

To: Jeff Petroff, Coastal Land Design
From: Nicole Smith, Associate Planner; 910-341-1611
CC: File;
Date: 11/10/2020
Re: Eden Village

The following is a list of comments for review from planning regarding the project. Please provide your corrections as listed below. Additional review will be required once all the needed documents have been provided. Items or documents not provided on initial submission will be subject to further review. Please contact me for any further questions.

Review	Department	Comments
Nicole Smith	Planning	See comments below
Richard Christensen	Engineering	See comments below
Chris Walker	Fire	Nothing Further. Prepared to sign.
Bill McDow	Transportation Planning	Nothing further. Prepared to sign.
Mitesh Baxi	Traffic Engineering	See comments below

Planning (Nicole Smith):

Sec. 18-327: Single-family Courtyard developments Comments:

- Elevations are required to ensure compliance with Sec. 18-327(b)(3)(b) and 18-327(b)(3)(c). Update elevations to provide details required to ensure code compliance with avoiding blank rear façade. Porch details are now code compliant.
- Add minimum distance between buildings per Sec. 18-327(b)(3)(f)(ii). Please add note to site data table for clarity.
- Add setback of 6-18 ft. from units to open space per Sec. 18-327(b)(3)(f)(iii). Please add note to site data table for clarity.
- Provide calculation to ensure compliance with Sec. 18-327(b)(6)(e). Please add to sheet Sp-1.

Landscape Plan:

- Please provide details of the required fencing used as part of the dumpster screen per Sec. 18-504. Security fence is ok. Minimum height of required dumpster screen is 8 feet along rear and side property line.

- Four trees short of code compliance for Sec. 18-327(b)(4)(b). Agree 64 is the requirement, but 2 preserved trees cannot count as 6. Section 18-448, table I only applies to required tree mitigation. It is not applicable to Sec. 18-457(g).

Engineering (Richard Christensen):

Engineering has reviewed the plans for the Eden Village project submitted October 22, 2020 and have the following comments:

1. SW-1: The portion of the public sidewalk that is outside of the public r/w, specifically the sidewalk at the turf cell drive exit, must be placed in a public access easement.
2. Update the second paragraph of the Project Overview Description in the Design Narrative. It still lists site BUA as if the pervious concrete was receiving the pervious credit.
3. Update the Proposed Conditions under the General Site Description. Both paragraphs need to be updated to address the increase in impervious due to the P.C. not receiving credit.
4. No further comments from Engineering.

Please call or email if there are any questions. Thank you.

TrafficEngineering(MiteshBaxi):

TECHNICAL STANDARDS:

- Proposed driveway shall be City-standard ramp-type. Show appropriate City standard detail(s) on plan. [\[SD 3-03.3 & 3-03.4 CofWTSSM\]](#). 15' flares are subject to variance. Coordinate with engineering division for any variance to the technical standards.

Please let me know if you have any questions or if I can be of further assistance.