

150 & Ward PDP Application Comment Response Letter

March 11th, 2025

RE: 150 & Ward PDP Application
PL2024319

Dear Mr. Scott Ready,

Below are the responses to the comments previously provided by city staff on 2/18/2025 regarding the Preliminary Development Plan Application PL2024319 re-submitted on 2/10/2025. Application has been previously sent:

CITY PLANNING REVIEW

1. The modification request letter should encompass all modifications even if included on other plans (elevator requirement, 20% of all walls facing public streets containing windows and doors, and any others you may be requesting).
 - a. **Acknowledged. An updated modification request letter has been attached with this submittal.**
2. As mentioned in the applicant call, the balconies would be considered to count towards the off-set requirement of 4-ft if covered. Therefore, every 100-ft. there needs to be a 4-ft. off-set. Currently the span between covered balconies is about 142-ft.
 - a. **A roof was added to several balcony locations to qualify towards this requirement**
3. Update the landscaping plan to include the evergreens along the street frontages.
 - a. **Acknowledged. Coniferous trees added to site perimeter landscape buffer.**
4. On Building C, there is a span of about 98-ft. on the rear elevation where there is no variation in the roof height. The front elevation appears to be different and there should not be difference between front vs. rear.
 - a. **Rear elevation has been modified, the front and rear elevations are not exactly the same**
5. With the modifications being requested, staff encourages enhancing the landscaping to go above and beyond. There is a large amount of area within the internal courtyard being created that seems pretty bare.
 - a. **Acknowledged. Please see Amenity Space Enlargement plan for preliminary courtyard design.**
6. Although not required, it could be extremely helpful when presenting this project if you included some 3D renderings and even some images of what that would look like with the surrounding area (providing some context).
 - a. **A perspective for each building has been added to set.**
7. Are sidewalks within the courtyard proposed to be 5-ft. wide? If so, could you add a dimension please since we have varying widths throughout.
 - a. **Sidewalks within the courtyard are proposed to be 5-ft wide. Refer to Sheet**

C200.

8. On the front elevation of Building C, the third balcony from the left, the roof line does not match the others as far as the height projection. Was that just an error?
 - a. Elevations have been adjusted

CITY ENGINEERING REVIEW

1. The Summary and Recommendations section of the stormwater report should be expanded to discuss the existing downstream infrastructure such as the box culverts beneath M-150 and Ward Rd., as well as the dam immediately upstream of Raintree Lake, are suitable for the stormwater flows generated by the project. Correction required.
 - a. The Summary and Recommendations section has been revised to include more analysis of the existing downstream infrastructure, including box culverts and the dam immediately upstream of Raintree Lake.
2. The stormwater report spends most of the time accounting for past allowances for stormwater flow from the site. While this is a good exercise to demonstrate the logic, a pre-versus-post development analysis is required to show the increase in peak flows at critical point 1 from existing (i.e., today) conditions. Correction required.
 - a. A pre-versus-post analysis has been included in the report in the Peak Comparison section. Please note, this refers only to today's drainage conditions. Increase in flows were mitigated by previous improvements.
3. The peak flow analysis described above should be expanded to show if the 100 year water surface elevation in the vicinity of the concrete spillway is increased to a point where it encroaches upon adjacent property to the southwest or southeast. This concern is caused by the increase in the 100 year WSE due to increased peak flows for the existing versus proposed condition. Correction required.
 - a. Refer to exhibits 10 and 11 for information regarding the existing dam and adjacent properties.
4. Is a 6-inch fire line sufficient? Evaluation and correction required.
 - a. Refer to response to Fire Review Comment 2.
5. Is a single 2-inch master meter sufficient for this project? There is doubt this is large enough to serve all the buildings in this project. Evaluation and correction required.
 - a. The private water main and master meter have been revised from 2" to 3". Refer to Sheet C300.
6. United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) jurisdiction shall be confirmed prior to formal approval. Informational comment.
 - a. Acknowledged.

CITY FIRE REVIEW

1. All issues pertaining to life safety and property protection from the hazards of fire, explosion or dangerous conditions in new and existing buildings, structures and premises, and to the safety to fire fighters and emergency responders during emergency operations, shall be in accordance with the 2018 International Fire Code.
 - a. Acknowledged. Refer to Fire Code Note on Sheet C000.
2. IFC 507.1 - An approved water supply capable of supplying the required fire flow for fire protection shall be provided to premises upon which facilities, buildings or portions of buildings are hereafter constructed or moved into or within the jurisdiction. Work with Water Utilities to provide a water model to confirm the required fire flow of Table

B105.1(1) is being met for the type of construction and building size. Per amendment only a 50% reduction of fire flow is allowed for buildings equipped with an automatic sprinkler system.

- a. Upon emails with city staff, it is understood that we will be providing a fire suppression system that will meet the fire code requirements in the final plans. Work is ongoing to model the size of the fire lines. This information will be provided to the City if required.
3. IFC 507.5.1 - Where a portion of the facility or building hereafter constructed or moved into or within the jurisdiction is more than 300 feet from a hydrant on a fire apparatus access road, as measured by an approved route around the exterior of the facility or building, on-site fire hydrants and mains shall be provided where required by the fire code official. Provide a hydrant for Building 1 to meet the 300' foot requirement and the 100' requirement for the FDC.
 - a. This requirement has been satisfied. Refer to Sheet C300.
4. IFC 903.3.7 - Fire department connections. The location of fire department connections shall be approved by the fire code official. Connections shall be a 4 inch Storz type fitting and located within 100 feet of a fire hydrant, or as approved by the code official. Show the location of the FDC on all buildings. Not shown on resubmittal.
 - a. The hydrant layout has been revised. Refer to Sheet C300.
5. IFC 503.3 - Where required by the fire code official, approved signs or other approved notices or markings that include the words NO PARKING—FIRE LANE shall be provided for fire apparatus access roads to identify such roads or prohibit the obstruction thereof. The means by which fire lanes are designated shall be maintained in a clean and legible condition at all times and be replaced or repaired when necessary to provide adequate visibility.
 - a. Fire lane curb paint markings have been added. Refer to Sheet C200.

CITY TRAFFIC REVIEW

1. Staff will need an updated Developer's Agreement that states that a new Traffic Study will be required with each new phase and a signal warrant will be evaluated at that time. Once the signal is warrants are met, the developer will be required to construct the signal and all required improvements, i.e. turn lanes, pedestrian facilities, etc., at that time.
 - a. Acknowledged. Milhaus Development is currently working with Christie Development to draft a new Developer's Agreement to satisfy the city's requirements.

Sincerely,

Patrick J. Joyce, P.E.
Sr. Project Manager | Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.