

**PUD &
SUBDIVISION STAFF REPORT****Date: July 7, 2005****DEVELOPMENT NAME** D'Iberville Town Homes**SUBDIVISION NAME** D'Iberville Town Homes**LOCATION** South side of Southland Drive, 800'± West of Knollwood Drive, extending to the West terminus of Southland Drive**CITY COUNCIL
DISTRICT** District 6**PRESENT ZONING** R-3, Multi-Family Residential**AREA OF PROPERTY** 10.8 Acres 58 Lots**CONTEMPLATED USE** Amend a previously approved planned unit development to allow reduced lot size, widths, reduced building setbacks, increased site coverage, and on-street shared parking for a single-family residential town home subdivision.**TIME SCHEDULE
FOR DEVELOPMENT** Phase One — Immediately upon approval**ENGINEERING
COMMENTS** Must comply with all stormwater and flood control ordinances. Any work performed in the right of way will require a right of way permit.

Engineering will require a drainage easement be dedicated for maintenance of any existing stormwater drainage system located on the property that handles water discharged from a public rights-of-way. The width of the easement is dependant upon the width of the existing drainage-way from top of bank to top of bank plus approximately 10 feet on one side for access purposes.

Engineering recommends requiring a minimum of a 25 feet stream bank buffer (from the top of the bank) to protect the highly sensitive Campground Branch stream. The buffer should be left vegetated.

A Hold Harmless agreement will be required for any stormwater discharge onto an adjacent property owner if the discharge has been increased or concentrated.

Roadway layout appears not to be City standard. Some cul-de-sacs do not have adequate ROW specified and curbing stated ("role-back") is not City standard. If streets are to be dedicated to and maintained by the COM, they must be constructed to City of Mobile standards.

TRAFFIC ENGINEERING**COMMENTS**

Driveway number, size, location, and design to be approved by Traffic Engineering and conform to AASHTO standards. Head in parking that requires backing into the travel way is not allowed. Although right-of-way widths are shown, actual street widths are not given on the drawing and in some instances are not shown. Without this information, it cannot be determined if the shown turnarounds are adequate.

URBAN FORESTRY**COMMENTS**

Property to be developed in compliance with state and local laws that pertain to tree preservation and protection on both city and private properties (State Act 61-929 and City Code Chapters 57 and 64).

REMARKS

The applicant received PUD approval in July 2004, to allow Multiple buildings on a single building site for a residential, condominium, town-home complex with private streets and shared parking. The applicant is now requesting PUD and subdivision approvals to allow the development to consist of individual lots with reduced lot size, widths, reduced building setbacks, increased site coverage, and shared on-street parking for a single-family residential town home subdivision. The plan also proposes that the streets be dedicated, public streets.

Planned Unit Development review examines the site with regard to its location to ensure that it is generally compatible with neighboring uses; that adequate access is provided without generating excess traffic along minor residential streets in residential districts outside the PUD; and that natural features of the site are taken into consideration. PUD review also examines the design of the development to provide for adequate circulation within the development; to ensure adequate access for emergency vehicles; and to consider and provide for protection from adverse effects of adjacent properties as well as provide protection of adjacent properties from adverse effects from the PUD.

The planning staff met with the applicant prior to submission and discussed issues relating to the preliminary plan at that time. Some of those issues were public vs private streets, parallel parking vs head-in parking, and the general concept of the proposed development. It was suggested to the applicant's site designer that discussions with City Engineering and Traffic Engineering would be appropriate prior to submission of the application(s).

While there were some modifications to the plan, the issues discussed with planning staff prior to submission still apply.

The first relates to the streets being dedicated, public streets and the on-street parallel parking as proposed. While on-street parking on minor residential streets may be allowed, consultation with Traffic Engineering would be appropriate if it is a design feature of the proposed development. In addition to the parallel spaces proposed, the plan reflects a number of “guest” parking spaces that back into the right-of-way. Based upon comments from both City Engineering and Traffic Engineering, the streets as proposed do not appear to comply with City of Mobile construction standards, and the parking spaces that back into the street are not allowed.

With regard to the dwelling units, the individual “buildings” will have either two or three town houses per building and in most instances there will be a common or service area between the buildings. The PUD Section of the Zoning Ordinance requires a minimum separation of 8 feet between two-story buildings, and windows would not be allowed on the exterior walls flanking the common or service areas unless the minimum separation required by the Zoning Ordinance is provided.

PUD approval is site plan specific. Therefore, given the concerns regarding road construction standards, parallel parking and parking that backs into the street; and the impact that easements and buffers requested by the Engineering Department could have on the development, a holdover to allow the applicant to meet with Engineering and Traffic Engineering to address these issues and submit a revised plan would be appropriate.

As with any new construction, full compliance with the landscaping and tree planting requirements of the Ordinance will be required. Additionally, the site contains wetlands and adjoins a creek, thus the area could be considered environmentally sensitive; therefore, the approval of all applicable federal, state and local agencies would be required. Moreover, as the site adjoins R-1, Single-Family Residential property to the South, the provision of a buffer in compliance with Section IV.D.1. should be provided.

Revised for August 4, 2005

Revised Traffic Engineering Comments: Driveway number, size, location, and design to be approved by Traffic Engineering and conform to AASHTO standards. Traffic Engineering would prefer that the proposed turnaround be changed to standard cul-de-sacs. A standard cul-de-sac is easily recognized by drivers and will avoid any potential confusion. The extra guest parking at the end of streets (non parallel) should be accommodated in standard parking lot layouts.

Revised Engineering Comments: Must comply with all stormwater and flood control ordinances. Any work performed in the right of way will require a right of way permit.

Engineering will require a drainage easement be dedicated for maintenance of any existing stormwater drainage system located on the property that handles water discharged from a public rights-of-way. The width of the easement is dependant upon the

width of the existing drainage-way from top of bank to top of bank plus approximately 10 feet on one side for access purposes.

Engineering recommends requiring a minimum of a 25 feet stream bank buffer (from the top of the bank) to protect the highly sensitive Campground Branch stream. The buffer should be left vegetated.

A Hold Harmless agreement will be required for any stormwater discharge onto an adjacent property owner if the discharge has been increased or concentrated.

Roadway layout appears not to be City standard. Some cul-de-sacs do not have adequate ROW specified and curbing stated ("role-back") is not City standard. If streets are to be dedicated to and maintained by the COM, they must be constructed to City of Mobile standards.

Site has been cleared without benefit of permit. Please provide appropriate erosion control measures.

Comments: *The applicant has submitted a revised site plan that addresses some of the concerns referenced in the original staff report and comments from other departments, such as better delineation of the parallel parking along the proposed streets and dimensioning of the proposed street improvements, exclusive of the proposed parallel parking (22' clear). The plan also proposes "hammerhead" type turnarounds in several locations to allow for maneuvering of fire trucks and other emergency vehicles. These turnarounds replace previously proposed cul de sacs and eliminate some of the parking that backs into the right-of-way, but not all. Additionally, based upon discussion with Fire Department personnel, there appears to be some question with regard to the functionality of the apparatus turnaround located on the Southeast portion of the site.*

Revised Comments from Traffic Engineering indicate that the full cul de sacs would be preferable, and that guest parking facilities proposed at the end of turn arounds (not parallel) should be provided in the form of standard parking lots layouts.

In concept, the plan could be considered innovative. However, as stated in the original report, PUD approval is site plan specific. Given the concerns regarding parking facility design, Traffic Engineering preference for cul de sacs, and Fire Department concern regarding the functionality of the turnaround in the Southeast portion of the site, approval of the plan as submitted would not be appropriate due to the number of modifications required. Additionally, as stated in the original Engineering Comments, the construction standard stated in the original application is not city standard.

Therefore, another holdover to allow the applicant time to meet with Traffic Engineering, City Engineering and Fire Department to resolve all of the issues relating to design and construction standards of this development would be warranted. Final revised plans should be submitted by August 15 for consideration at the September 1 meeting.

RECOMMENDATION


PUD: Based upon the preceding, it is recommended that this application be heldover until the August 4, 2005 meeting. Any revisions or additional information must be submitted by July 11.

Subdivision: Based upon the preceding, it is recommended that this application be heldover until the August 4, 2005 meeting. Any revisions or additional information must be submitted by July 11.

REVISED RECOMMENDATION PUD: *Based upon the preceding, it is recommended that this application be heldover until the September 1, 2005 meeting. Any revisions or additional information must be submitted by August 15.*

Subdivision: *Based upon the preceding, it is recommended that this application be heldover until the September 1, 2005 meeting. Any revisions or additional information must be submitted by August 15.*

LOCATOR MAP



APPLICATION NUMBER Holdover DATE August 4, 2005


APPLICANT D'Iberville Town Homes Subdivision

REQUEST Planned Unit Development, Subdivision



NTS

PLANNING COMMISSION VICINITY MAP - EXISTING ZONING



A group home and a health facility are located to the north of the site. An office and a retirement community are located to the east of the site. A hospital is located to the south of the site.

APPLICATION NUMBER Holdover DATE August 4, 2005

APPLICANT D'Iberville Town Homes Subdivision


REQUEST Planned Unit Development, Subdivision

LEGEND

R-1	R-2	R-3	R-A	R-B	H-B	B-1	LB-2	B-2	B-3	B-4	B-5	I-1	I-2
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

 NTS

SITE PLAN




The site plan illustrates the proposed development

APPLICATION NUMBER Holdover DATE August 4, 2005
APPLICANT D'Iberville Town Homes Subdivision
REQUEST Planned Unit Development, Subdivision



TYPICAL LOT LAYOUT



APPLICATION NUMBER 6 & 7 DATE July 7, 2005

APPLICANT D'Iberville Town Homes Subdivision

REQUEST Planned Unit Development, Subdivision



NTS