B5. Pod B5 is a very small pod (the smallest by far in the PRD) and is adjacent to a major arterial. It is surrounded by open space. Because of these factors, it is much better suited for multi-family development. Similarly, Pod B4 is adjacent to Ingle Road which is a collector level street designed to carry significant traffic. It too is surrounded by open space and critical areas. In light of these factors, the City's code does not prohibit the location of these pods, but does suggest that Planning Commission and the City Council be made aware of them. The City Council is aware of them as evidenced by its approval of the master plan incorporated into the Development Agreement containing all of these pods in their present location.

- *Pod B4, a multi-family pod, is located on the northern portion of the project in the R-10 zone. The application discusses how the development becomes less dense as you move north.*

If the project were broken up into four or five sections from south to north, there is a clear and substantial decrease in density as the project moves north. Much like there are minor anomalies to a slope analysis where a two foot section of a 100 foot section of the slope might be 40%, but the overall slope from top to bottom is 8 percent, here there are minor anomalies designed into the project as necessary or appropriate, that while present, do not change the overall character of the density distribution of the project.

- *The regional T-27 Trail which is PIF creditable and is required to be a minimum of 12' wide and paved per the PROS plan (we also like to have the regional trails as ADA compliant to the maximum extent feasible). The plan calls for an 8' wide paved trail at the central park area, a 6' wide paved trail from flat up to 8% trail grade and a 4' wide gravel section in steeper terrain. The city may have difficulty justifying/granting PIF credits on trail segments that don't meet the PROS plan.*

The trail specifications proposed in the PRD application are those which were approved by the City Council through the Development Agreement process. See Exhibit C to the Development Agreement. The amount of Park Impact Fee credits will be determined prior to or at the time of construction.

- *The preliminary utility plans do not identify a method of solids collection for the sanitary sewer flows from the development.*

The Applicant has spent several months working with City staff on a public private partnership to comprehensively plan and build a sanitary sewer system for the North Urban Growth Boundary. Agreements are close to being complete to bring this plan to fruition. The system

that will be born out of this effort will no longer require the presence or maintenance of individual solids tanks. Prior to that system being constructed, the Applicant is utilizing a traditional system for phase 1 that does contain tanks for solids. The preliminary location of those tanks is provided in the pdf drawing submitted concurrently with this response. The ultimate location of the tanks will be determined at final engineering.

- *The pump station is not located on the applicant's property – it appears to be located on city property.*

The sewer plan referenced above that is being developed by the City identifies a pump station west of the Applicant's property on property owned by the City. Pursuant to long standing discussions with the City, the Applicant will construct the necessary portions of that pump station at the location identified by the City.

- *Other than the narrowed entry roadway and 28' wide paved interior streets there does not appear to be any other traffic calming elements proposed within this project.*

Most if not all of the streets in the PRD are curvilinear in nature to reduce traffic speeds. There are no long straight runs of streets currently proposed anywhere in the PRD.

- *Lots 70 – 75 don't have access to a public street. It appears that they are accessed in the front by a private alley identified as Tract D and access to the rear via a 10' wide Tracts C & E.*

While the identified lots do not abut a public street, each of them has access to a public street by way of the alleys and tracts. The alleys are in compliance with the City's code and the homes will be sprinkled.

- *If an interior roadway connection to the northerly half of the development is not feasible it may be helpful to include substantive evidence to that fact.*

Olson Engineering indicates that the northern portion of the Green Mountain PRD is separated from the southern portion by steep slopes. They indicate that while the length of the steep slopes varies, it is in the 200'-300' range with gradients in the 50%-60% range. Olson Engineering indicates that these slopes make it impractical to construct a connector street connecting the northern and southern portions of the project with an internal road way.

- *Access related to CMC 18.23.100(G)*

CMC 18.23.100(G) provides:

*The proposed development shall provide at least two access points (where a PRD does not have access to a primary or secondary arterial), that distributes traffic to adjacent streets in an acceptable manner.*

The proposed PRD does have access and proposes access to Goodwin Road, which is identified by the City as an arterial street. Additionally, the PRD has at least four access points to the surrounding street network. The TIA prepared by Kittelson and Associates demonstrates that with the identified proposed mitigation, there will be no level of service deficiencies resulting from the development of the PRD.

The Applicant appreciates the opportunity to further address or clarify any aspects of its proposal.