

Development Review Team Memo

FROM: Kelly Douglas, Senior Planner

DATE: 06/29/2023

RE: PL20220662 The Astrid Development Plan – Submittal #2

General

1. The Ski Inn Condominiums parking lot needs to show snow storage and replacement of existing landscaping.

Section 210 RR-2 Zone District

2. It is unclear whether all elevations of building 1 meet the RR-2 75' overall height maximum. Retaining walls 10A-C also appear to be part of the building. The proposed grade is shown (thank you) however, measurements are not taken from it on all elevations. Example below for reference. Please clarify.



2 BUILDING 1 - WEST ELEVATION
DP-3.1 1/16" = 1'-0"

Section 402 Landscaping

3. Landscaping is needed to buffer the Ski Inn Condominiums parking lot.
4. Please add landscaping on the south and east sides of Building 5 and 6.

Section 413 Phasing

5. Phase I should include the stairs connection from building 7 down to Gondola Ln per 413.C.3.b.

6. 413.C.2.c requires perimeter landscaping be included with phase 1. Please show the plantings to be included with phase 1. Please also show which specific plantings are to be included with each subsequent phase.
7. Per 413.C.3.d, the pool amenity space needs to be included with phase I.

Section 418 Retaining Walls

8. Thank you for the updated justification, model and renderings provided. They are all very helpful. However, Staff has outstanding concerns and questions that need resolution before a recommendation can be made:
 - a. Please elaborate on the acceptable alternative justification provided. How are walls that exceed 6' in setback areas and exceed 11' within the building envelope equal to or better than walls that meet the standard i.e. are 6' in setback areas and 11' within the building envelope? Also, all walls may not have the same justification to support a Major Variance.
 - b. In order to fully understand the proposal, it's important to know what type of wall is proposed and how it will look. Please provide additional information.
 - c. It is evident that the height and ability to step some walls per 418.C.3 is related to access, however other walls, particularly those that abut pedestrian connections, appear very large. For example, wall 11 is 19' tall, abuts a 6' wide sidewalk, and is 10'-11' from building 2-3. This creates a narrow, somewhat confined feeling space for an important pedestrian connection between buildings 2-3 and 7, and the Base Area. It seems the height of some walls, such as wall 11, could potentially be minimized with stepped vertical segments. Please adjust the design, or help staff better understand why there are walls that appear they can be stepped or otherwise minimized yet are not proposed to be, as well as the assessed impacts that are being minimized or mitigated with the design proposed.

Section 440 Base Area Design Standards

440.E Building Massing

9. The response to standard 440.E.1.b emphasizes compatibility with adjacent developments. 440.E.1.b does not recognize a development's compatibility with neighbors, but rather requires structures to be massed to complement the topography by placing the greatest height and mass at the base of a slope and reducing height and mass higher on the slope. Building 1, the largest mass, is proposed high on the slope. It appears a Major Variance request is needed.
10. Standard 440.E.1.c and 440.E.1.d re: step backs do not appear to be met. Please demonstrate compliance for all buildings with walls that exceed three stories or 45', adjust the proposal, or request a Major Variance.

440.K Mechanical, Service, and Accessory Structures

11. Thank you for the response, and the appurtenance calculations for building 1. Staff understands there will be rooftop equipment and that it will be screened. Please show appurtenances, equipment, and screening.