

Date: August 26, 2016

To: Allen Freeman
Pierce Township Trustee

From: Jay Stewart, AICP
The Kleingers Group

Re: **Zoning & Engineering Review of the Prestwick Place Preliminary PUD
Development Plan**

Mr. Freeman,

As the Township requested, please allow this memorandum to serve as our technical review and analysis of the Prestwick Place Preliminary PUD Development Plan as submitted by Grand Communities, Ltd.

PLANNING & ZONING REVIEW

Many of the planning and zoning comments in this section are based on items I would typically ask for in a stage II preliminary PUD development plan. Given the flexible framework and negotiations involved with a planned unit development zoning application and the Purpose Statements set for in Zoning Resolution Section 7.02, a preliminary PUD typically requires a higher level of design detail and review as compared to a straight (non-PUD) subdivision review.

Since this is a proposed planned unit development, the Township, at their discretion, may grant “waivers” to certain development regulations to foster innovative and efficient planned developments. It is recommended that any waivers from a Township Zoning Resolution or County Subdivision Regulations requirement be documented at this stage of the review. I believe these waivers could be included in the list of “Crucial Features” as provided for in Section 7.03(C)(3) of the Zoning Resolution.

1. Conceptual Landscape Plan. I would recommend that a conceptual landscape plan be submitted at this stage addressing any project gateways, streetscaping, typical bufferyard design, screening or other required landscape or buffer elements. The applicant provides text notes for some of these items, but an overall conceptual landscape plan allows the Township to review the proposed landscape and buffering treatments in the context of the overall development and to ensure an attractive and well planned community. A conceptual (graphical) plan is required for the Township to properly review and understand if the spirit and intent of Article 10 “Landscaping and Buffering” is being achieved.

2. Street Trees. The submitted site plan sheet states that street trees “may” be planted in the public and private rights of ways. This note should state the street trees “shall” be planted in accordance to the Conceptual Landscape Plan. This same note also states that the number of street trees will be determined based on the overall street scene proposed at the final development plan stage. I would recommend that a minimum number of street trees within the



development be determined and noted on the conceptual landscape plan at this preliminary development stage. If the applicant is seeking to create various street scenes based on the particular housing types, I would recommend, at a minimum, that street tree typical section drawings are provided at this stage for Township review and approval.

3. Recreation Center and Park Area. I would typically require additional design details on the various elements of the recreation center, park area and any other active amenity areas at this stage of PUD review. This would include a conceptual site plan for the recreation center / park area providing sufficient level of detail and notes to allow the Township to properly review the extent and design of the proposed amenity package. I would also recommend that preliminary/ conceptual building elevations for the recreation center be provided at this preliminary development plan stage.

4. Gateway Entry Signage. The site plan notes that entry identification will be installed at the entrances. I would recommend that the proposed entry sign elevation drawings be submitted as a part of this preliminary stage. The sign drawings should provide the Township with the design, materials and proposed colors for the entry signs. I would also recommend that the locations of the sign footprints be shown on the plans.

5. Fencing Details. The fencing proposed around the open space is listed as “horse-park type” fencing as a note on the site plan sheet. I would recommend that a typical fence section be submitted for review by the Township.

6. Street Signs, Lighting, Other Street and Site Furnishings. I would recommend we see sample imagery or specifications for the proposed street lights, street sign poles and other furnishings such as benches, trash receptacles, etc.

7. Legendary Run Design Handbook. One condition of the Trustees Stage I Concept Plan approval was that the Legendary Run design handbook be used as a guideline for the development of this preliminary development plan. I have not reviewed the Legendary Run Design Handbook for compliance to this condition, but would recommend the Township Zoning Commission and Trustees address these guidelines during their review.

8. Lot Size. I would typically ask to see each lot have its’ square footage shown on the plan to determine compliance with the minimum lot area requirements with the Zoning Resolution. Even though this is a PUD and waivers can be given for unmet code requirements, it is still helpful to understand how many of the lots are under the required area minimums so they can be incorporated into the list of PUD waivers.

9. Cul-de-Sac Length. The northernmost cul-de-sac shown on the site plan is approximately 2,000 LF in length from the intersection to the radius point of the cul-de-sac and serves 44 lots. Section 504.B.3 of the Clermont County Subdivision Regulations states the maximum length for a cul-de-sac is 900 feet (or as needed to serve a maximum of 30 lots) from the intersection to the radius point of the cul-de-sac. I suspect the street layout was intended to run along the ridge line and terminate at the end of the ridge. Just understand that many communities don’t permit cul-de-sac lengths beyond, say 700 – 900 lineal feet due to emergency vehicle access concerns. If it is the desire of the Township to permit a PUD waiver for this item, I would recommend it be documented as a “Crucial Feature” on the Preliminary Development Plan.

10. Panhandle Lot Widths. The panhandle lot widths appear to be 20 feet. Section 512.D of the Clermont County Subdivision Regulations states the minimum panhandle lot shall have a

minimum width of 25 feet (unless it can be demonstrated that easements of adequate dimensions are provided for access and utilities). The Township Zoning Resolution has the same 25' minimum standard. If it is the desire of the Township to permit a PUD waiver for these reductions, I would recommend it be documented as a "Crucial Feature" on the Preliminary Development Plan.

11. Yard Setbacks. The proposed front, side and rear yard setbacks are less than the stated minimums in Table 6.05 of the Zoning Resolution. If it is the desire of the Township to permit a PUD waiver for these reductions, I would recommend it be documented as a "Crucial Feature" on the Preliminary Development Plan.

12. Dwelling Size. The plans propose a 1,400 square foot minimum floor area for dwellings located in the Village Sections of the development. Table 6.05 of the Zoning Resolution requires a 1,600 sq. ft. minimum floor area for SFR zoning districts. If it is the desire of the Township to permit a PUD waiver for these reductions, I would recommend it be documented as a "Crucial Feature" on the Preliminary Development Plan.

13. Density. It is my understanding that the Township Trustees previously approved the Concept PUD Plan for 219 residential lots. The proposed preliminary development plan currently shows 229 lots which exceeds the approved 219 figure by 10 lots.

TRAFFIC ANALYSIS

An engineer in our Transportation Engineering Group has completed a review of the traffic impact study that was prepared for the proposed Prestwick Place development (Ferguson Property). As a result of our review, we offer the following comments.

1. It appears that the background traffic volumes for the intersection of Merwin Ten Mile Road and the proposed development access road were estimated based on the counted traffic volumes arriving and departing at the intersection of Merwin Ten Mile Road and White Oak Road. This methodology does not capture traffic volumes from the Legend Oaks subdivision that travel to and from the north on Merwin Ten Mile Road. Since the study shows that left and right turn lane warrants are very close to being met at the proposed development access road, it is recommended that the study be updated with additional traffic count data near the proposed development access road once schools in this area resume and that the turn lane warrants be reevaluated with projected traffic volumes that are based on these counts.

2. The traffic study should include intersection capacity analyses each of the development access roads on Merwin Ten Mile Road and White Oak Road. Although the notes on the site plan state that site distance studies will be performed at the final stage per the Clermont County Engineer's regulations, we would not recommend that approach. We typically deal with all traffic analysis at this stage of a subdivision review process. It is possible that layout design changes may be required as a result of the site distance analysis. We believe it is prudent to understand whether or not there are layout changes required at this preliminary development stage and have the approved preliminary development plan incorporate those changes, if required.

3. The traffic study should document the sight distance from each of the proposed access roads on Merwin Ten Mile Road and White Oak Road.



4. The traffic study should document the intended lane configuration and traffic control on the proposed development access roads at the existing public roadways.

It is recommended that the consultant address these comments in the traffic report.

STORMWATER DRAINAGE ANALYSIS

A site civil engineer has completed a review of the stormwater and drainage approach for the proposed Prestwick Place development. As a result of our review, we offer the following comments.

1. Basin 3 is labeled as 12.76 Acres on the stormwater management plan sheet for pre-developed and post-developed conditions. Per information shown on the preliminary grading plan, Basin 3 is proposed to outlet into a tributary that cuts through the back sides of the neighboring properties along Castlebay Drive. Not all of the 12.76 Acres within the Basin 3 area drains to this particular tributary under existing conditions. Therefore, the allowable release rates from Basin 3 will need to be closely examined by the designer to ensure higher rates are not being sent to this tributary on the back sides of the properties along Castlebay Drive to negatively impact those property owners.
2. There does not appear to be an overland flood route to direct runoff from the entrance drive from White Oak Road to Basin #4. Calculations will eventually need to be provided to confirm if those storm pipes are being designed to handle the 100-year storm event in lieu of an overland flood route.