



October 5, 2020

Sara Roediger, AICP Planning and Economic Development Director
Kristen Kapelanski, AICP Planning Manager

RE: Cambridge Knoll – Landscape
City File: # 19-033 Section: # 14

Dear Sara and Kristen

Our office has done a thorough AutoCAD analysis to verify the landscape material. As I suspected during our planning commission meeting, the discrepancy that commissioner Hooper was referring to was that the proposed plant quantities on the material list did not match up with the required concept plan numbers. The reason the number did not match was that the existing trees preserved along the property lines were counted toward the required tree buffers so that the required number of trees did not equal the proposed number to be planted. We have added a data chart of the required trees, proposed and existing trees (which add toward the required total), along with replacement tree credit calculations on sheet LA-1.0.

We found a minor discrepancy of two preserved trees counted as deciduous which should have been marked as evergreen. This occurred on the west property boundary and has been corrected in the tables on sheets LA-1.0 and LA-1.1. An existing tree symbol with the letter E in the center has been added to differentiate evergreen from deciduous trees.

We conducted a field site and photographed the rear yards of the adjoining property. We then revised the landscape plans and modified the plants to increase screening where the adjacent properties have none or limited plantings in their own backyards.

To address the other condition from the planning commission, we have substituted four - 3" caliper required buffer deciduous trees on the east side to four - 10' high evergreen trees. The spacing of evergreens on our first submittal were 15 feet on center – a recommendation by the forestry department. We have moved these closer together, 12 feet on center spacing, to provide an additional screening as well as providing room for the trees to grow properly. The property owner of the home adjacent to Arsenal Court stated that he would be constructing a fence in the rear yard.

Along the north property line, we have proposed to plant replacement credit trees. In this area proposed are seventeen - 8' ht. evergreen trees and six - 2" caliber shade trees. To the south we are proposing ten - 8' tall evergreens on 180 E Avon property if the neighbor agrees.

The total replacement tree credit is 45 trees, with the balance of 10 tree credits x \$216.75 with \$2,167.50 be paid into the City's Tree Fund.

The last item that needed to be addressed was for Jim to contact the adjacent neighbors to the south again. Two of the neighbors to the south are fine with the development as it is. The property at 180 East Avon was contacted several times. We have prepared several alternate plans trying to satisfy this homeowner. Each time the proposal has been rejected and additional demands have been made.

We had designed the first berm concept 3' from the existing right-of-way as directed. The neighbor rejected this, stating she wants the same berm as the neighbors to her west. Her neighbor's berms are located within the existing right-of-way. These berms most likely were constructed without permission.



Engineering would not permit this along Avon Road. Any future work within the right-of-way is under the Oakland Road Commission and the City Engineering department.

We received a communication which indicated that engineering may permit a 4' encroachment within the watermain easement. The graphic which was attached in an email indicated a watermain with a 20' easement that is within the existing right-of-way. We prepared a berm located out of the future right-of-way closer to the property owners' home. The difficulty with this is the grade of the berm would only be possibly two feet on the north side and it would have to slope three feet to meet existing grades near the home.

Before proceeding with this plan, we contacted Paul to discuss the issues of a berm, watermain, and the future right-of-way. The watermain is a 16-inch transmission line. Engineering does not want a berm located within the easement nor plantings. Our opinion is that a berm could cause a drainage issue to the homeowner. Paul is not in favor of any type of berm on this property. We strongly advised our client against this option because of the high probability of continued issues with this homeowner.

We are proposing ten giant arborvitaes 8' high to plant in a staggered double row with five foot spacing. These arborvitaes are fast growers and will grow between three to five feet in height per season if properly cared for. Attached is the data sheet provided by the grower for reference. This will be beneficial in screening the headlights from our development, along with her existing hedgerow and deciduous tree. Per our discussions with engineering, the plantings will be three feet from the future half sixty-foot right-of-way.

If you have any questions, please give me a call.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely

NÚÑEZDESIGN, Inc

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R. Núñez', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Ralph L. Núñez, PLA, CLARB, ASLA
President
Landscape Architect | Urban Designer