

**CITY OF RAMSEY LAND USE APPLICATION  
TECHNICAL REVIEW FILE**

<b>DATE</b>	4/28/17 <u>6/9/17</u>	<b>PROJECT ADDRESS</b>	14800 BLOCK PUMA ST NW
<b>PROJECT TITLE</b>	RIVERSTONE ADDITION (PRELIMINARY PLAT)		
<b>PROJECT #</b>	17-106		
<b>DEPARTMENT:</b>	Community Development – Planning Division		
<b>TECHNICAL REVIEWER:</b>	Name: Tim Gladhill, Community Development Director Phone: 763-433-9826 Email: <a href="mailto:tgladhill@cityoframsey.com">tgladhill@cityoframsey.com</a>		

We offer the following comments regarding your land use application. Staff is supportive of the proposed subdivision, subject to corrections to plans identified within this report and final review for compliance with future steps (Final Plat). This preliminary plat phase is the most significant approval step in the overall process. Preliminary Plat gives entitlement to the project, in which the City cannot reverse overall layout. The last step in the phase, Final Plat, simply approves construction documents and the Final Plat Sheet for recording and legal subdivision.

NOTE: This Review Letter has been modified from the April 28, 2017 version. Additions are indicated by underline. Deletions are indicated by ~~strikethroughs~~.

## Comprehensive Plan

*Action Item: Comprehensive Plan Amendment required to change areas of High Density Residential and Commercial.*

The City Council already authorized a Comprehensive Plan Amendment for the ‘Armstrong West’ area. The amendment will now enter Metropolitan Council review. The amendment will be consistent with the proposed subdivision.

~~Upon approval of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment, the entire site will be guided as Medium Density Residential. Please note that approximately 90% of the project site is already guided in this manner. The Comprehensive Plan Amendment adjusts two (2) minor areas based off of previous land use planning. In 2013, the City embarked on a minor Small Area Plan commonly referred to as Armstrong West. The proposed project is consistent with policy direction from that planning effort. Results of that process are attached under separate cover.~~

The Comprehensive Plan defines Medium Density Residential as areas that are within the MUSA and intended to receive medium density housing including lower density multi-family housing and higher density single-family housing. Average density will be 6 units per acre [Zoning Code allows for range of 3 – 6 units per acre].

The fact that the project requires an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan and Planned Unit Development affords the City certain discretion in approving/not approving the project.

## Permitted Uses

*Action Item: Zoning Amendment required to be consistent with Comprehensive Plan Amendment noted above. Staff recommends utilizing a Planned Unit Development (PUD) due to the overall master plan for the project to be discussed below.*

The project is being generally reviewed under the standards of the R-2 Residential District (this district implements the Medium Density Residential (MDR) designation of the Comprehensive Plan. The intent of the R-2 Residential District is to accommodate multiple dwellings at a density of three to seven dwelling units per acre and multiple-dwelling complexes within the 2002 MUSA. All lots created by subdivision located within the 2020 MUSA shall be serviced by sanitary sewer and municipal water. However, there are multiple residential types within the proposed project that make it difficult to apply one single zoning district to the project. Please note that one of the City's goal is to provide a variety of housing options for people at all life stages and income levels to encourage existing and future residents to stay in Ramsey throughout their lives and to achieve a balanced housing supply. One strategy identified in the Comprehensive Plan to achieve this is to continue to develop more affordable single family housing such as small-lot single family homes. The four (4) different types of housing proposed within the project include:

1. 65-foot-wide traditional single-family lot
2. 50-foot-wide traditional single-family lot
3. 50-foot-wide 'villa' lot (association maintained lawn care and snow removal)
4. 4-unit townhome building

*Continued on next page.*



### Traditional Single-Family/Small-Lot Single Family Lots (65 foot width, 50 foot width)

Detached single-family lots are traditionally guided by the R-1 Residential District. However, the minimum lot width is 80 feet. The City has on multiple occasions allowed this style of development in the R-2 Residential District through the PUD process. Most recently, this was utilized for the Villages of Sunfish Lake Development (mid-2000s). These units do not meet the specific definition of detached townhomes in the R-2 Residential District, thus necessitating the need for a PUD, an appropriate tool.

### Villa Lots

These would be classified as detached townhomes. The use is consistent with the R-2 Residential District. Please note that the definition of detached townhome within Zoning Code is slightly different than that of Building Code. Staff raises this point not to suggest any conflicts with the proposal, yet clarify for future steps (Building Permit Review).

### Townhome Lots (Quad Units)

The use is consistent with the R-2 Residential District.

## Layout

The following design standards are required for the various housing types proposed within the development. Please note that due to the variety of housing types, it is difficult to apply a single-set of layout standards to the project. Any perceived deviation to City Code appears to be reasonable with the utilization of a Planned Unit Development. A significant portion of the project area is being preserved for open space, a key component of a PUD Approval, and a requirement of the R-2 Residential District.

### Traditional Single-Family/Small Lot Single-Family and Villa Lots

Miscellaneous Standards	Attached and Detached Townhomes
<b>Lot size</b>	None
<b>Minimum density (net)</b>	3.0
<b>Maximum density (net)</b>	7.0
<b>Lot width</b>	None
<b>Building setback from public street right-of-way</b>	25 feet
<b>Building setback from private street measured from back of curb</b>	25 feet
<b>Building setback from exterior development boundary line</b>	30 feet 25 feet (detached)
<b>Minimum separation between buildings, including any appurtenances thereto (i.e., patios, decks)</b>	20 feet 15 feet (detached)
<b>Parking node setback from exterior development boundary line</b>	30 feet
<b>Parking node setback from structure</b>	15 feet
<b>Maximum lot coverage</b>	35%
<b>Maximum building height (measured from mean ground level to mean gable)</b>	35 feet
<b>Accessory structure setback (measured from the development boundary line)</b>	30 feet
<b>Maximum number of units per structure</b>	81 (detached)
<b>Open space required</b>	40% general open space 10% of which must be identifiable community space

The only deficiency in the above table would be the minimum separation between buildings. The Planning Commission and City Council have already seen this project in concept, and appeared generally supportive of the overall approach. The PUD appears to be an appropriate tool in this instance. The Planning Commission recommended approval of the PUD as an appropriate tool to deviate from this standard.

Townhome/Quad Units

Miscellaneous Standards	Twinhome or Quad
<b>Lot size</b>	7,000 square feet per dwelling unit
<b>Minimum density (net)</b>	3.0
<b>Maximum density (net)</b>	7.0
<b>Lot width</b>	50 feet
<b>Front yard setback</b>	30 feet
<b>Side yard setback</b>	10 feet
<b>Side yard setback corner lot</b>	30 feet
<b>Side yard interior wall setback</b>	0
<b>Rear yard setback</b>	30 feet
<b>Maximum lot coverage for all principal and accessory buildings (excludes impervious or prepared surface)</b>	35%
<b>Maximum building height (measured from mean ground level to mean ground gable)</b>	35 feet
<b>Accessory structure setbacks:</b>	
<b>Front</b>	30 feet or same as principal structure, which ever is greater
<b>Rear</b>	5 feet
<b>Side</b>	6 feet
<b>Side corner</b>	30 feet
<b>Maximum number of units per structure</b>	4

The only apparent deficiency to the above table is lot width, which is measured at approximately 45 feet. There appears to be sufficient space in the common area to widen the individual lots without impacting the proposed buildings themselves.

*Action Item: Adjust the lot widths of the quad units to 50 feet.*

*Continued on next page.*

## Architectural Standards

Attached are proposed architectural renderings of the different models. Please note that with approval of the Preliminary Plat, the City is approving the following models as 'master plans'. So long as the models are in substantial compliance with the approved models. The Community Development Department will make a final determination on 'substantial compliance'. Models that are not in substantial compliance shall require the approval of the Planning Commission.



*It is our mission to work together to responsibly grow our community, and to provide quality, cost-effective and efficient government services.*

*Riverstone Addition Planning Division Review April 28, 2017 (Preliminary Plat)*



## Street Widths and Design [section modified from Sketch Plan Review]

The proposed street widths are shown at twenty-nine (29) feet. Traditional City Streets in Ramsey are measured at thirty-two (32) foot widths. ~~There are benefits and drawbacks for each scenario. City Staff needs policy direction from Planning Commission and City Council and cannot make a formal recommendation at this point. From a neighborhood design and traffic calming, the 29 foot width approach would be acceptable. However, the City's Public Safety and Public Works Maintenance Teams have expressed concern with this design due to maneuverability. The narrower road widths may require restricting parking to one side of the street.~~ The Planning Commission recommends approval of twenty-nine (29) foot road widths with parking restricted on one (1) side of the road. Note: the City's Public Safety and Public Works team can support this recommendation; however, prefer the standard thirty-two (32) foot road width. This is ultimately a decision of the City Council.

~~The intersection of Street H and Alpine Drive is deficient in pedestrian safety. The current recommended strategy is a roundabout in this location and would include a cost share. The proposed intersection has been identified as a concern due to sight lines, geometry, and pedestrian safety. The intersection will also serve as an entrance to future Lake Itasca Park. City Staff and Developer have recently discussed alternative approaches.~~

Within the current plan set, the intersections of Puma Street and 'Street H' with Alpine Drive are deficient in pedestrian safety. The Street H intersection is a future intersection. Puma Street is an existing intersection that will be modified in the future. Plans shall be amended to show appropriate pedestrian crossings at these nodes, subject to approval of the City Engineer. City Staff has ordered a Technical Memorandum from the Toole Group for an objective analysis on appropriate pedestrian crossings. Staff has confidence in this team to provide proper guidance on this issue. These crossings will need to be reflected on an amended Preliminary Plat at the time of Final Plat for Phase 1. The City reserves the right in Preliminary Plat approval to require the appropriate scale pedestrian crossing, as determined by the City.

The Developer's Traffic Study recommended a trail connection from future Street H to Puma Street due to pedestrian travel patterns. Furthermore, no trails are planned to the west of future Street H. Another development is planned just to the west of this development.

The project also requires execution of the Armstrong West Arterial/Collector Infrastructure Project. The City Council has approved a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) outlining cost obligations between impacted Property Owners and the City.

The proposed street between proposed Pearson Park (quasi-public park on Outlot C) and Lake Itasca Greenway (Outlot B) shall be modified to enhance pedestrian safety by introducing reduced width and smaller on-street parking bays (often referred to as 'chokers').

A Street Light Plan must be created and submitted to the City for review. The City will work with Connexus Energy to determine the final, appropriate Street Light Plan.

Please note that there appears to be objection to the current proposal to vacate road easement for former Puma Street south of Bunker Lake Boulevard. This is an item that will need to be resolved before Final Plat approval, otherwise the Preliminary Plat will need to be modified. The City requests a Letter from Connexus Energy outlining acceptable alternatives to the transmission line in question.

*Action Item: ~~Amend the plan set to include a roundabout at the intersection of Street H and Alpine Drive OR propose an equivalent approach that improves sight line and pedestrian safety. City Staff has requested that the Developer consider a center median pedestrian safety improvement with enhanced pedestrian signalization. Amend the plans to include pedestrian crossings at Alpine Drive as indicated above.~~*

*Action Item: Amend the plan set to modify Street B as outlined above.*

*Action Item: Amend the plan set to add a trail connection along Alpine Drive from Street H to Puma Street.*

## Stormwater Pond

Based on projects with similar stormwater pond size and depth, Staff anticipates some concerns regarding safety to be raised by Planning Commission. We encourage you to be prepared to discuss stormwater safety, especially along public trails and compliance with stormwater regulations. Please refer to the Engineering Review Memo for specific regulations. The Planning Commission did raise concerns about the depth and slopes of stormwater ponds. However, the Planning Commission found the response of the Developer and City Staff appropriate to address safety and maintenance concerns.

## Development Fees

Standard Development Fees are due on the plat. The Developer has indicated a desire to obtain certain Park Dedication and Trail Development Fee Credit for the open space and trail areas. Staff's recommendation is that trail easement and trail construction for the Lake Itasca Greenway internal to the site is eligible for Park Dedication Credit. Staff recommends a partial credit for the quasi-public park (Outlot C). The final details have not been ironed out, and will be reviewed by the Parks and Recreation Commission on May 11. The City Council has noted that they would be open to additional options for parks and recreation.

Standard Development Fees are due on the plat at time of recording of the Final Plat. The fees will be collected at the rate in effect at time of recording of the plat for buildable lots.

- Park Dedication
- Trail Development
- Water Trunk/Connection
- Sanitary Sewer Trunk/Connection
- Stormwater Management

Park Dedication Credit will be provided as outlined in the Resolution approving the Preliminary Plat.

## Environmental Review

An Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) is mandatory by the State of Minnesota for this project. The City Council has authorized the draft for public comment. A Public Comment Meeting is scheduled for Thursday, May 4 at 5:30 p.m. The City Council cannot act on the Preliminary Plat until it approves the final EAW.

An Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) is mandatory for this project and has been prepared. No public comment was received during the Public Comment Period nor at an optional Public Comment Meeting held on May 4, 2017. Several regulatory agencies provided comment. Responses to said comments are included in the final draft EAW. The Planning Commission was updated on the status of the EAW and expressed no concerns moving forward.

Staff has flagged two items of interest. Please note that neither of these items would likely change Staff's recommendation that a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is not needed.

1. Noise Study
2. Traffic Study

Noise Study

The noise study completed by the Developer identified one (1) proposed lot that was experience noise levels in excess of maximum allowable decibels under State Rules. The Developer shall amend the plans to increase noise mitigation. Furthermore, almost all receptors used in the study are expected to experience noise levels in excess of maximum allowable decibels in the future. It is the City's responsibility to ensure that the Development takes reasonable measures to avoid noise level exceedances. Staff believes the current berming and landscaping are a reasonable measure. Staff does not believe a noise wall is necessary at this time.

Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) Staff has raised concern about modelling methodology used for existing noise conditions. State Rules are based on one (1) hour time periods. Noise collection was not studied for an entire hour, but modelled/extrapolated from a portion of an hour study period. The City Council has two (2) options.

1. Accept the modelling approach for existing conditions as presented.
2. Require new testing for an entire hour.

Note: regardless of concerns raised by testing methodology, Staff is not likely to recommend the construction of a full noise wall. Staff would encourage additional landscaping and appropriate species of tree amendments to maximize noise mitigation as a reasonable measure.

Action Item: Amend the Preliminary Plat to extend the berm around the impacted lot and provide landscaping or fencing that demonstrates reasonable measure to mitigate the decibel exceedances.

### Traffic Study

Generally speaking, traffic forecasts appear to be acceptable to previous planning efforts. Future planned infrastructure appears to accommodate the development and maintain acceptable levels of service. One node studied in the analysis (Alpine Drive and Highway 10) does forecasts that this node is forecasted to operate at a Level of Service 'F', the lowest possible rating. However, it is anticipated that planned improvements of the Highway 10 Access Planning Study will address this deficiency. The Alpine Drive/Highway 10 Node is an Opportunity/Development Driven priority. Approval of this development will increase the priority of this node.

### EAW Conclusion

Staff believes that all items required of the EAW have been addressed, with actions noted above. However, Staff is still working on final comments on the Traffic Study. While Staff does not believe these outstanding items should hold up the process, there are forecasts and statements that will need to be revised for accuracy, consistency, and clarity.

## Policy Document

~~During concept plan phase (unofficial review), the City prepared a Policy Document to guide discussions between Staff and Developer. This document is included as reference.~~

This document has been deleted from the Staff report, as many items are now out of date. This document is available upon request for context.

## Planning and Zoning Approval Contingencies

1. Amend the lot widths for the quad/townhomes to fifty (50) feet.
2. A pedestrian crossing at the intersection of Street H and Alpine Drive must be added to a plan set. The crossing must be designed more than just a painted cross walk and a single-light pedestrian signal. These details must be finalized prior to Preliminary Plat approval by the City Council.
3. Street B shall be modified to a more pedestrian-friendly design given the adjacent parks and recreation space. Please propose a design based on recent discussions with City Staff.
4. A Master Park Dedication and Trail Development Fee Agreement Policy Framework must be approved along with City Council approval of the Preliminary Plat. The final agreement shall be approved with the Final Plat.
5. A final determination on street width will need to be made by the Planning Commission and City Council. Plan revisions may be required based on final approvals.

You will need to submit a revised Preliminary Plat with these required revisions in addition to the Final Plat for Phase 1. This will ensure clarity in approved Preliminary Approvals for future phases, credits, etc.

## City Council Decision Points

The City Council will need to provide direction/confirmation on the following decision points.

1. Environmental Assessment Worksheet
  - a. Adequacy of Noise Study Methodology
  - b. Reasonableness of Noise Mitigation
2. Preliminary Plat
  - a. Street Widths
  - b. Pedestrian Crossings
  - c. Trail Connections

**CITY OF RAMSEY LAND USE APPLICATION  
TECHNICAL REVIEW FILE**

<b>DATE</b>	JUNE 8, 2017	<b>PROJECT ADDRESS</b>	WEST OF PUMA STREET, SOUTH OF ALPINE DRIVE
<b>PROJECT. TITLE</b>	RIVERSTONE		
<b>ESCROW #</b>	115626		
<b>DEPARTMENT:</b>	Engineering		
<b>TECHNICAL REVIEWER:</b>	Name: Leonard Linton Phone: 763 433-9834 Email: llinton@ci.ramsey.mn.us		

The Engineering Department offers the following comments regarding the Preliminary Plat Exhibits for Riverstone. The submittal consists of 16 sheets prepared by Carlson McCain dated March 8, 2017. The submittal included a document with the stormwater summary and geotechnical report. *Italicized comments were included in our previous review memo and have not been addressed.*

**General comments:**

- 1. A legend must be shown on all sheets. All symbols used on that sheet must be added to the legend for the sheet. A scale must be shown on all sheets.**
2. All sidewalks in public right-of-way must be shown as 6 feet wide and 6 inches thick.
3. Class 5 shall meet the Ramsey modified gradation. This gradation must be included in the details.
4. Plan readability – Proposed sanitary sewer lines and symbols, and watermain lines and symbols must be the most prominent items on the sewer and water sheets. Proposed storm sewer lines and symbols must be the most prominent on the storm sewer sheets. Proposed curb lines, sidewalks and pedestrian ramps must be the most prominent lines on the street sheets. All other lines on the sheet must be screened so the lines and symbols for proposed features stand out. This includes the symbols in the legends which must match the plan view in size, pattern, weight, and color.
- 5. Underlying lines must be broken where they are under text boxes to enhance readability. Underlying text must be moved so there is not text on text.**
6. Move the typical street section to one of the Street/ Storm Sheets.
7. Add match lines and continuation notes to all sheets where part of the street is shown on a different page. Station numbers must be darker in plan view. Lines must be broken under the match lines.
8. Each pedestrian ramp requires a specific detail with walk/ trail width, ramp slope, landing pad slope, spot elevations and number of truncated domes.

9. Final plat documents must have plan and profiles for streets, sanitary sewer, storm sewer and watermain. Plan view must be shown for all pipes extending outside of the right-of-way.

**Sheet Specific Comments:**

**Sheet 4:**

1. *A drainage and utility easement must be dedicated along Puma Street for the future Lift Station. See additional comments on utility plan.*

**Sheet 8:**

1. *The future lift station must be placed in a drainage and utility easement outside of the public right-of-way. The lift station must have a driveway access from Puma Street.*
2. *Rim and invert elevations are required on the proposed sanitary sewer in Puma Street. The responsibility for construction of this line and the lift station has not been determined; however, design information must be shown on this plan to ensure that the proposed line will function properly.*
3. Sanitary sewer north of the lift station can be 8", not 18" diameter pipe.

**Sheets 10-13:**

1. The grading plan must be revised to achieve the following separation distances per the Lower Rum River Watershed Management Organization rules (LRRWMO).

*The lowest floor elevation of all development, including basements, must be at least 3 feet above the highest anticipated ground water table, 2 feet above the designated or designed 100-year flood elevation, or 1 foot above the emergency overflow, whichever is higher.*

*This requirement may be waived if evidence that a lesser separation can be achieved is:*

- *submitted and certified by a geotechnical engineer*
- *reviewed and approved by the city engineer or other party designated by the city engineer, and*
- *approved by the LRRWMO.*

*If this process is pursued, the developer should consult with the LRRWMO Engineer before beginning the study to discuss acceptable methodologies.*

Information on the process was provided to the applicant. A table must be included on the final grading plan listing the garage elevation, lowest floor elevation, controlling elevation (groundwater or emergency overflow determined from the provided process documentation), and method used.

**Stormwater Management Plan:**

1. The proposed conditions section states 27.3 acres of new impervious will be created. The next paragraph states 35 acres of new impervious will be created. The locations of these areas must be identified in plan view.
2. The applicant has provided documentation from the Minnesota Department of Health and the Minnesota Pollution Control agency stating
3. Soil borings are required in the area of the infiltration practices to verify the soils are suitable for infiltration.
4. Water cannot be directly discharged to the wetland. It must be treated as noted above.
5. Detailed procedures for constructing the infiltration basins and bringing them online will be required in the final plans.
6. The narrative indicates 0.04 acres of wetlands will be lost. Wetland sequencing must be provided to document this loss. If this area is larger than the de-minimus then mitigation must be provided.
7. ***The table on page 4 lists Highway 10 as a discharge point. Drainage from this area does not reach Highway 10. The railroad tracks block flow to the south.***

**Geotechnical Report:**

1. The logs indicate loose to very loose sands at depth in each boring. The report must be revised to indicate how these loose to very loose sands should be addressed under the future pavements. The City must maintain the roads and requires that the subgrade be as uniform as possible to prevent differential settlement of the pavements.

**CITY OF RAMSEY LAND USE APPLICATION**  
**TECHNICAL REVIEW FILE**

<b>DATE</b>	APRIL 14, 2017	<b>PROJECT ADDRESS</b>	TBD
<b>PROJECT. TITLE</b>	RIVERSTONE ADDITION		
<b>ESCROW #</b>	115626		
<b>DEPARTMENT:</b>	Community Development: Planning Division (Landscape Plan & Environmental Resources)		
<b>TECHNICAL REVIEWER:</b>	Name: Chris Anderson, City Planner Phone: 763-433-9817 Email: <a href="mailto:canderson@cityoframsey.com">canderson@cityoframsey.com</a>		

We offer the following comments regarding the Landscape Plan, prepared by Carlson McCain and dated March 8, 2017:

The City’s Natural Resources Inventory (NRI) does not identify any natural areas over the roughly ninety (90) acres other than a small segment of an altered/non-native plant community. Furthermore, there is essentially no tree cover on the property other than a small portion in the northwest corner, which will be developed in a later phase of the overall project. Generally speaking, this project would convert agricultural cropland into residential homes and townhomes.



The project is being proposed as a Planned Unit Development (PUD) and includes smaller lot single family homes and townhomes. Traditionally, single family residential lots require two (2) trees per lot. While not every lot has two (2) trees, overall, the project is proposed landscaping in excess of that required by City Code. However, there appears to be a discrepancy in terms of the total number of trees proposed. Sheet L5 notes that 1,003 trees will be planted; however, when adding up quantities in the Overall Landscape Schedule, that totals 758 trees. This needs to be clarified.

The Landscape Plan does include plantings along a berm separating the homes from the railroad tracks, along some of the trails, and within a proposed small, neighborhood park. The Landscape Plan also is providing boulevard trees along all public streets, including Puma St, which is along the rear yard of many lots.

While not shown on the plans, City Staff and the Developer spoke about how the berm would be landscaped with ground cover. Staff has suggested that the berm be finished with a native seed mixture that is pollinator friendly and, in the long term, would require less intensive maintenance than if traditional turf grass were established. The Developer was open to this suggestion.

As proposed, the project includes landscaped medians. While Staff believes that this adds overall value to the project and enhances the streetscape, it will be critical to have Home Owners Association documents clearly specifying maintenance responsibilities. These documents will need to be reviewed and approved by the City.

Note that the proposed landscaping for the berm, along the trails and neighborhood park, as well as in some of the outlots (and even possibly some of the boulevard plantings) will need to be installed as a Stage I Improvement as they are not directly adjacent to a lot. Furthermore, these trees will be subject to a Maintenance Guarantee to ensure their survival for two (2) years after acceptance by the City.

It is anticipated that this overall subdivision will be phased in over a number of years. A greater review of landscaping for the subsequent additions will be conducted when those additions come forward. Similarly, the only tree cover existing is in the northwest corner of the site. At this time, a Tree Inventory is not critical but will need to be provided eventually. Finally, a phasing plan for the development as a whole, along with the landscaping, should be prepared so that there is no misunderstanding as to what landscaping is being installed with each addition of the project.

The Landscaping Plan is generally acceptable with the following required revisions:

### **Required Sheet Revisions**

#### **Sheet L1**

- Suggested Plant List needs to be updated with species names.
- Identify proposed vegetation (ground cover) for the berm.
- Add note that no trees shall be planted within the Vision Clearance Triangle as defined in City Code Section 117-348 (g).
- Update label of US Highway NO. 10 & 169 (references 69).

#### **Sheet L2**

- Add note/label identifying all trees in center islands/medians and in outlots are to be privately maintained.
- Add note that no trees shall be planted within the Vision Clearance Triangle as defined in City Code Section 117-348 (g).

#### **Sheet L3**

- Add note/label identifying all trees in center islands/medians and in outlots are to be privately maintained.
- Add note that no trees shall be planted within the Vision Clearance Triangle as defined in City Code Section 117-348 (g).

#### **Sheet L4**

- Add note/label identifying all trees in center islands/medians and in outlots are to be privately maintained.
- Add note that no trees shall be planted within the Vision Clearance Triangle as defined in City Code Section 117-348 (g).

#### **Sheet L5**

- Add note/label identifying all trees in center islands/medians and in outlots are to be privately maintained.
- Add note that no trees shall be planted within the Vision Clearance Triangle as defined in City Code Section 117-348 (g).
- Revise Planting Detail to specify that the first set of primary roots shall be at finished grade and to only prune out dead/broken branches at time of planting.
- Topsoil meeting the City's specification shall be required for each lot. Copies of the load tickets shall be provided to the City. A topsoil inspection shall be requested and completed prior to installation of sod.
- No topsoil (or other fill) shall be placed within any wetland or wetland setback area.
- Reconcile the number of trees to be planted with the quantities shown in the Overall Planting Schedule.
- Advisory comment: irrigation system should include some sort of water efficient technology (e.g. soil moisture sensors, ET sensors, smart controller, etc.).