City Engineer Comments and Heritage Responses on Creekside Estates
January 17, 2024

Craigs comments on Draft 2 after the last Administrative Land Use Authority meeting held on December 19, 2023.

Tami's (Heritage) comments addressing Craig's concerns shown on Draft 3, which will be the concept discussed with the Planning Commission on January 23.

1. The developer has incorporated a look to the lots at the north end as discussed. I think this helps with plowing, but there are still two short hammer-head dead ends on the street that present plowing challenges. I understand why the developer has shown the street loop this way, they are providing frontage to lots 4 and 9. At question, will the City allow this or will the City require no hammerhead/dead end street section? Options would be to leave as-is with challenges for snow removal that certainly take additional time to plow, take out the hammerhead and provide a wider radius on the outside of the loop. With this configuration you would either loose the two lots in the corner due to not adequate frontage, or provide a frontage waiver for the lots.

1. Heritage would prefer to keep the hammerhead turnarounds as I believe it will make plowing easier; however, if city code is provided that states we cannot do so, I will gladly change the design.

2. The townhouses do not have the 20 ft setback from the alley for a driveway/parking area at each townhouse. The intent of the PUD ordinance is clear with respect to this. The developer is saying there is no lot line at the alley for a setback. The lot is the actual zero lot-line of the townhouse. In my opinion, the intent is clear in the ordinance, but wording may be able to be interpreted differently with respect to technicalities. City can require the 20 ft setback for driveway outside of garages at townhouses as per the intent of the ordinance or may exempt this. If an exemption is given, absolutely more parking is required, which will take away open space. Requiring the 20 ft setback per the ordinance will reduce the number of lots in the development, it is important to note that the City does not guarantee any number of lots – the ordinance has a maximum density, but does not state that a developer is entitled to get that density, etc.

2. To us, the code is evident in the opposite of how you are interpreting the code. A setback is defined as being the distance to a property line, not to an alley. This is clearly stated in the code. As this is an item of code, I am glad to have our lawyer amicably talk with the city lawyer about the interpretation of the code. As for the parking, per Table 10-14-1-1 in River Heights City Code, 0.25 guest parking spaces are required per unit; our 12 spaces currently provided on the concept surpass this requirement.

3. Last meeting a dumpster location was discussed for the townhouses. I do not see this called out on the plan, but a white rectangle at the end of one of the alleys is shown. I wonder if this is the dumpster location? If so, it is not very centrally placed for all the townhouses and would be difficult to access for pickup.

3. The dumpster is now called out. The alley is less than 150' long and, therefore, meets the code for the garbage truck.

4. Improvements to the easterly side of the single family lot loop have been made. However there is still a bulb-type street extension at lots 34, 35, and 36 that creates real snow plowing challenges. Options include leaving as is with the problems for snow plowing, leaving the property lines as is and constructing the street to a standard pavement width around the corner (taking out the bulb) and having a wider planter strip. This option cleans up the street for snow plowing and maintains frontage requirements for these three lots. It does reduce on-street parking for these lots. Another option would be to waive frontage requirements and build the standard street section with standard 3 ft park strip.

4. We need the bulb, as discussed in the last concept meeting. We will ensure that there is a snow easement to shove snow for the bulb to help ease the city's concerns.

5. The plan has not been revised to show the water line loop through the school property to 600 South Street. Looping to the north is much better for water circulation for quality and quantity and provides much better redundancy for the water system in the development. Clayten has had preliminary conversation with the District and this appears to be moving forward with the District. This will either require the line to job around lot 30 or will require adjustment of parcel lines so the pipe can come straight down along the school property line without a jog in the waterline (preferred).

5. I will show the water line on the school's property once the school has approved the connection. I request the school district provide River Heights City and Heritage with an approval letter. As I progress with each phase, we can design to each phase's requirements before construction begins.

6. Stormwater coming through the school property has not been satisfactorily addressed. There are two items associated with this. Overland flow from the school, plans call out a swale along the northerly side of the development at the back side of lots adjoining the school. This does not address the situation – what happens to water in a swale, and property owners are not good at maintaining a swale on their lot. Second item is the large storm drain that comes through the school property. A note was added to the plan that states this may be handled on the Vineyard development and asks the City Public Works to verify. Clayten and I will review, but I expect that Heritage will need to address this stormwater conveyance.

6. The stormwater will be handled by a swale as called out in the plans; the swale will direct water to the road, to then be collected by the storm system; this will be shown in the construction drawings.

7. A pathway was added between lots 35 and 36 as required by city ordinance. My recommendation is that the side fences along the path and rear fences along lots 35 and 36 be limited to 4 ft so the path does not feel like walking along a cattle chute. This impacts privacy on these two lots, but would certainly make for a better feel for anyone using the path.

7. Thank you. I will consider this advice and discuss it with my team and engineer.

8. Plan does not show a playground area for the townhouses.

8. The playground is now shown. I'm following up with this email with the playground idea I wanted to present. Can the city let me know if they plan to take over the Park and open space?

9. There are many questions not answered or discussed yet about open space use, general amenities, and whether or not the HOA or the City will manage the open space. In my opinion, I don't see a significant benefit for the City to manage the open space. However, I do recommend that the City require that the trail/pathway through the development and paralleling Spring Creek be open to the public because a public trail along Spring Creek is on the City Master Trail Plan.