

## **Estates Meadows Project**

Application 2020-00000135

Planning Commission's Comments

October 19, 2021 Meeting

### **Commissioner Ruth Miller**

- Parking seems tough, consider unbundling the parking
- Look at rental car or shared car use on site
- Use signage for the wetlands for two different audiences – construction workers and people passing by
- Look at ways to add entries along Estates Drive
- Move trash off of the wetland

Here are specific questions/comments from Ruth Miller that were forwarded to us after the meeting:

#### Questions for applicant

- What would happen to the project if we didn't allow this 2' allowance on the rear setback?
- Could the building accommodate three stories within 35" if it wasn't modular construction?
- Is it not possible to build a deeper foundation?
- 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?
- The proposal is nine enclosed bike parking spaces for a 30 unit development? How many bikes can the indoor storage facility accommodate?
- Why no private balconies/decks?
- Why no pedestrian entrances in buildings A and C along 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?
- 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?)
- Would it be preferable to allow construction to go later into the evening, such as 8 pm (when the sun sets after 8 pm)?
- Who will be performing the parking enforcement? Will there be a staff person on site? Will there be staff onsite 24/7?
- Can we add on-street parking? This might decrease the perceived travel speeds on Estate Drive.

#### Comments

- The parking management plan is just about enforcement of tight rules while providing 76% of the requirement and no guest parking. Don't like the idea of building the need for police enforcement into an affordable project. Would like to see more creativity applied. (Condition of approval no 46)
  - Rental cars by the hour (turo, getaround). Car share membership. Include van / truck options. Or offer reserved parking to residents that make their car available 60% of the time.
  - Reserved parking for deliveries.

- Unbundle parking (remove it from the cost of the apartment, make people decide to pay for it. This should see lowered rents. "Parking cash out")
- Bike share membership / e-bikes
- Condition of approval 53: add the minimum required distance from walls and other structures in front and behind the rack (since overhead already exists).
  - "If the rack is designed to hold the bicycle parallel to a wall, the minimum distance to the wall is two feet. If the rack is designed to hold the bicycle perpendicular to a wall, the minimum distance is six feet."
- Would like pedestrian entrances on Estates Drive. Not sure if it merits a condition of approval?
- Would like to see construction hours be a bit later into the evening (8 pm ok) and Saturday start later (8 AM)?

#### **Vice Chair Tarnay**

- Consider moving the building forward toward Estates Drive. Would rather have the building close to the road and farther away from the wetland.

#### **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.
- Consider removing a building to shrink the scope of the project
- Lower the height – considered about shading, lack of articulation
- Concerned about trash in the wetland
- Concerned about the setback reduction
- Concerned about the lack of parking