*HEARING DATE/AGENDA ITEM 2*

 *Project Number: PR-004030*

*Application Number: SD-2020-00540*

*Project Name: Wintergreen Luxury Apartments*

Request: Site Plan for Apartment with more than 50 Units

COMMENTS (requirements that need to be met):

* There is no Code Enforcement signature block

**Response:** Code enforcement signature line added.

* The applicant needs to verify if a sensitive lands analysis is required

**Response:** Not required, justification below:

Following a sensitivity review of the project site in regards to IDO Section 5-2 Site Design and Sensitive Lands, the following assessment was made by the applicant that Tract E-1 does not meet any of the sensitive land elements, as described further below:

5-2(C)(1)(a) Floodplains and flood hazard areas – the site is not with in a floodplain or flood hazard area per FEMA FIRM Map 35001C0108G dated 9/26/2008

5-2(C)(1)(b) Steep slopes – Steep slopes is not defined by the IDO but generally considered steep if the slope is greater than 20%.  The average slope of the undeveloped site is 4.5%

5-2(C)(1)(c) Unstable soils – per USGS the of soil is bluepoint loamy fine sand 98.1%

5-2(C)(1)(d) Wetlands – per FEMA FIRM map no evidence of wetlands.

5-2(C)(1)(e) Arroyos – per FEMA FIRM map no evidence of recorded arroyos.

5-2(C)(1)(f) Irrigation facilities (acequias) – no

5-2(C)(1)(g) Escarpments – there are no escarpments on the property

5-2(C)(1)(h) Rock outcroppings – there are no rock outcroppings on the property

5-2(C)(1)(i) Large stands of mature trees –  not present, the site is in an undeveloped condition with vegetation typical of the west mesa with areas of scrub, small vegetation and some minor disturbance by dumping of soils.

5-2(C)(1)(j) Archaeological sites – certificate of no effect provided by the COA dated May 6, 2020 on file.

* The landscape buffer along the eastern property boundary meets the IDO requirements. However, the applicant could add additional trees in the landscape buffer to provide additional screening between the Site and the adjacent single-family residential dwellings east of the Site to provide two full layers of trees within the buffer.

**Response:** Developer already modified the planting species in the buffer and increased the density of planting based on community feedback from the public meeting.

* Open space calculations need to be provided.

**Response:** Open space calculations added to sheet C1.

* Staff recommends park benches be placed in the landscaped open space and near the sidewalks and trails within the proposed development.

**Response:** Benches added to development and labelled call-out 18

* Outdoor/exterior lighting needs to be depicted.

**Response:** Exterior lighting added labelled call-out 20 and added to detail sheet C.6

* The CMU screen wall along the boundary of the Site is depicted as 6-feet in height. However, this screen wall cannot be more than 3 feet in height in the front yard. The Zoning Enforcement Officer (ZEO) must make an exception to this height standard for security reasons due to specific site conditions or the nature of the land use or related materials and facilities on the site according to 5-7(D)(3)(c) of the IDO. Along the southern boundary of the site adjacent to the arroyo running alongside the southern boundary of the Site, the applicant should consider 3-feet of wrought iron on top of 3- feet of CMU blocks in lieu of 6-feet of CMU blocks.

**Response:** Wall on south, west and north property frontage changes to be a 3-ft wrought iron on top of 3-ft of CMU block wall.

* Staff requests the applicant provide a plane-angle illustration/depiction of the proposed apartments and the residences to the east of the Site depicting to scale the height of the proposed apartments and the residences and the distance between them.

**Response:** Cross section exhibit included with re-submittal for reference.

* Consider moving the dumpsters farther away from the residential development

**Response:** North east dumpsters was relocated based on community feedback at the public meetings further away from the eastern property line. Dumpster location for the south west dumpster had to be relocated to avoid conflict with public sewer extension.

* Please provide an elevation key so that we can determine each elevation of each building

**Response:** Scale bars added for scaling purposes.

* The unit mix table is difficult to read, the letters are blurry can you update so that is more clear

**Response:** I reformatted the text style and think legibility is improved.

* COMMENTS (requirements that are met):
* The façade is consistent with 5-11(E)(2) because it has a clear distinction between the ground floor and upper floors, windows on upper floors, primary pedestrian entrances, wall projections and changes in plane and material (see IDO for full citation).
* The carports are consistent with 5-11-(D)(4) although some of them are located between the street and building most of them are disbursed throughout the site and there street facing carports are screened by a row of street trees
* The landscaping plan exceeds the requirements by providing a total of 144,030 square feet of landscaping when 48, 141 square feet are required.
* Please note that staff could have future comments and the Site Plan is still under review.

*Disclaimer: The comments provided are based upon the information received from the applicant/agent. If new or revised information is submitted, additional comments may be provided by Planning.*

FROM: Jay Rodenbeck DATE: 7/22/2020

 Planning Department
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