

11-18-2020 Town Council Meeting

Responses to Council Questions

ITEM #9: Reopen the Public Hearing: Application for Conditional Zoning at Bridgepoint, 2214 and 2312 Homestead Road

Council Question:

On page 226 of the packet it says that there is no on-street parking, but on page 228 it says that there will be 17 on-street spaces. Which is correct? If the latter, has this been reviewed with the Fire Marshal, et al., to ensure that we don't have problems similar to Chandler Woods and Burch Kove?

Staff Response:

We have worked with the applicant and Fire to ensure that there is no on-street parking along Public Streets 'B' and 'C'. Only the southern, or bottom, loop of Street 'A' will have 17 parallel parking spaces. There will also be four spaces adjacent to the mailboxes along Public Street 'C'. On-street parking will be limited to those area where the street widths ensure sufficient space for emergency vehicles.

Council Question:

Is this the same policy that we agreed doesn't apply to this application- "Recreation Area Payment-in-Lieu: The Town has a policy to request 25 percent of the Recreation Space requirement in the form of a payment-in-lieu. We understand the applicant is requesting Council to consider a lower amount."

Staff Response:

The applicant is required to provide a recreation area ratio of 0.281 or 19,999 SF of recreation space on-site. The previous site plan provided the required rec space on-site; however, the applicant had requested the Town Council to waive the additional 25% payment-in-lieu as required by a Town policy. The revised site plan has eliminated the proposed pocket park and the applicant is now providing 17,330 SF of required recreation space along the greenway and will provide the remainder as a payment-in-lieu.

Council Question:

If Council is to consider the question of sending a development application to a non-required board for review, can we agree that this will require majority support by the Council?

Staff Response:

The Council would need to pass a motion to send a development application to a non-required board for review.

11-18-2020 Town Council Meeting

Responses to Council Questions

Council Question:

Did stormwater staff issue an opinion on the appropriateness of the RCD incursion proposed by this project (separate from any stream determination)? Did they suggest alternatives to the applicant that would lower the RCD incursion? If so, can we see this information?

Council Question:

Why is there such large incursion into the RCD? Where is our stormwater review for these projects and how do we ensure we get better RCD protection and stormwater analysis in the future?

Staff Response:

Stormwater staff requested that the applicant demonstrate “no practical alternative” to the Resource Conservation District (RCD) encroachment associated with the Stormwater Control Measure (SCM). Because this could not be demonstrated and the applicant did not want to significantly change the proposed site layout, the applicant opted to request a modification instead of complying with the regulations.

Stormwater staff provided the following comments during the first two rounds of review of this project:

- *Round 1: Proposed plan does not appear to be in compliance with RCD dimensional regulations. Provide proposed disturbed area ratios for Managed Use Zone and Upland Zone along with supporting calculations.*
- *Round 2: Demonstrate no practical alternative for proposed RCD encroachments. Recommend considering alternative stormwater BMPs due to reportedly high infiltration rates and deep water table.*

In response to the Round 2 comment, the applicant stated that they were not able to reduce the pond’s area and volume due to (1) Engineering factor of safety, (2) Town’s 2-year volume requirement, (3) Contractor cannot construct a wet pond to the exact area and volume used in the design calculations, (4) Balancing earthwork, (5) The site has 52-ft of fall from south to north with an average slope of 9.3%, and the site has to be terraced, (6) Ponds need to be located at the low end of the site, and (7) Proper grading to allow connection the Town’s project to the west.

Once it was apparent that the applicant did not intend to change the SCM type or significantly reduce the RCD encroachment, Stormwater staff worked with the engineer to reduce the SCM footprint as much as they were able based on their engineering experience with SCM construction and performance. Based on the most recent iteration of the plan, the applicant was able to reduce land disturbance in the Managed Use Zone to below the allowable threshold. If the application is approved, Stormwater staff will continue to work with the applicant to reduce the SCM footprint as possible as the project moves forward to Final Plans. Unless the impervious area on the site is reduced, the pond size will not be able to be

11-18-2020 Town Council Meeting
Responses to Council Questions

reduced significantly and still meet stormwater requirements. Alternative SCMs such as underground detention were not considered by the applicant to the knowledge of staff.