

Collaborative Planning, LLC

MEMORANDUM

TO: Honorable Mayor and Council

FROM: Cindy Nash, AICP, City Planner

DATE: January 31, 2019

SUBJECT: **River Town Villas** for Concept Plan

APPLICANT: Wits Land Realty

LOCATION: Generally located west of River road and north of Church Street

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: Multi-Family

Requested Action:

The Council is asked to provide specific feedback to the developer on the concept plan, including general guidance on whether the design parameters used may be considered acceptable. Possible motions are the following:

1. Make a motion to approve the concept as shown in the plan and as per the design parameters assumed and subject to the comments by the City Planner and City Engineer.
2. Make a motion to approve the concept as shown in the plan and as per the design parameters assumed with the exception that the private drive should be not less than 28 feet wide, and subject to the comments by the City Planner and City Engineer.
3. Make a motion to approve the concept as shown in the plan and as per the design parameters assumed with the exception that the private drive should be not less than 28 feet wide, and any other design parameters that should be changed (note the other changes), and subject to the comments by the City Planner and City Engineer.
4. Recommend denial of the concept plan, providing feedback for why the plan is not acceptable.

Description of Request

The applicant has submitted a concept plan to redevelop a property on Church Street into a detached villa neighborhood consisting of 18 homes on approximately 4 acres. An aerial photo of the proposed redevelopment property is to the right.

A concept plan is a courtesy review of a proposed project prior to engineering design being completed. Comments and approval by the City Council is non-binding and meant to be used as a guide when preparing a preliminary plat for a development. Full review of project plans occurs at the preliminary plat stage, and there are frequently additional changes made to the plans prior to preliminary plat submission. **However, the Developer is looking for specific enough feedback that they can feel comfortable preparing a preliminary plat based on the design parameters shown in the concept plan and outlined later in this memo.**



Utilizing the density calculations, this development would have the following approximate density:

Gross Acreage	4 acres
Less Ponding	.75 acres (rough estimate)
Equals Net Acreage	3.25 acres

$$\text{Density} = 18 \text{ units}/3.25 \text{ acres} = 5.53 \text{ units/acre}$$

This density is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan guidance of Multi-Family Residential which requires greater than 4 but less than 12 units per net acre. However, the density calculations made at this time are an estimate and would be recalculated with a preliminary plat application. This density is less than would be possible if the property were developed as townhomes or an apartment (under R-2 zoning) while still meeting the density required by the Comprehensive Plan.

The site is proposed to have an HOA that maintains the yards, driveway plowing, entrance monuments, and the private road. The individual driveways appear sufficient to provide guest parking, but there are also approximately 12 designated guest parking spaces proposed.

Design Parameters used by the Developer

The developer is assuming that this development would be prepared as a PUD. Performance standards contained within the Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations that they would be seeking to vary from include, but may not be limited to:

1. Private Streets
2. Hammerhead style turn around rather than a cul-de-sac
3. Reduced pavement width – the concept shows 26-foot-wide streets, but the City Engineer recommends not less than 28 foot wide
4. Reduced Front Yard setbacks – the concept shows 25 feet from back of curb to the front of the building. In a standard development there is still several feet of boulevard between the curb and the property line that is still in the right of way, and then 30 more feet to the building. The actual setbacks that would be requested at the time of a PUD submittal would possibly be less depending on specifically how the lot lines are drawn and are intended to be staggered so may vary from 25 feet.
5. Reduced Lot Widths – approximately 55 feet wide
6. Side yard setbacks of 10 foot on home side and 5 feet on garage side – depending on where the house and garage side are, this results in varying separation between buildings of 10 feet, 15 feet, or 20 feet
7. Garage Size – sample home plans provide show a garage size of 418 square feet rather than the 576 square feet required in the ordinance.

Planning Commission Recommendation

The Planning Commission reviewed the concept plan at their meeting on January 28, 2019 and recommended approval noting the following items:

1. Private drive was okay to them.
2. Garage size was a concern.

Staff Comments

Staff and consultants have reviewed the concept plan and offer the following comments:

1. A separate engineering memo is provided.
2. The site must be designed to meet the density requirements of the Comprehensive Plan (4 to 12 units per net developable acre). This design appears to meet this requirement.
3. An application for rezoning is required. The property is currently zoned B-1A. There is not currently a zoning district that is a perfect match for this type of use (villas on smaller

lots) as the R-2 zoning that would typically be associated with Multi-Family Residential Comp Plan guidance does not currently allow for detached villas. The suggested zoning district for this request would either be 1) R-1A, which would then require a PUD for the various exceptions needed for lot size and setbacks, or 2) R-2, which would also require a text amendment to allow villa lots in the R-2 District and would likely still require a PUD.

4. City subdivision ordinances prohibit private streets and requires that all lots front on a public street. However, in a PUD the City can deviate from that requirement.
5. The plat needs to be designed to meet the setback of the underlying zoning district on the perimeter of the site.
6. Information should be provided with plat submittal to verify that the proposed hammerhead turn-around is sufficient for fire trucks to make turning movements.
7. Prior to design, coordination with the City Engineer on the street section for the private road is encouraged.
8. The City will need to discuss whether the water and sewer utility lines will be private or public.
9. A Homeowner's Association will be required, and association documents will be required to be provided to the City for review and approval with the Final Plat submittal.
10. The City's Comprehensive Plan does not identify a need for additional park land in this location. Park dedication would be payment-in-lieu of land.
11. Architectural requirements would be a part of a PUD approval.
12. No overhead utilities would be permitted.
13. A landscape and tree preservation plan would be required to be submitted with preliminary plat.