

Black Mountain September 2019 submittal – Development Standards Comments

Development Standards:

- Revise Exhibit 3.A description- page 3 – to reflect minimum lot size of 10,000 square feet or add new section to address Founder’s Parcels
- Exhibit 4.G and 4.H – pg. 4, 60-61 – explain why not use standard COH 47’ street cross-section
- Section 1.4 – Page 6 – 1st bullet – change “General Plan” to “Comprehensive Plan”
- Section 1.7 – Page 7 – add definition for “Code” as reference in Section 1.6
- Section 1.7B – Page 7 – Why are we including height in the definition of a Cluster Product and a height that exceeds current code? This should be in the lot standards section.
- Section 1.7E – page 7 – define Enhanced landscape condition or provide reference
- Section 1.7G- page 7 – remove things that are not proposed to be developed within the project (ie. parking structures, bridges, etc.)
- Section 1.7P – Page 8 – Add a bullet for Theme Street
- Section 1.7P – Page 8 – remove stub streets bullet
- Section 2.1 – Page 12 – This will likely need revision given the number of units
- Section 2.2 – Page 12 – Change the medium/high density statement to low/medium or just medium.
- Section 2.2.B – page 14 – why not allow courtyard homes to be attached as well?
- Section 2.3 – Page 14 – change medium/low to just low
- Exhibit 2.A – Conceptual Land Plan page 15 – Add columns for acreage for each parcel and density for each parcel. Clarify what the 1,800 unit is based upon.
- Exhibit 2.A – page 15 - increase map size for legibility
- Exhibit 2.A – page 15 - Revise Parcels 9-11 to be minimum 10,000 sq. ft. lots, adjust unit count accordingly
- Exhibit 2.B – Land Use Plan page 16 – We will need to discuss how our comments affect this exhibit
- Exhibit 2.B -Land Use Plan page 16 – Parcel adjacent to Mona should be lower land use category (LUC 1 or 2). Lots sizes directly adjacent to Mona should be no less than 6,000 square feet in size.
- Section 3.1 – page 18 – remove “of” after include on 1st sentence.
- Pictures on page 19 – Label these with the appropriate style
- Section 3.3.B.i – Major Home Plan requirements – page 22 - Let’s discuss last paragraph under “Eight distinctly different elevations” and if this is adequate. As well as the color and material changes in last sentence.
- Section 3.3.B.ii – provide more minimum diversity of product within the two proposed lot thresholds. – page 22
- Section 3.3.B.iii – Edge Conditions – page 22
 - Add “side” to this section.
 - This should be any street, not just “major” roadways.
 - Add themes street edge conditions
 - Change the language in the leading paragraph to require enhanced details visible from ALL roadways, not just major roadways.
 - 7th bullet point – who is going to ensure compliance with this requirement?

10/9/19

- Section 3.3.B.iv – page 23 - Discussion... how do we plan check for mix of roof types? Remove “major” from first sentence before community.
- Section 3.3.B.v – second bullet on page 23 – discuss, we may want some distinctly different elevations for townhome buildings. Also, who is enforcing this requirement. Seems like developer needs to set up a DRC and provide COH letters of compliance prior to application submittal.
- Section 3.3.B.vi – Front Elevations – page 23 – increase the required options beyond just one
- Section 3.3.B.vii – Corner Buildings – page 23 – same comment as above...increase required options
 - This needs to include when facing the small strip common element used to get to get around not being a “corner side” designation.
- Section 3.3.B.viii – Pages 23 and 24 – this section “encourages” which means we won’t get any of these projections... we need something more
- Section 3.3.B.X – page 24 – discuss how we plan check for these
 - Master Developer will need to set up DRC to review for conformance to these standards before submitted to COH
- Section 3.3.D – Materials – pages 24 and 25
 - Second bullet – change should to must? (discuss)
 - Third bullet – change should to must
 - Fourth bullet – change should to must
 - Sixth bullet – we may need a graphic for this one
- Section 3.3.E.i – page 25 – Discuss...we may want more than one here
- Section 3.3.E.ii – page 26 – discuss... do we want to be more specific for treatments for each product type?
 - Clarify that garages must be setback a minimum of 6 feet from front of house plane for lots greater than 40 feet in width.
- Section 3.3.E.iii – Page 26 – remove courtyard wall option
- Section 3.3.E.iv – remove note about use of appliances above 48”
- Section 3.4.K – Page 28 – Do we want the entire BLM parcel to be gated??
- Exhibit 3.A – page 29 - Let’s discuss accessory structures within the front yard setback. If permitted, need to add some standards for architecture to be equal to primary structure.
- Exhibit 3.B – page 30 - Let’s discuss accessory structures within the front yard setback. If permitted, need to add some standards for architecture to be equal to primary structure.
- Exhibit 3.C – page 31 - Let’s discuss accessory structures within the front yard setback. If permitted, need to add some standards for architecture to be equal to primary structure.
- Exhibit 3.C -page 31 – why not allow for attached product within this lot type?
- Exhibit 3.D – page 32 - Let’s discuss accessory structures within the front yard setback. If permitted, need to add some standards for architecture to be equal to primary structure. Will accessory structure fit on this lot size and within the front yard?
- Exhibit 3.E – page 33 - Let’s discuss accessory structures within the front yard setback. If permitted, need to add some standards for architecture to be equal to primary structure. Will accessory structure fit on this lot size and within the front yard?

10/9/19

- Exhibit 3.F – page 34 - Let's discuss accessory structures within the front yard setback. If permitted, need to add some standards for architecture to be equal to primary structure. Will accessory structure fit on this lot size and within the front yard?
- Exhibit 3.G – page 35 - Let's discuss accessory structures within the front yard setback. If permitted, need to add some standards for architecture to be equal to primary structure. Will accessory structure fit on this lot size and within the front yard?
- Exhibit 3.G – page 36 - Let's discuss accessory structures within the front yard setback. If permitted, need to add some standards for architecture to be equal to primary structure. Will accessory structure fit on this lot size and within the front yard?
- Exhibit 3.G – page 36 – Provide articulation requirement along alley façade, and require landscape to be provide in “green areas” between driveways as shown on exhibits.
- Exhibit 3.I – page 37 – clarify lot size; Provide articulation requirement along alley façade, and require landscape to be provide in “green areas” between driveways as shown on exhibits
- Section 4.2.A – Page 48 – Discuss gating the entire BLM parcel
- Section 4.2.A.iii – Page 49 – 3rd bullet, 300 feet is too long for a offset, especially with smaller lot sizes. This requirement should be less or maximum number of lots before offset.
- Section 4.2.A.v – Page 50 – we may want to have shorter block lengths for narrow lots to break up the street scene. Discuss increasing the 1200-foot block length and have that only apply to 5500 SF lots
- Section 4.2.A.vi – page 50 – this section makes it sounds like Mona Lane is the only fire access. May need to revise to state where required by Fire Department.
- Section 4.2.A.vii – landscape Buffer page 50 – discuss whether these buffers are large enough especially on Greenway.
- Section 4.2.A.viii – Sidewalks – Page 50 – Do not support sidewalk on one side of the street. Sidewalks shall be detached where required per COH Master Transportation Plan.
- Section 4.3.B.iii – Page 51 – minimum sidewalk width should be 5 feet, and all should be detached
- Exhibit 4A – page 53 – revise to show interior collector as Theme Street and remove note about sidewalks on one-side of street.
- Exhibit 4C – page 55 – is there a retaining condition all along Greenway?
- Exhibit 4D – page 56 - Does this proposal include landscaping in the Horizon Drive median? I think it should and I think the HOA should maintain – discuss with PW
- Exhibit 4E – Page 57 – Who maintains the 30-foot area containing the 5-foot meandering trail?
- Table 4.A – page 58 – provide width of Neighborhood Street type
- Table 4.A – page 58 – revise all sidewalks to be minimum 5-feet wide; clarify why not doing standard COH 47-foot street section? Why proposing a 46' & 48' section?
- Exhibit 4H – Page 61 – what are the situations for the use of each of these cross-sections?
- Exhibit 4.M -page 66 – Staff does not support this proposed street design
- Exhibit 4.N – page 67 – Staff does not support this proposed street design (cul-de-sac to cul-de sac)
- Section 5.2 – Page 70 – Section may need revision after meeting with staff to discuss parks and open space

10/9/19

- Table 5.A – Page 71 – Lots less than 6000 SF require 700 SF of open space per unit; however, this table does not seem to capture that requirement. Do these standards intend to waive the open space requirement for all parcels within the plan? Discuss
- Section 5.2.A – 2.77 Acre park – page 71 –
 - 3rd bullet – May need to add a reference to the landscape standards that contain minimum turf dimensions
 - 7th bullet – let’s strengthen this and add as a requirement... not “should”
- Section 5.2B – Pocket Parks – pages 71 and 72 –
 - what does “as necessary” mean? We will want a standard here
 - 1st bullet – maybe limit this to artificial turf
 - 4th bullet – suggest only allowing decomposed granite and part of a natural trail only.
- Section 5.3.A and table 5.B – Page 72 –
 - change “General Plan” to “Comprehensive Plan.”
 - The total number of new residents shown in this section and in the table is 1300-ish residents less than shown on the previous page
- Section 5.3B – Existing Parks – page 73 – this section may need revision based on meetings with staff related to Parks and Open Space
- Exhibit 5A – page 75
 - Are there any improvements proposed in the existing Rail trail to the west of Greenway where open space credit should be given?
 - Suggest discussing with parks the idea of requiring the connection to College.
 - Table should be separated into Public Open Space and Private Open Space.
- Section 6.1.A – Primary Entries – Page 79
 - Discuss again the reasoning for gating off the entire “Urban District”
 - Add minimum standards for tree and shrub requirements for primary entries
- Section 6.1.B – Page 79 – Help staff to understand or provide an exhibit that better explains where primary trees are not required. Is it intended that exhibits 6C through 6 G provide this explanation?
- Section 6.1.C – Open Space and Pedestrian Connections – Page 80
 - 1st bullet – change 24” box to 36” box
 - 2nd bullet – change 15 gallons to 24” box
 - Alternatively, explain why these plant size standards should be less than what is required by Code.
- Section 6.1.D – page 81 – revise table to provide minimum 36” box tree for “Up to 50’ and 51’-75’” for primary tree
- Section 6.1.D.i – Page 82 – 1st paragraph below shrub section – BIAS ALERT... do we want pines and junipers to be allowed at all? Discuss...
- Section 6.1.D.iii – Alley and Cluster... - Page 82
 - 4th bullet – this is a significant departure from Code
- Section 6.1.E – Front Yard Landscape Grading – Page 83
 - Discuss requiring front yard contouring
- Section 6.1.I.iii – Interior Walls – page 84 – I don’t believe we want to aloe painted block under any circumstance
- Section 6.2.E – Ground Cover – Page 86 – Consider removing DG as an allowed ground cover

10/9/19

- Section 6.2.I – Prohibited Plant Materials List – page 87 – add note “and other plants as listed on SNWA Regional Plant List”
- Section 6.3.A – Dark Sky – Page 87 – Discuss with Developer and Public Works the idea of not requiring street lights on interior streets but only requiring them at decision points and requiring lanterns in front yards instead
- Section 6.3.B – Identification Signage – Page 87 – remove this section or need to provide actual design criteria and size standards.
- Section 6.3.C – Paving and Hardscape – Page 87 – discuss idea of requiring paver driveways for all units instead of concrete.
- Exhibit 6H – page 97 – Discuss under what circumstances we would want wall or fencing to extend above the lower retaining wall. Also, require a cap on both walls
- Exhibit 6J – page 99 – same comment as page 97