

MEMO

From the Desk of Chris Rader, City Council Liaison to DRC



Comments regarding the October 16 Resubmittal of the Holden Avenue PD Rezoning Application

Generally, the applicant has done a good job of accommodating previous comments through the response to comments, development narrative and the developer's agreement. However, some items are outstanding and additional comments should be incorporated into the P&Z submittal.

1. Please revise the name of the development. SODO is a district in unincorporated Orange County. This development is in the City of Edgewood.
2. The perimeter wall is not dimensional and will likely just end up a painted wall. Specify something similar to the below for the Holden Avenue frontage. The DRC previously discussed the compromise to pre-cast versus masonry, but only in consideration of something similar to this in quality.



3. Response to comments indicates revised elevations are attached. They were not received.
4. The Holden Avenue sidewalk is now proposed at 6'. What is the sidewalk dimension on either end of the project? From previous staff comments, it appears 7' width exists on either end, and the proposed cross-section will support a 7' sidewalk. Please revise.
5. Driveway widths of 16' do not accommodate daily parking of two cars side by side, without great frustration. Though, the addition of 1-sided on-street parking and community spaces is a value to the plan, it is more likely needed just to accommodate visitors and other regular needs of the community. The minimum lot standard should accommodate two garage spaces and two driveway spaces that do not block the sidewalk. Thus 18' wide by 20' deep minimum driveway should be incorporated.
6. How will gate operations work. Specifically, will gates open in the direction of travel? Is there sufficient swing space to accommodate? Will the gates open independent when normal residential traffic accesses?
7. The revision to remove the landscape median from the entry gate resolves the Orange County Fire emergency vehicle access requirements but creates another safety issue. The nearby legacy community regularly has problems with individuals going in the community through the exit gate, when they cannot gain access. This has cause many near-miss incidents and Legacy has a landscape median to assist with physical separation. Is a

MEMO

From the Desk of Chris Rader, City Council Liaison to DRC



mountable curb an option to still meet emergency access requirements? If this is an option, I would also encourage geometry that makes a movement from the entry call box to the exit side of the gate very difficult, if not impossible.

8. Though, I do agree the palm tree heavy landscape is consistent with the design them of the development, I do not think a landscape plan completely void of shade trees is consistent with the character of the City nor previous staff comments regarding shade tree incorporation given the absence of overhead utilities.
9. If palm trees will be the proposed street tree, species should be limited to slow growing alternatives, as the dimensions of the community will result in a tree like Washingtonian simply being a row of tree trunks not given their height. Applicant should provide details of growth patterns and maximum heights for the proposed species for discussion.
10. Are the lot trees in addition to the street trees? Same comments apply on species.
11. What is placement of shade trees? Front/rear? If in rear, it is fully expected these trees will be sacrificed for pools, patios, etc.
12. A 12" mulch bed and 3 gallons of landscape materials in insufficient.
13. There is a paragraph about non-uniformity of residential structures, which is good, but this simple requirement is inconsistent with previous discussions about defining building material/dimensional variations.
14. The DA has no mention of paver driveway, as previously discussed.
15. Irrigation of the street green space must be accommodated. Community governing documents must be clear on intent to have lots maintain.
16. Wall construction in the developer's agreement lists vinyl and aluminum picket fences as acceptable perimeter alternatives. The perimeter is to be pre-cast only and consistent with dimensional character comment above.
17. DA Para 9 still refers to overhead utilities – It was previously indicated these are being under-ground as part of the project.
18. The DA says "The following is recommended to be added to the Declaration of Covenants Conditions and Restrictions:" This was cut/paste from staff comments. The items should be incorporated no listed as "recommended"
19. The funding recommendation in the periodic Engineering report is indicated as 3 years of funding. Should be 5 years consistent with previous paragraph.
20. DA para 13 again refers to elevations which did not accompany the packet. It also mentions PD development standards which were not received.