

CIVIL CONSULTANTS MEMORANDUM

TO:	Chris MiMatteo	FROM:	Geoffrey R. Aleva, PE	DATE:	3/22/2023
SUBJECT:	Site Plan and Subdivision Review				
PROJECT:	Bristol Pointe Phase 2 — Jefferson Homes, Inc. CC Project 1931802				

Following please find CIVIL CONSULTANTS's responses to the memorandum from Chris DiMatteo

COMMENT	RESPONSE
<u>COMPLETENESS REVIEW</u>	
<p>The applicant has submitted an application for Preliminary (6.4) review and appears to include all of the required submittal requirements, with the exception of those that are part of requested waivers and the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>6.4.3 The water supply system design contained in the Site Plan or Subdivision Plan shall be approved in writing by the appropriate agency or individual, and shall be submitted with the Final Plan.</u> No approval has been submitted. 2. <u>Section 6.4.4 The sewage disposal system design contained in the Site Plan or Subdivision Plan shall be properly endorsed and approved in writing by the appropriate agency.</u> Although an email with review comments has been provided, no approval has been submitted. 	<p><i>Please see architects response information indicating this information has been provided.</i></p>
<u>COMPLIANCE WITH THE TOWN'S ORDINANCES</u>	
<u>ZONING ORDINANCE</u>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Section 4.1.2 Business, Village and General Districts.</u> The proposed uses, commercial, office and residential, are subject to this section and specific requirements, that includes having no greater than 50% of a residential use on the street level of a mixed-use building; no greater than 50% of office space on the same level and not occupy more 50% of the front half of the building; and commercial retail is no greater than 2,500 SF. The proposed development appears to conform to this. 	<p><i>Please see the architects response memo.</i></p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. <u>Non-residential Performance Standards (Sec. 6.1).</u> The applicant has provided information as to the conformance to these standards (Memorandum prepared by Civil Consultants). The Board may want the applicant to elaborate on specific items for its consideration, as well as the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>A.</u> Sec. 6.1.12.1 requires the Board to consider how the proposed building enhances and compliments the York Village Center character by means of its architectural design. Though the response-to-omment memorandum references this comment to 	<p><i>Please see the architects response memo.</i></p>



<p>be addressed by the Architect, nothing specific was found in the submittal. The Board may want the applicant to elaborate on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. How the proposed building conforms to this provision; and ii. Confirm that the following materials are not used: vinyl siding, aluminum siding, Exterior Insulation and Finishing System (“EIFS”), foam or PVC materials. <p>B. Sec. 6.1.9 Explosive Materials does not appear to allow for the propane tanks at the proposed location, 10 feet from the property line. This provision calls for a 75-foot setback from property lines to above ground tanks that hold highly flammable or explosive materials and 40 feet for underground tanks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The applicant has submitted information related to the NFPA required setbacks, however, the Town may very well have a more stringent requirement than the NFPA. The Code Enforcement Office should provide an interpretation as to the applicability of Sec. 6.1.9 and 1,000 gallon propane tanks. ii. Further consideration should be made to the location of the proposed fire pit as it relates to its proximity to the propane tanks. If the required setback should be confirmed and shown on the Site Plan along with the proposed fire pit as well. <p>C. <u>View from the Street.</u> It appears the garage entry is open to view from the street; with an atypically wide breach. At the last meeting with the Board, it appeared members were not concerned. This should be confirmed.</p>	
<p>3. Wetland impacts. It has been made clearer on Sheet L3 (Wetland Restoration/Sewer connection Plan) that the proposed impact(s) are required by the sewer line connections, which are permitted per Sec. 11.3.2 of the Zoning Ordinance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Sheet L1 should be revised to remove the label that directs the replacement of the sewer lines in the wetland where the applicant has stated this work has been done already as part of Bristol Pointe 1. B. Any impacts associated with the construction of the retaining wall and/or the stormwater features/riprap are not permitted. Prior to final approval the applicant should demonstrate that the conditions per Sec. 11.4 will be met. C. Other than in the vicinity of the proposed impact, the new sewer line connection from SMH#2 that is 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. <i>Note has been removed.</i> B. <i>No impacts to the wetlands are proposed. It is our opinion the proposed meets the zoning requirements.</i> C. <i>We indicate the erosion berm outside the work area to protect adjacent areas. The mulch berm will be removed after the work is completed and restored.</i> D. <i>The proposed work abuts the wetland. Although we do not feel additional linework is needed, we will review the plan and adjust as needed.</i>



CIVIL CONSULTANTS MEMORANDUM

<p>in the wetland, should the proposed erosion control berm be located in the wetland?</p> <p>D. It should be clear that the construction related to the retaining wall and stormwater outlets is not permitted to disturb the existing wetlands. The limit of work line should reflect this, currently this line is not clear on the plans.</p>	
<p>4. <u>ADA Parking Requirements.</u> The proposed development plans provide for two van accessible spaces to accommodate the commercial/office space and the proposed ADA residential dwelling unit.</p>	<p><i>No response required</i></p>
<p>5. <u>Parking Calculations.</u> The plans have been revised to include information on the number of parking spaces required, how the values are arrived at and how the reductions are permitted under Sec. 15.2 in the Zoning Ordinance. The Site and Subdivision Plan has been revised to include this information as well.</p>	<p><i>No response required</i></p>
<p><u>SITE PLAN AND SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS AND OTHER COMMENTS</u></p>	
<p>6. <u>Stormwater and Engineering-Peer Review.</u> Gorrill Palmer prepared a review of the final plan submittal, and is attached. Integrated Environmental Engineering has some follow-up comments which are also attached.</p>	<p><i>Please see attached information, plan adjustments will be presented</i></p>
<p>7. <u>Retaining Wall.</u> The top and bottom of wall elevations have been added to the site plan and a railing is depicted.</p>	<p><i>No response required</i></p>
<p>8. <u>Utility Easements.</u> All areas where it is necessary to access/cross the abutting property (Bristol Pointe 1) for utility connections (e.g. electrical, sewer, storm drain, etc....) should be depicted on the plans as proposed easements.</p>	<p><i>The applicant will work with Town Staff to indicate cross easement information.</i></p>
<p>9. <u>Lighting.</u> The submittal does not include any specific details on proposed fixtures that informs if the applicable codes are being met (Art. 10-H) , including mitigating glare and light trespassing from the garage. The image of the proposed fixture for above the garage entrances appears to have the bulb exposed and not a cut-off.</p>	<p><i>Please see the architects response memo.</i></p>



CIVIL CONSULTANTS MEMORANDUM

<p>10. Gross Floor Area limitation: The architect’s Master Plan and the engineer’s Site and Subdivision Plan have a discrepancy with regard to the how this requirement under Article 4 (see comment #1 above) is reflected on the plans.</p> <p>A. Plan note #29 should be referencing (Article 4 Permitted Uses in YVC) no that more than 50% of the proposed office space occupies the front half of the first floor and residential not occupying more than 50% of the street level floor of the mixed-use building. The note should be revised to provide more clarity. These percentages are based on gross floor area, not street frontage.</p> <p>B. The Master Plan depicts a dimension line measuring the building’s ‘commercial frontage’. It’s not apparent from the provisions under Article 4 that this is a requirement. The applicant should elaborate.</p>	<p><i>Please see the architects response memo.</i></p>
<p>11. <u>Traffic</u>. The Public Works Director has concurred with the traffic impact/trips assessment prepared by the applicant and will not require a traffic study.</p>	<p><i>No response required</i></p>
<p>12. <u>Landscaping Plan</u>. Proposed vegetation for the area behind the building to be regraded should be reflected on the plan. It’s currently labeled as natural vegetation.</p>	<p><i>Please refer to the architects plans</i></p>
<p><u>WAIVER REQUESTS</u> The applicant is requesting the following waivers: (see Memorandums from Civil Consultants and Weger Architects) (Items 1-3 have been granted at preliminary approval)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Section 6.3.3.A.2 – (Existing Conditions Plan) elevation contours at 2’ intervals referenced to NGVD of 1929. Requesting to reference the NAVD 1988 instead. 2. Section 6.3.3.A.7 – Depicting areas of a high or seasonal high-water table on the existing conditions plan. [The submitted checklist states there is not high-water table, if this is the case, then this is not applicable, and no waiver is necessary]. 3. Section 6.3.32 – High Intensity Soil Survey. 4. Section 6.4.1.7 – (hydrogeological assessment) 	
<p><u>CONCLUSION</u> The final application submitted, with the exception of written final approval by the water and sewer districts, appears to be substantially complete, with consideration of the requested waiver. In addition to the comments above, there are a few of comments from Gorrill Palmer and Integrated Environmental Engineering that will need to be addressed. The Board should determine if it wants to have an opportunity to see revised plans prior to considering final approval.</p>	

J:\aaa\2019\1931802\PLANNING-BOARD\20220317-REVIEW-COMMENTS\20230322-Response Memo-DiMatteo.docx

