Council Question: Has the Town's urban designer reviewed the project and the design guidelines?

<u>Staff Response:</u> Brian Peterson has reviewed and commented on the Design Standards over multiple iterations.

**Council Question:** Would the design guidelines be legally binding?

<u>Staff Response:</u> As proposed, the Special Use Permit referencing the guidelines would be binding, however the Design Standards would allow flexibility outside of the Special Use Permit.

Council Question: How do the design guidelines compare with those we have adopted for Blue Hill?

<u>Applicant Response:</u> They are similar in principle, having defined frontages with prescribed streetscapes and build-to- zones in lieu of setbacks and buffers, having primary and secondary heights that include either a building step-back or module offset requirement for buildings 4+ stories, etc. The approach taken is likely more comparable to Carraway Village than to Blue Hill, but has similarities to both.

**Council Question:** Have we used the new Town-wide traffic model to assess this project?

Staff Response: No, only the site specific Traffic Impact Analysis has been conducted at this time.

Council Question: Can we get additional information as to where drive-thrus might be placed?

<u>Applicant Response:</u> This has yet to be determined, but drive-thru facilities would likely be located on Pods C and D in addition to the existing bank with drive-thru on Pod E.

<u>Council Question:</u> The applicant has cited existing contractual/lease commitments as preventing the addition of more trees to the surface parking lots. Can we request a stipulation that as these leases expire, trees would be added?

<u>Staff Response:</u> Reasonable and appropriate conditions and safeguards may be imposed upon the permit if the local government has authority to regulate such conditions. A stipulation could be requested if the applicant agrees.

Applicant Response: We would be open to discussing this; however, it may be challenging to structure as a stipulation since several of the protected areas overlap with multiple tenant rights, so we'd need to include every combination of tenants that have protection over areas in order to accurately account for that area and not create a requirement that would put us in default of a lease provision. For example, one parking lot area has protected lease rights from Aveda, Planet Fitness, AT&T and Harris Teeter, so it would require all four to vacate to remove lease restrictions from that area.

<u>Council Question</u>: Page 263: Affordable housing – why would we not expect affordable housing if some portion of the new construction is over 55 age restricted? Is it because it would be modeled after the Azalea Estates project? We were to receive affordable housing for the project approved on Homestead.

Applicant Response: We are not senior housing developers, but from discussions we have had with those in that line of business, it's much more challenging to have an affordable component within a senior rental project than one that isn't age restricted and senior affordable housing is run much more efficiently when it is either 100% market rate or 100% affordable. Because there are several requests from the various advisory boards that we'd like to accommodate that will ultimately translate to additional project costs, efficiency is essential to making the project economically feasible.

<u>Council Question:</u> Page 282: Independent Senior Living is shown as a permitted use. What is the definition of this type of housing?

Staff Response: Definition per LUMO - A commercial facility made up of senior units, in which the residents are limited in occupancy to persons at least fifty-five (55) years or older, such that no more than half of individuals in a unit of the facility requires living assistance. The age restriction is excluded for rooms occupied by resident staff personnel performing duties directly related to the operation of the facility. The facility shall consist of a single building or a group of buildings with one (1) ownership and management. The facility shall maintain a common dining room and common kitchen. The facility may provide senior units with or without independent kitchen facilities. The ownership and management may also provide other services, all of which must be exclusive to the residents, guests, and facility personnel, as a part of the fees associated with residency. Examples of these services include personal services, such as transportation, banking, and/or a barber shop/hair salon; recreation activities and amenities; concierge services; and housekeeping. The facility owners or management cannot provide health maintenance services and/or treatment.

<u>Council Question</u>: Page 285: Stipulation 9 – I think clarification of the language is needed here. Shouldn't this reference "for comparable units" or some such?

**<u>Staff Response:</u>** Clarification will be provided.

<u>Council Question:</u> Page 288: Stipulation 25 – Is 4.5 ft. our standard for bicycle lane widths? I believe bicycle lanes are generally wider than this.

<u>Staff Response:</u> 5' wide lanes have been suggested by town staff. The connectivity and mobility plan often suggests a 4-6' allowable range for non-buffered bike lanes.

<u>Applicant response:</u> The standard is generally 5-feet. We worked very closely with the Town staff to establish a section along Willow that would narrow the existing travel lanes and create room for the 4.5- foot bike lane to minimize the encroachment towards the existing mature trees along the street frontage in order to preserve them.

<u>Council Question:</u> Pod A along Willow Dr. permits building up to 90 ft./seven stories high. Can we get renderings showing what such building would look like as seen from the Willow Dr. condos or wherever along Willow these buildings would face?

Applicant Response: Along Willow Drive frontage, the height would be capped at 75' (the "Primary Height") with 90' being proposed as the secondary height limit, meaning for every foot away from the street frontage, an additional foot of height would be allowed, so the 90' of height would only be allowed at a minimum of 15' from the setback at the street frontage. What's being proposed in Pod A along Willow Dr is a 5-story building and a massing model will be included in the applicant's presentation.