

April 20, 2022

## Estates Meadows Housing

### Review of Changes from 9/2020 submittal to 4/2022 submittal

1. The project site location consisting of the 2 acre parcel south of Estates Drive remains unchanged.
2. The primary change from the last application consists of changing from family affordable housing to senior affordable housing.
3. The previous proposal was comprised of 4 individual buildings (A-D) with a total approximate building footprint of 10,700 sq ft. The new proposal includes only 2 individual buildings (A & B) with an approximate building footprint totaling 13,000 sq ft.
4. The previous design proposal had a total gross building area of 32,500 sq ft (including covered exterior circulation space) across the 4 individual buildings. The new proposal totals 25,432 gross building area (including interior circulation) across the 2 individual buildings.
5. The previous proposal included a mix of 1, 2, and 3 bedroom units for family living with the total number of units at 30. The new proposal consists solely of thirty 1 bedroom units for senior living.
6. In the previous proposal, buildings A, B & C were 3 stories and building D was a single story structure. In the new proposal both buildings A & B are only 2 stories.
7. In the previous proposal the max building heights of buildings A, B & C were 37', 38' and 39'-5", well above the allowable building height of 35'. The new max building heights for building A & B are 33' and 34'-2", under the allowable building height of 35'.
8. The previous proposal included a community room, bike storage, laundry and managers office located in the single story building D. In the new design the community room, bike storage and manager's office have been integrated into the first floor of building A. Each unit will include a washer and dryer for individual laundry needs.
9. The previous proposal included green space at the southwest and southeast corners of the parcel intended for children play space, equipment etc. The new proposal still includes green space at the east and west ends of the parcel but will be intended to remain open space. The new proposal does include an outdoor patio area similar in size located to the south of building A for community gatherings.
10. All associated site improvements will still be required – access drives, vehicle and bike parking, utilities and drainage improvements. The site will still have its own solid waste removal service.
11. The design still assumes an allowable coverage of 50%.
12. The front setback remains the same as the previous design. The rear setback is shown on the drawings as 18', but the buildings are within a 20' rear setback.
13. Parking requirements have changed slightly to accommodate the new designation for 1 bedroom senior units as well as guest parking requirements. Refer to "Parking Requirements" on cover sheet for further breakdown of number of required parking spots. Parking lot design has been revised to allow for two traffic and fire truck access on the western portion of the lot and one way traffic on the remainder.
14. The architectural concept has been revised to reflect a more traditional mountain character. The previous design with the 3 story buildings included large shed roofs over the main massing of the building forms. The new design now has one primary gable roof continuing the length of the building with secondary gables over each unit, acting breaking down the scale and massing of the buildings, and providing protection from snow shedding. Fenestration patterns and sizes reinforce the traditional style of the buildings. Material and color schemes remain similar to previous design, and blend with the natural earth tones of the surrounding meadow.
15. In the previous design the 3 story building heights would cast a max shadow depth well across Estates Drive and onto the neighboring property across the street. The current design reduction to 2 story building

heights has eliminated any shadows being cast on the adjacent property and the max shadow depth extending only about halfway across Estates Dr. with the exception of one gable end on building B casting a shadow just past the edge of pavement.

16. The primary entrances to the buildings face the street side and are protected by secondary lower gable roof forms to provide cover from the elements and express an open and inviting public entrance. The secondary entrances/egress exits are less pronounced.
17. Other design changes include the addition of a 70 s.f. private patio/deck space for each individual unit. The previous design only had a few private decks for a handful of the units on building C along with common outdoor covered deck space in buildings A & B which mostly consisted of circulation space and no other outdoor patio space on the ground level.
18. The previous design had exterior storage closets for each unit. The new design will also have individual storage closets accessed off the hall or the exterior patio.
19. In the previous proposal building D was in close proximity to the larger wetland delineation on the south side of the parcel. On the west side of building D there was a spot wetland that was also in close proximity to the building but remained just outside building envelope. In the previous version of building A there was a spot wetland in the center courtyard and just to the west of the building envelope. In the new design of building A the spot wetland to the west is still in close proximity but the other spot wetland in the courtyard and wetlands to the south of the building are provided with greater buffer. In the previous design, building C was in close proximity to the large patch of wetlands on the east side of the parcel. In the new design building C has been eliminated and the parking is now pushed closer to that patch of wetlands but remains outside the perimeter and further away than the previous building C. Both the old and new building envelope of building B is not in close proximity to any wetland delineation.
20. Exterior lighting selection remain unchanged, similar fixtures etc. Locations are based on architectural features such as covered entry ways, door/window locations etc.

## Response to Commissioners' Comments Regarding Physical Design of Project

### Commissioner Miller

- *What would happen to the project if we didn't allow this 2' allowance on the rear setback?* Buildings have been removed from rear setback
- *Could the building accommodate three stories within 35" if it wasn't modular construction?* Buildings have been changed to two-story
- *Is it not possible to build a deeper foundation?*  
Not applicable to current proposal
- *Is it possible to blend modular with non-modular construction? For example, make the two bottom floors modular, and then customize the top floor to integrate the roof pitch?*  
Not applicable to current proposal
- *The proposal is nine enclosed bike parking spaces for a 30 unit development? How many bikes can the indoor storage facility accommodate?*  
Current proposal includes storage for 30 bikes
- *Why no private balconies/decks?*  
Private balconies and decks are now included
- *Why no pedestrian entrances in buildings A and C along Estates Drive?*  
Entrances to each building are provided on Estates Drive

- *Am I reading the map correctly that building C is closer to the rear setback than the parking lot, which is itself closer to the setback than building D?*  
Not applicable to current proposal
- *Explain the limits of modular construction? What options exist in designing the sizes of these interior spaces? (Why not shave a foot off each Bedroom 3 in building C and meet the rear setback requirement?)*  
Not applicable to current proposal
- *Can we add on-street parking? This might decrease the perceived travel speeds on Estate Drive.*  
Space needed in the front setback for stormwater treatment does not allow for widening of the road for on street parking

#### Commissioner Tarnay

- *Consider moving the building forward toward Estates Drive. Would rather have the building close to the road and farther away from the wetland.*  
Buildings have been placed at the front setback

#### Commissioner Riley

- *Believes that the wetlands are being encroached – construction footings will be outside of the building wall shown on the plans. Eaves are encroaching into the wetlands. The Geotech report notes soils issues/clay issues. With use of the required structural fill, she believes that the wetlands will be impacted.*  
Building footprint has been revised to be farther from the wetlands. Geotechnical engineer and wetlands consultant believe construction can take place without encroaching on the wetlands
- *Consider removing a building to shrink the scope of the project*  
Project scope has been reduced by changing to all one-bedroom units
- *Lower the height – considered about shading, lack of articulation*  
Building heights have been reduced to below 35' height limit, shading of street is reduced, and street façade is highly articulated
- *Concerned about trash in the wetland*  
Trash enclosure is in the only practical location for the project, which is more than 35' from the adjacent pond. There is a fence surrounding the trash receptacles which contain trash which doesn't make it into the receptacle
- *Concerned about the setback reduction*  
Building is within 20 rear setback
- *Concerned about the lack of parking*  
Current proposal is more than 50% over what would be required for an affordable housing project that requests a Density Bonus.

