

Staff Report

To: Planning Commission

From: Robin Pierce, Development Director

Date: May 4, 2017

Re: Site plan review for Phase I of an approved Master Plan to construct a 4 storey multi-unit elderly housing building with 43 one-bedroom apartments at 9 & 11 Park Street in the VC District, by Ruggiano Engineering, agents for Handy's Hotels & Rentals LLC c/o Gabe Handy, owners.

Project Location: 9 and 11 Park Street

Project Area Size: 55,061 square feet

Lot Frontage: 373 feet Park Street and Park Terrace

Existing Land Use: Rental units, restaurant and vacant lot

Surrounding Land Use: Residential & Mixed Use/Retail and Commercial

Total Lot Size: 1.27 Acres

Minimum Lot Size Village Center District: 5,000 Square Feet

Existing Lot Coverage: 40%

Permitted Lot Coverage: 100%

Proposed Lot Coverage: 85%

Project Description.

This is Phase one of a previously approved Master Plan for the site, and is in conformance with what was approved at the Master Plan stage, and the proposed Senior Housing is consistent with the Master Plan approval. The applicant proposes to construct a four storey senior housing apartment building with forty three (43) one bedroom apartments and common space, with 23 underground parking spaces and eight (8) surface spaces at the rear of the property which currently is undeveloped scrubland. Access to the site is one way; in from Park Street (which includes a five foot sidewalk), and exiting through the front of the Park Street School site (where a curb cut for this purpose was installed by the School District some years ago), to Park Street. Traffic impacts from this development are estimated to be light; an additional 4.73 trips will be generated between the busiest hours of 4 and 6 pm. With Staff encouragement the building has been moved to the south of the site, moving it further from residential rear gardens and placing it close to the parking lot at the front of the Park Street School. Moving the building closer to the Park Street School parking and having the access drive come off Park Street are the two major changes made to the proposal since the Master Plan approval on February 18, 2016. This is the last application that will be reviewed under the previous LDC which was approved March 29, 2011.

The plans reviewed as part of this submittal consisted of the listed in the table below and were all prepared by Ruggiano Engineering, Inc. an architectural elevational rendering with four different colour schemes by Innovative Design. Staff recommends the elevation with the grey clapboards, green at the entry level and the vertical structure over the entrance with red trim.

Sheet #	Sheet Name	Date	Last Revised
C-1	Existing Conditions Site Plan	11/11/16	03/02/17
C-2	Proposed Site Plan	11/11/16	03/02/17
C-3	Utility Plan	11/11/16	03/02/17
C-6	Landscaping Plan	11/11/16	01/20/17
C-7	Details	11/11/16	01/20/17
C-8	Details	11/11/16	03/02/17
C-9	Stormtech Details	11/11/16	03/02/17
A1-1	Proposed Elevations	11/14/16	

SECTION 604: VILLAGE CENTER (VC)

A. Purpose. To provide for a compact commercial center, having a mix of commercial, governmental, cultural and residential uses, and which reflects and reinforces the existing architecture, design and layout. It is the intent of this district to allow as new structures only those structures which are designed and constructed to be visually compatible with the historic character of the Village Center and similar to existing structures. **The proposed four storey structure has a flat roof similar to the Kalanges Building and will be screened from Park Street by future development at the front of the site and a possible new building further south on Park Street. This project provides senior housing apartments, which are needed, in the Village as older residents sell their larger homes to give them an opportunity to stay in the Village.**

B. Lot Size/Lot Coverage.

1. The minimum lot size shall be 5,000 square feet. **Standard met.** The Village Center District shall not have a maximum allowable density. The maximum number of dwelling units shall be determined by the ability to meet the standards of the Land Development Code including, but not limited to, parking, setbacks lot coverage and building height.
2. The maximum total lot coverage shall be determined by the Commission as part of Site Plan Review.

C. Setback Requirements. **No requirements for commercial buildings.** The front yard setback shall be established by the average setback of the principal structures on the two adjacent lots (or the closest two lots on the same side of the same street) and the minimum setback requirement for the underlying zoning district. The principal structure shall have a setback between the established maximum and minimum setback as described above. Semi-attached accessory structures (such as a deck) shall be allowed if there is sufficient space between the principal structure and the minimum setback. Porches that are integrated into the principal structure shall be considered part of the principal structure. If a principal structure is not parallel to the front lot line the setback will be determined by the average setback at the two corners of the

structure closest to the front lot line. The Planning Commission may waive this requirement if the following conditions are met:

1. The proposed setback does not negatively impact the character of the neighborhood.
2. The proposed setback would be in keeping with the setbacks and character of anticipated future development of the area.

Applicants may apply for a variance if they do not meet the criteria above but believe they cannot meet the requirements of this section.

D. Permitted and Conditional Uses. **This proposal is permitted.**

E. Design Review and Historic Preservation. **The size of the structure, placement of the windows and pediment meets the basic standard. The height of the building is less than what could be permitted by the Code under which it is being reviewed but in line with the new Code requirements approved by the Trustees in December 2016.** Because of the unique and historic qualities of the Village Center District and the special role that it plays in the over-all Village, the Commission is hereby authorized to undertake a special review, as part of its site plan review. Design review is required by the Planning Commission for any proposed construction, reconstruction, demolition or exterior alteration (including a change of color) of any building in the district with the exception of sign permits, which are approved administratively. Activities involving buildings listed or eligible for the state or national registers of historic places must meet additional standards as described below. All reviews shall be conducted at a public meeting.

1. Purpose. The purpose of this section is to protect the historic character of the Village Center District including those buildings listed or eligible for the State or Federal Register of Historic Places while accommodating new and appropriate infill and redevelopment supporting increased density and multi-modal development. Infill and redevelopment brings opportunities to protect existing historic resources while increasing density, activity and economic opportunity in the Village Center District. Demolition may be allowed, but only following a thorough review of the economic and structural characteristics of the building and the proposed redevelopment plan and its community benefits. New buildings and modifications to existing ones shall be compatible with the historic character of the Village Center District as represented by the design review standards listed in Section 604.E.4.

2. Applicability.

(a) The design review standards are applicable to all development proposals within the Village Center District. The historic preservation design standards with respect to alterations, additions or redevelopment of existing historic structures as defined in Section 604.E.4.B of this Code are applicable to all buildings listed or eligible for the State or National Register of Historic Places. Documentation from the State Division of Historic Preservation documenting a building's eligibility for the State or National Register of Historic Places. **NA.**

(b) Any development proposal for the existing residential structures fronting Pearl, Park, Lincoln, Maple and Main Streets in the Village Center District submitted to the Planning Commission shall be reviewed as a Planned Residential Development (PRD) or Planned Unit Development (PUD) are subject to the

provisions of Section 724: Planned Residential Development & Planned Unit Development and Chapter 9: Subdivision Regulations.

3. District Design Review Procedures. The Planning Commission may deny approval of a proposed development or modification of a structure if it determines that the intent of this Section has not been met. Accordingly:

(a) Within this district, no structure may be demolished, reconstructed, moved, erected, or changed in use, nor may the exterior be altered or restored without design approval from the Planning Commission, issued in conjunction with subdivision or site plan approval. In the event that subdivision or site plan review is not otherwise required, design review shall be conducted in accordance with site plan review procedures under Section 502 or Section 503. **NA.**

(b) Nothing in these design control criteria shall be construed to prevent the ordinary maintenance or repair of any exterior architectural feature in the district, which does not involve a change in the design, material, color or the outward appearance of the feature. **NA.**

(c) The review of plans under this Section by the Planning Commission requires the submission of information listed in Section 502 or Section 503 along with building elevations, a description of materials to be used on the exterior of any structure, plans for exterior lighting, signs, drainage and snow removal, and photographs of existing structures and adjacent buildings if applicable. The Planning Commission may require additional information and documentation, as it deems necessary including 3D drawings and/or models of the proposal to assist in understanding the fundamental design elements and important spatial relationships.

(d) Should the Planning Commission deem it necessary to employ an architect or other qualified individual to review any development proposal, the cost of employing such an individual shall be borne by the applicant.

4. District Design Requirements. The Planning Commission shall review all development applications in the Village Center for compliance with the criteria listed below and in accordance with the character of the district as defined by the Village of Essex Junction Comprehensive Plan. The Planning Commission reserves the right to require applicants to undertake their development per the Secretary of Interiors Standards. Staff will review the applicant's proposal and provide guidance as to what the Planning Commission will expect with historic structures.

(a) Design Standards for the Village Center

(1) The relationship of building mass and architectural detail to open space and to the relative size of a person shall be compatible with such established relationships in the district.

(2) The predominant direction of structural shape, of placement of openings and architectural details at the front facade shall be consistent with such established conditions in the district

(3) Buildings shall generally have no setback from the street and be at least two stories in height to create a consistent street edge and sense of enclosure. Additional building setback to provide for an expansion of the sidewalk or active pedestrian space such as sidewalk cafes or display areas may be allowed and in some cases encouraged.

(4) The proposed height of structures may be limited to within ten percent (10%) of the average height of existing adjacent buildings where necessary to protect the residential character of adjacent residential structures. The height limit shall not apply in predominantly commercial and mixed-use areas.

(5) The following architectural elements or features shall be compatible with existing buildings and significant, predominant or established patterns in the district:

(a) The relationship between the width to height of the front elevation of the building.

(b) The relationship of width to height of windows and doors.

(c) The rhythmic relationship of openings to solid areas in front façades.

(d) The spaces between the proposed structure or structural alteration.

(e) The relationship of entranceways to buildings and porches.

(f) The materials, textures, and colors, including primary and accent or trim colors.

(g) Proposed architectural details (such as lintels, arches, chimneys).

(h) Proposed roof shapes and lines.

(i) Proposed enclosures, including fences, brick walls, stone walls, evergreen hedgerows and building facades, which are also continuous and cohesive with existing walls in the district.

(j) Proposed landscaping shall be compatible with existing quality and quantity of landscaping in the vicinity, with consideration given to existing landscape mass and continuity.

(k) The proposed ground cover shall be compatible with the predominant ground cover in the district.

(l) Storage areas, service areas, trash receptacles, accessory structures and parking areas shall be screened from view from the street and adjoining properties.

5. Demolition of Historic Structures. **Not applicable. Vacant site.**

6. Formula-Based Retail and Restaurants. **Not applicable.**

F. Parking. Due to the unique characteristics of this District no minimum parking requirements are established. However, the Planning Commission may require parking as a part of any Site Plan approval. The Commission shall use the parking standards of Chapter Seven as a guide to determine reasonable parking. If on-site parking is required, it shall be placed on the side or rear of the building, not in front. If parking is placed on the side, it shall not take up more than 30% of the linear frontage of the lot. The Planning Commission may waive this requirement due to site constraints. Below grade parking or structured parking may also be approved by the Planning Commission.

G. Planned Unit Development. Pursuant to 24 V.S.A. §4407(12), the Planning Commission may approve a Planned Unit Development in the Village Center District. In connection with such PUD approval, the Planning Commission may authorize the construction of structures and

facilities to accommodate any of the uses allowed in the Village Center District. Any application for proposed development in the Village Center District may, at the applicant's request, be reviewed as a Planned Unit Development under the provisions of this Section. **This property is close to bus and rail transit and many Village Center amenities.**

1. General Review Standards.
 - (a) Physical characteristics of the site and relation to surrounding properties.
 - (b) Relationship to major transportation facilities, including mass transit, walkways and bike paths.
 - (c) Design characteristics of the proposal and compatibility to adjoining developed land.
 - (d) Unique design or land planning characteristics.
 - (e) Methods used to provide a transition between adjoining uses and proposed uses including, but not limited to, setbacks, screening, fencing, building design and parking design.
 - (f) The preservation of unique natural physical characteristics.
 - (g) Building design compatibility with adjoining structures.
 - (h) Other criteria, as deemed necessary by the Commission to evaluate the merits of a specific proposal.
2. Specific Review Standards
 - (a) Proposed traffic flow and circulation design.
 - (b) Structural design and compatibility with adjoining developed properties.
 - (c) Scale and design of proposed structures.
 - (d) Location and setbacks of all proposed structures.
 - (e) Unique physical characteristics of the proposed use.
 - (f) Unique characteristics of the proposed use.
3. Waivers. The Commission may waive requirements for setbacks, parking and lot coverage, based upon the merits of the specific proposal. Waivers shall be based upon the following criteria and may include specific conditions.
 - (a) Unique physical characteristics of the site proposed for development.
 - (b) Superior building design, lot layout and landscaping design.
 - (c) Provision of public open spaces or superior bicycle and pedestrian access.
 - (d) Joint or combined vehicular access with adjoining properties.

H. Building Height. Building heights shall not exceed four stories or 58 feet, whichever is less. **Standard met.**

SECTION 703: PARKING

Elderly Housing requires .5 parking spaces per dwelling unit. Phase I proposal, will require twenty-one and one-half (21.5) parking spaces. Two (2) of these spaces will be accessible. The applicant has proposed thirty-one (31) new parking spaces.

SECTION 719: LANDSCAPE AND TREE PLANTING REQUIREMENTS

A. Purpose and Intent. To protect and enhance the community's environmental, economic

and aesthetic quality, thereby contributing to the overall objective of promoting public health, safety, and welfare. **The applicant has proposed a hedgerow along the western side of the new building where the structure is closest to the property line and a split rail fence on the northern end of the property between the surface parking and a residential garden. Two planting islands are proposed along with a patio area for residents. There may be a need for additional planting or screening of the parking area on the north side of the property where it adjoins residential gardens. The property opposite the access road is screened from incoming traffic by shrubs. The vegetative edge along the property line between Park Street School and proposed structure is planned to be maintained. If this does not occur the applicant shall plant a new vegetative buffer with species chosen by staff.**

More specifically, it is the purpose of this Section to:

1. Reduce noise, glare, and heat.
4. Promote energy conservation through the use of vegetation.
5. Protect the environment by contributing to air purification, oxygen regeneration, ground water recharge and minimizing erosion through storm water run-off.
6. Enhance community appearance, identity and unique natural beauty.
7. Preserve and protect existing mature tree growth.
8. Channelize vehicular and pedestrian movement within off-street parking areas.
9. Delineate parking areas and adjacent right-of-way.
10. Delineate ingress and egress points.

B. Tree Protection. Any application for development approval by the Commission shall submit a plan, which indicates the location of existing mature trees, or tree groupings, and shall indicate on the plan those trees or tree groupings which are proposed to be saved. The Commission may grant a credit of up to fifty (50) percent of the required landscaping for the preservation of mature trees.

C. Street Trees. The developer or applicant for any development approval under this Code shall plant one (1) shade tree of a species determined by the Commission for each forty (40) feet of frontage along a right-of-way bordering the property.

2. Street trees shall be planted either within the right-of-way or along the frontage of the lot, as determined by the Commission.
3. The Commission may waive this requirement if substantial efforts are proposed for preserving existing mature trees along the right-of-way.
4. This provision shall not apply to applications for the expansion of existing commercial or industrial facilities if the expansion amounts to five hundred (500) square feet or less of enclosed floor space.

D. Landscaping. There shall be a sufficient amount of landscaping and screening, as may be reasonably determined by the Planning Commission, to insure protection of and enhance the quality of the project in question and adjacent properties. The landscape plan must be drawn by a landscape architect, landscape designer, or competent landscape professional. For projects above \$250,000 construction cost, the landscape requirement shall be a minimum of 2% of the total construction cost. This may be waived in unusual circumstances. With a new use on existing development or renovation on existing property, the applicant must provide landscaping adequate

to provide screening and environmental enhancement to the satisfaction of the Planning Commission.

1. Landscaping Requirements.
 - (a) A minimum of fifty percent (50%) of the required landscaping shall be located within twenty (20) feet of the parking lot. All required landscaping shall comply with the intent and purpose of these regulations.
 - (b) All required landscaping shall be installed as per plans submitted.
2. Applicability - New and Existing Developed Areas
 - (a) The Commission may require review of proposed landscaping.
 - (b) New Development or Redevelopment: All new development, construction or reconstruction shall be in full compliance with the provisions of these regulations.
 - (c) Existing Developed Areas. Compliance required: All property with existing development which is not in compliance with the provisions of this Section shall be considered nonconforming, and allowed to continue until such time as application is made to add, enlarge or reconstruct a structure on the property. At that time a plan showing existing and new development and the proposed landscaping plan shall be submitted. The Commission will consider the existing development, proposed change or alteration, and the impact of the proposed use on the site, parking and circulation. Nothing in this Section shall prevent the Commission from requiring landscaping for the proposed area designated for change.
4. Design Standards
 - (a) Required parking areas must be shaded by deciduous trees (either retained or planted by the developer) that have or will have when fully mature a trunk of at least 12 inches in diameter. Each tree shall be presumed to shade a circular area having a radius of 15 feet with the trunk of the tree as the center and there must be sufficient trees so that using this standard, 20 percent of the parking area will be shaded. The 20% parking lot shade coverage may be waived by the Planning Commission in unusual circumstances, such as existing lots or lots which are not visible from off-site.
 - (c) The parking lot should be screened with shrubs or other barriers to the extent possible.

SECTION 720: LOT FRONTAGE Standard met.

A. Lot Frontage. Within any District, a minimum frontage of sixty (60) feet is required at the street, unless specifically stated otherwise. The Commission may waive this requirement in unusual circumstances. **Exceeds requirements.**

SECTION 905: GENERAL STANDARDS

D. Protection of Significant Features.

This proposal is in line with resident and Trustee desires as outlined in the recent Design Five Corners Trustee initiative.

SECTION 906: STREETS

No new public streets are proposed. A private road connecting the site to Park Street and Park Street School is proposed.

SECTION 909: PEDESTRIAN AND BIKEWAY STANDARDS.

SECTION 910: OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS/PUBLIC FACILITIES.

None planned.

SECTION 911: MONUMENTS AND LOT CORNER MARKERS.

The required lot corners are shown on the plans.

Staff Comments

General

- 1) *The applicant has indicated that “A right-of-way to the adjacent Essex Jct. School District property has been granted...” for the exit drive from the site onto the school property. The applicant should provide copies of this documentation to the Village.*
 - **The applicant has a right of way agreement with the School District to exit the site to access Park Street. The Village now owns the Park Street School and this Agreement is still in place.**
- 7) *The applicant should provide information on the estimated sewer and water demands for the project and request allocation capacity from the Village.*
 - *The applicant indicated that the water and wastewater demands are 4,515 gpd based on 105 gpd/unit. We find this acceptable for the wastewater flow, but question whether the water flows will be different based on the Water Supply Rules. The applicant shall provide confirmation as appropriate. In addition, the applicant stated that “Allocations will be obtained as part of the State WW permit process.” The applicant will need to submit a request and receive approval for water and sewer allocations for this project from the Village, prior to final approval.*
 - **The applicant has indicated that they “are in the process of confirming design flows with the Water Supply Division.” and that they “fully expect the confirmation of design flows with the State will be resolved prior to going before the board.” As above, the applicant will need to submit a request and receive approval for water and sewer allocations for this project from the Village, prior to Permit issuance.**

Site Layout – Roadways, Drives, and Walkways

- 6) *The grading in the area of the accessible parking space should be revised to not exceed a maximum slope of 1:48 in all directions, to comply with the current ADA Standards.*
 - **The applicant has stated that “Minor grading changes have been made to ensure the accessible parking area meets ADA slope requirements.” Based on our review of the plans, the cross slope within the accessible parking space appears to exceed 1:48. We feel that our concern has been noted.**

Grading & Drainage

- 1) *The proposed building is shown approximately 1 foot off the property line adjacent to the school property. The applicant should confirm that there will be no impacts to the school property during construction; or provide appropriate easements.*
 - **The applicant has stated that they “will ensure that all necessary construction easements are secured from the appropriate neighboring land owners as needed.” We recommend that necessary easements be secured and submitted to the Village prior to permit issuance.**

- 2) *The applicant should confirm how drainage along the north side of the school property will be maintained after the construction of the new exit drive from the project site connecting with the school property access.*
- *The applicant has indicated that “The curbing has been removed from the proposed driveway where it crosses onto the school property and grading has been modified so that water will retain its existing flow path across the driveway.” Based on our review of the plans, it appears as though runoff is likely to now flow down the paved drive and into the drainage system constructed as part of this project. The applicant should confirm that the drainage system is sized to accommodate this off-site runoff.*
 - ✓ **This comment has been addressed. The applicant has acknowledged “that there is likely some offsite contribution due to the proposed grading.” and that this offsite area has been included in the stormwater design modeling.**
- 3) *The applicant should confirm that the proposed retaining wall can be constructed without disturbance or impacts to the Hinsdale property; or provide appropriate easements. The detail for the wall presented on Sheet C-8 shows geogrid extending behind the wall, which may extend onto the Hinsdale property.*
- **The applicant clarified that the geo-grid will be placed on the project side of the wall. We apologize for our misread of the plans. In addition, the applicant has stated that “If field conditions require, the applicant will obtain all necessary easements prior to construction.” Similar to item #1 above, we recommend that any necessary easements be secured and submitted to the Village prior to Permit issuance.**
- 5) *The applicant should confirm the size of the existing storm drainage manhole in Park Street that the new drainage pipe is connecting to, in order to ensure that the new 24” pipe can be accommodated. In addition, the plans should be revised to include a detail for this connection (watertight, etc.).*
- *A Typical Storm Drain Manhole detail has been added to Sheet C-8. This detail should be revised to require a minimum 24” deep sump for new drain manholes, per the LDC. In addition, the applicant stated “The contractor will be responsible for evaluating the condition and structural feasibility of the proposed core for the new pipe. If the existing structure cannot handle the necessary modifications, the structure will need to be replaced.” The plans should be revised to include a note to this effect. Also, the Village or their authorized representative shall make the determination as to whether a replacement structure is necessary; not the applicant or contractor. This shall be reflected in the note added to the plans.*
 - ✓ **This comment has been addressed. The detail has been revised to require a minimum 24” deep sump and a note has been added to the plan to address this comment.**
- 10) *The applicant should provide field confirmation of the infiltration rate and depth to seasonal high groundwater in the locations of the proposed infiltration practices.*
- *The applicant has stated that “A conservative infiltration rate of 6.25 in/hr was established for this site during a previous development proposal by Lamoureux & Dickenson in 2007. This information was included in the site plan documentation which was reviewed by Hamlin Engineering and Village staff. To add additional conservancy the stormwater model currently proposed only utilizes an infiltration rate of 1 in/hr to comply with the Village stormwater requirements.” We note that the 2007 project proposed pervious concrete pavement in the area of this site where the current building is proposed. This is a different location than where the infiltration area is currently proposed. It is for this reason*

that the Village is requesting confirmation of the infiltration rate and depth to seasonal high groundwater in the location of the currently proposed infiltration facility.

- ✓ **This comment has been addressed. The applicant provided soil test pit information and the results of infiltration testing performed at the site on 02/21/2017 in the area of the proposed infiltration system.**

11) *The Stormtech Subsurface Layout detail shown on Sheet C-9 shows one inspection port in approximately the middle of each row. We recommend that an inspection port be provided at each end of each row.*

- The applicant has stated *“The inspection port locations are at the recommendation of the manufacturer. The manholes at the ends of the chambers will act as inspection points and the additional ports near the center will give a better assessment of the sediment buildup than only having them at the ends.”* Our comment referred to providing inspection ports at the end of each row in addition to the ones in the middle of the rows, as it is our opinion that as configured, the manholes do not provide ready access to each row for inspection and maintenance. As the inspection and maintenance of this private system will be the responsibility of the applicant, and inspection reports will be submitted to the Village, we feel our concern has been noted and **find the applicant’s response acceptable.**

14) *It is unclear whether the off-site areas to the west of the project site have been included in the drainage computations. Based on our review of the plans, it appears as though at least portions of these off-site areas will flow onto the project site and into the proposed drainage system. The applicant should address this matter.*

- *The applicant has indicated that “There are very small areas of the neighboring Dowling and Naef properties to the west and north of the building that contribute to the inflow to the system. This is relatively insignificant but has been accounted for in the model. Any other flow potentially contributing further north is being maintained via its existing path and will not contribute to the system.” The applicant should submit a plan depicting the drainage areas that have been included in the proposed drainage system, including those off-site areas.*

- ✓ **This comment has been addressed.**

16) *For the benefit of the Village in matters related to the Village’s compliance with the MS4 permit, the drainage computations should include an analysis of the water quality and channel protection storm events.*

- *The applicant stated “See attached revised reports which include the CPv storm event as well as the volume calculations for WQv based on State standards.” We did not see the computations for the WQv and CPv storm events included in the submittal. This information is requested by the Village for use in matters related to the MS4 permit compliance.*

- The applicant has revised the HydroCAD computations to include an analysis of the WQv storm event. Pertaining to these computations, we offer the following:

- a) The Water Quality volume should be calculated based on the area draining to the treatment practice. The worksheet included only lists 0.67 acres, while the drainage area for the infiltration basin is 1.06 acres presented elsewhere.
- b) The HydroCAD modeling for the WQv storm event should be revised to include a modified curve number to produce the volume of runoff equivalent to the water quality volume.

- c) Notwithstanding items a) and b) above, the isolator row used for pretreatment should be sized for the entire water quality volume. The applicant should provide confirmation on the sizing of the isolator row(s).

The applicant also indicated that computations for the CPv storm event were provided. **Based on our review of the submittal information, we did not see computations for the 1-year storm event. This information is requested by the Village for their use in MS4 permit compliance.**

Water

- 1) *The proposed waterline for this project will be a private line beyond the connection to the existing water main on Park Terrace. However, the Village will need a 20’ easement, centered on the pipe, along the waterline up to and including the hydrant and isolation valve for the building (see item #2 below).*
 - o The plans have been revised to provide a 20’ wide easement for the waterline, but the applicant has indicated that “*the line cannot be centered for the entire length due to site constraints.*” Wherever possible, the proposed waterline should be centered in the 20’ wide easement area. The applicant should acknowledge that this waterline is to be a private waterline.
 - ✓ **This comment has been addressed. The applicant has acknowledged that this will be a private waterline. The waterline has been centered in the 20’ wide easement as much as possible. We find this acceptable.**
- 9) *The applicant should provide computations for the anticipated available fire flow for the proposed hydrant.*
 - **The applicant has stated that “Fire flow calculations are being completed as part of the State Water Supply Permit to Construct.” We recommend that these computations be provided to the Village for approval prior to Permit issuance.**
- 10) *On Sheet C-8, the Typical Water Line Trench detail should be revised to specify compaction requirements for pipe bedding and backfill material, regardless of whether the pipe is located in paved or unpaved areas.*
 - o *The detail has been revised to state “See specs regarding compaction of trench backfill.” The applicant should submit the ‘specs’ for review, or the detail should be revised to specify the compaction requirements for pipe bedding and backfill.*
 - **The applicant provided an excerpt from the project specifications presenting the soil compaction requirements. The table below presents the applicant’s proposed compaction requirements, along with our comments pertaining to each item.**

Fill and Backfill Location	Density	Review Comments
Under structures	95% of max.	
Top 2 feet under road subgrade, including trenches	95% of max.	
Below top 2 feet under road subgrade, including trenches	92% of max.	95% of maximum dry density for work inside Village right-of-way or for utilities owned or to be owned by the Village.
Trenches through unpaved areas	90% of max.	95% of maximum dry density for all trenches for utilities owned or to be owned by the Village, regardless of

		whether through paved or unpaved areas.
Embankments and lawn areas	90% of max.	95% of maximum dry density for work inside Village right-of-way or for utilities owned or to be owned by the Village.
Pipe bedding	92% of max.	95% of maximum dry density for all pipe bedding for utilities owned or to be owned by the Village, regardless of whether through paved or unpaved areas.

Sanitary Sewer

- 1) *The proposed sewer service line for this project will be a private sewer line beyond the connection to the existing sewer manhole on Park Terrace.*
 - ✓ **This comment has been addressed. The applicant has confirmed that this will be a private sewer line with a response of “Correct”.**
- 3) *The plans should be revised to include a detail for the connection of the new sewer service to the existing sewer manhole on Park Terrace (watertight, etc.).*
 - *The applicant has indicated that “A typical sewer manhole detail is provided on sheet C-8 which includes connection specifications.” The detail provided shows a “cast-in-place flexible watertight connection”; for new installations. For connections to existing structures, the detail needs to require a core and boot installation and modifications to the invert channel and shelf.*
 - ✓ **This comment has been addressed.**
- 4) *Regarding the Typical Sanitary Sewer Trench detail shown on Sheet C-8:*
 - a) *This detail should be revised to specify compaction requirements, regardless of whether the pipe is located in paved or unpaved areas.*
 - *The detail has been revised to state “See specs for compaction requirements.” The applicant should submit the ‘specs’ for review, or the detail should be revised to specify the compaction requirements for pipe bedding and backfill.*
 - **The applicant provided an excerpt from the project specifications presenting the soil compaction requirements. See Water item #10 above.**

Traffic

- 1) *The applicant should provide a traffic control plan for implementation during construction. Two-way traffic should be maintained on Park Street at all times.*
- *The Traffic Estimate Summary submitted presents an estimated 3.44 AM trips and 4.73 PM trips associated with this project and indicated that the “project’s impacts to nearby streets and intersection are believed to be minimal.” According to the 9th Edition of the ITE Trip Generation Manual for Land Use Code 252, “Senior Adult Housing – Attached”, the fitted curve equations should be used and they reveal an estimated 9 trip ends during the AM peak of the adjacent street and an estimated 12 trip ends during the PM peak of the adjacent street. While we remain concerned about the potential impacts this project will have on this section of Park Street, we recognize the urban nature of this area and the existing traffic operation. We also note that several modifications to the traffic flow, roadways, and intersections in this vicinity will be forthcoming with the anticipated construction of the Crescent Connector and associated changes to the Five Corners intersection. Without detailed analysis, it is unclear as*

to what impacts these modifications will have relative to this project. **The applicant has stated that “anticipated added traffic associated with this development is a very small percentage of the overall traffic flow on adjacent streets. Traffic flow considerations have been accounted for in the design to mitigate the impact on the congested five corners area and no new curb cuts are proposed as part of this phase of development.”** We continue to recommend the requirement for a follow-up study to confirm the trip generation rate and determine if traffic improvements are necessary within a year of a CO being issued for this project.

Additional Comments

- 1) *Page 2 of the lighting information submitted depicting renderings of the proposed lighting does not appear to reflect the currently proposed lighting (revised from the initial submittal). The applicant should provide confirmation and submit revised information as necessary.*
 - ✓ **This comment has been addressed.**
- 2) *There is less than 0.2 footcandles of illumination along the walk from Park Street all the way to the proposed building. This is of special concern in the area of the pedestrian crossing of the access drive. The lighting should be revised to provide a minimum of 0.2 footcandles in accordance with the LDC.*
 - **The plans have been revised to include 18” tall bollard lights to be installed along the southern edge of the sidewalk along the access drive from Park Street. While this provides the minimum light levels per the LDC, we offer two comments regarding these proposed fixtures:**
 - a) **These proposed light fixtures may conflict with the installation of the proposed retaining wall. The applicant should provide clarification regarding this matter.**
 - b) **As the proposed bollard lights are only 18” tall, we have concerns that they may become buried by snow during the winter months. As this is not an LDC requirement, we will defer to the Village planning staff and Planning Commission regarding these proposed light fixtures.**
- 3) *The drainage computations should be revised to only utilize the bottom area of the infiltration area for infiltration.*
 - ✓ **This comment has been addressed.**
- 4) *The primary outlet orifice of the infiltration system is indicated as 24” diameter in the computations, but only an 18” pipe is shown on the plans. The applicant should resolve this conflicting information and submit revised information as necessary.*
 - ✓ **This comment has been addressed.**
- 5) *The applicant should confirm if “Flexstorm Pure Inserts” depicted on sheet C-9 are proposed for use on this project, as they are listed as “optional” The Village recommends that these are incorporated into the project design and construction.*
 - ✓ **The applicant has indicated that “Per correspondence with the manufacturer, Flexstorm Pure Inserts will not provide an appreciable benefit to this project and have therefore been removed from the details.” As this is not an LDC requirement, we find this acceptable.**

Recommendations:

Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve this application with the following conditions:

1. Village Staff recommendations shall be complied with.

2. The applicant shall provide copies of easement documentation to the Village prior to the issuance of a zoning permit.
3. All LED light fixtures shall have a maximum color temperature of 4300K.
4. The applicant is advised that the Village may require stormwater improvements on the project site in the future, in light of the MS4 requirements.
5. All work shall comply with the Village of Essex Junction Land Development Code as amended March 29, 2011.
6. The site does not contain enough soft or hard landscaping areas to comply with the 2% requirement for landscaping. The applicant shall provide the required landscaping funding to the Village in lieu of new landscaping on site to be used to develop tree planting on Village owned property and ROWs.
7. Post construction runoff from the site shall not exceed pre construction runoff from the site.
8. Ensure a vegetative and/or visual buffer is created between the new structure and neighboring residential properties and with the Park Street School.