

Response to Comments Sent by Westfield Planning Staff on June 2, 2012

June 11, 2012

Page 1, Comment 1	Response
Please change this to "All zoning ordinances..."	Change made as requested.
Page 1, Comment 2	Response
Please change to "zoning ordinance"	Change made as requested.
Page 2, No Comments	
Page 3, No Comments	
Page 4, No Comments	
Page 5, No Comments	
Page 6, No Comments	
Page 7, Comment 1	Response
GENERAL COMMENT -- It has been suggested that the proposal is not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan (specifically mentioned are 1) locating commercial at Ditch/146th Street is not consistent, and 2) the proposed density of the project is not consistent).	<p>The Comprehensive Plan served as the basis for the design of Harmony. Harmony is, in fact, extremely consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. We analyzed how Harmony compared to the 91 development policies of the Comprehensive Plan. Harmony fully meets 81% of the policies and partially meets another 10% of the policies. The remaining policies were not applicable to the Harmony proposal.</p> <p>Regarding the two items specifically mentioned in the comments, it is important to remember that the Comprehensive Plan is the combination of the text and maps. While the Land Use Concept Map does not show a neighborhood commercial node at the corner of 146th Street and Ditch Road, this location and the design of Harmony very strongly align with the Local Commercial Development Policies in the plan. The policies capture the principles for the location and design of neighborhood commercial areas. The policies are as relevant today as the day the Comprehensive Plan was adopted. The same cannot be said for the Land Use Concept Map. At the time the plan was created, the County's plans for the expansion of 146th Street were unknown. As such, the City took a conservative approach regarding the 146th Street corridor. In the years since the plan's adoption, the County has determined to make 146th Street a limited access highway eight lanes wide from Ditch Road to the Boone County line. A roadway of this magnitude carrying as many cars as SR 32 was never anticipated.</p> <p>Now as the County prepares to begin construction on the first phase of the 146th Street improvements, the implications of such a roadway on the abutting properties needs to be considered. Single family residential uses do not want to abut such a road,</p>

	<p>especially at major intersections where turning movements happen. As the Comprehensive Plan policies encourage, and good planning principles dictate, more intense land uses should be located against such high capacity roads and transition down to less intensive uses. This is what Harmony achieves by placing the commercial area at the corner and transitioning to multifamily residential to the west. This is why the Comprehensive Plan includes attached dwellings as an appropriate land use in the New Suburban district.</p>
Page 7, Comment 2	Response
<p>GENERAL COMMENT -- The proposed concept plan does not indicate opportunities for inter-connectivity with adjacent properties to the west. Please explain.</p>	<p>Connections to the west are fostered in several locations. First, a frontage road on the north side of 146th Street allows users to travel from Ditch Road to the west without entering 146th Street. Second, 151st Street is reconstructed to align with Bridgeport Drive removing a dangerous set of intersections and improving westbound circulation. Finally, a street stub has been added to the west at a location midway between 151st Street and 156th Street to foster connectivity with future development to the west.</p>
Page 7, Comment 3	Response
<p>GENERAL COMMENT -- It has been suggested that only a minimal effort by the petitioner has been made in notifying/informing the public of this project.</p>	<p>Harmony is being compared to the previously proposed Symphony project in this aspect. Symphony was a complex project five and a half times larger than Harmony with many moving pieces and requesting significant public improvements. Harmony is not a complicated project. It is two-thirds the size of Centennial, both in area and the number of homes proposed. It contains neighborhood commercial and attached residential uses similar to Centennial. In Centennial, the neighborhood commercial area has not been successful because it is undersized and located on the interior of the site. Harmony seeks to provide the neighborhood commercial anticipated in the area, but place it in a location where it is a viable use and transitions to the residential uses in the manner specified in the Comprehensive Plan. Because of Harmony's simplicity and its location where the Comprehensive Plan encourages future growth there is not the need for community dialog as extensive as required for the Symphony project.</p> <p>Notification has exceeded the legal requirements. There was a well attended neighborhood meeting, the Centennial HOA has sent information to all its residents about the project, there have been numerous individual meetings with residents regarding the project, Harmony was a cover story of Current in Westfield, legal notice was printed in the newspaper, notice to interested parties has been sent, and signs about the petition have been placed in the three most prominent locations on the site.</p>

<p>Page 7, Comment 4</p> <p>GENERAL COMMENT -- It has been suggested that the overall viability of the project is questionable at this time -- especially given that there are a number of pre-approved residential lots in Westfield that are not yet platted/developed.</p>	<p>Response</p> <p>There is ample evidence around the country and particularly in Hamilton County that we are in the early stages of a housing recovery. While it is expected that the recovery will be incremental and that it will be some time before we return to peak transaction levels, there is substantial evidence that the recovery will be quite strong. First of all, the inventory of new housing available for sale, is at historically low levels, as is vacant developed lot inventory, particularly in highly desirable locations. While there is ample supply of land zoned for development in most markets, much of it is not in the most desirable locations and is unable to attract the capital necessary for development. Meanwhile, population has continued to grow at demographically predicted rates during the recession, while household formation has been depressed by economic conditions. As the economy improves and job growth increases, household formation will return to long term trend lines and demand for housing will return to historical levels. Harmony is expected to capture its share of growing demand for upscale homes as the market improves. In this regard, it will be all alone in the market place, as virtually all activity has focused on commodity product.</p> <p>On the other hand, current market conditions support the near term development of the mixed use district. Several large users have already expressed interest in retail positions and a local apartment developer currently active in Westfield has expressed interest in the apartment site following completion of a current project.</p>
<p>Page 7, Comment 5</p> <p>GENERAL COMMENT -- It has been suggested that language be added to the PUD Ordinance requiring the installation of the 8' asphalt pathways along Ditch Road and 156th Street</p>	<p>Response</p> <p>The design of Harmony seeks to comply with the standards of the City's Zoning Ordinance first and foremost. Only those items where we are differing from the Zoning Ordinance are included in the Harmony PUD ordinance. It is our understanding that multi-use pathways are already required in the City's development ordinances and are therefore not restated in the Harmony PUD ordinance.</p>
<p>Page 8, Comment 1</p> <p>Define.</p>	<p>Response</p> <p>The phrasing of the standard has been clarified using existing Zoning Ordinance language so it is not necessary to define a new term.</p>
<p>Page 8, Comment 2</p> <p>What makes a "suitable planting buffer"? Please provide detail, or remove the word "suitable".</p>	<p>Response</p> <p>This standard refers to the Zoning Ordinance requirements and the additional requirements of Article 5. The word "suitable" has been removed as requested.</p>
<p>Page 8, Comment 3</p> <p>Please add either the phrase "a minimum of" or "at least" in front of "five".</p>	<p>Response</p> <p>The phrase "a minimum of" was added to the text.</p>

Page 8, Comment 4	Response
Is it the intent to allow chain-link without slats in the Mixed-Use District?	The wording has been clarified to achieve our intent to fully ban chain link fencing.
Page 8, Comment 5	Response
Are there ventilation (or other) requirements that can be established for restaurants that would help mitigate their smells?	Odor standards from the industrial district standards of the Zoning Ordinance have been added to Section 2.3(A)(4) to address this concern.
Page 8, Comment 6	Response
It has been suggested that "Restaurants with drive-through facilities" be added to the Mixed Use area on north side of 146th Street (2.2.A).	As proposed, the neighborhood commercial area north of 146 th Street does not allow restaurants with drive-through facilities because we are seeking a more pedestrian-oriented environment. If desired by the City we are willing to allow such uses, but would want to limit them to a maximum of two of the outlots so as to not harm the pedestrian friendliness of the center. Please provide further direction.
Page 8, Comment 7	Response
It has been suggested that this "island" needs enhanced buffering.	Enhanced buffering has been added to Section 5.4.
Page 9, Comment 1	Response
Please add "the City of Westfield's" in front of "State Highway 32..."	The requested change has been made.
Page 9, Comment 2	Response
Is outside display allowed? If so, are there any standards governing that activity?	Per the Zoning Ordinance, no. We are not seeking to deviate from this standard.
Page 9, Comment 3	Response
It has been suggested to add language which would limit the maximum 70,000 square-foot individual business space to only one business in the entire development.	The requested change has been made.
Page 9, Comment 4	Response
QUESTION -- How does the developer see the 170,000 square feet of commercial space being allocated/divided up?	Language was added to the PUD identifying the different types of uses and the maximum area of each use. The center will be the most successful if it can grow organically within the limits set.
Page 9, Comment 5	Response
Please clarify the intent/purpose of this standard. It has been suggested that it may not be necessary.	The language has been clarified. The standard addresses the use of private roads.
Page 9, Comment 6	Response
Is "Minimum Setback Lines" the same as "Building Setback Area" in Section 2.1, A above? If not, what is the difference?	Corrected by the change in Section 2.1(A).

Page 9, Comment 7	Response
Add requirements for amenities within the Multi-Family area.	These have been added in Section 2.4(O). The standards are based upon the Union Street Flats PUD, but with more description about the amenities.
Page 9, Comment 8	Response
It has been suggested that the proposed multi-family standards are too intense and too dense for this area of the community, and that they are more than 2x the City's standards in some cases (specifically, the Max Units per Structure; the Max Dwelling Units; and the Max Number of Units). What is the City getting in return for giving more density/intensity?	The multifamily project is intended to be developed to a high level of quality consistent with the standards applied to commercial development within the Mixed Use District. Specifically, the standards to be applied are intended to conform with those already used in conjunction with the Union Streets Flats PUD previously approved by the City. The overall density of the proposed development is considered appropriate for its location along an improved 146th Street and within the Harmony Mixed Use District. The proposed development standards will ensure that the project blends harmoniously within Harmony and the neighborhood as a whole.
Page 9, Comment 9	Response
What is the "green space" area? Define. Is there an open space requirement in the multi-family area? It has been suggested that there should be one included in the 20% to 40% range, but listed as an acreage amount rather than a percentage.	Yes. Section 2.4(M) clarifies how much Green Belt Space will be provided within the multifamily area. An acreage amount was used as requested.
Page 9, Comment 10	Response
It has been suggested that 30 units per building is too large. There is some concern with the potential size (mass/height) of multifamily buildings.	As requested, the standards for the Union Street Flats PUD have been incorporated into the Harmony PUD ordinance.
Page 10, Comment 1	Response
It has been suggested that the minimum square footage is small. Please be prepared to discuss.	The minimum square footage matches the standard of the Zoning Ordinance. To address the concern we believe the comment is targeting we have added additional minimum square footage requirements based upon the number of bedrooms in the dwelling units.
Page 10, Comment 2	Response
Please include a setback standard from public streets. Also, are there no setback requirements from other property lines? Please explain.	The requested changes have been made.
Page 10, Comment 3	Response
Why is 50' needed? This is an increase of 15' from existing maximum on the property (35'). It is also taller than the maximum for Union Street Flats (40'). Why the need to go taller?	The standard has changed to match Union Street Flats.

Page 10, Comment 4	Response
It has been suggested that parking not be allowed on the western edge of the MultiFamily area (adjacent to agricultural land).	The City required landscape buffer is located between the undeveloped ground and the proposed parking spaces. What is proposed complies with development anticipated by the Zoning Ordinance. We do not see a need to deviate from the zoning requirements.
Page 10, Comment 5	Response
Should this standard list a specific distance instead of "viewable"?	As requested, the standard has been changed to a specific dimension.
Page 10, Comment 6	Response
It has been suggested that the Union Street Flats architectural standards be used as guide for establishing architectural requirements in the Harmony PUD Ordinance. It has also been suggested that a minimum of 3 materials be required per building.	We agree and have incorporated the Union Street Flats standards into the PUD. Consistent with the Union Street Flats standards, a minimum of two materials are required per building.
Page 10, Comment 7	Response
It has been suggested that this be increased to at least 50%.	The Union Street Flats standards did not specify a minimum percentage. We did not change the percentage out of concern that it would limit the architectural variety of the buildings.
Page 10, Comment 8	Response
Please delete the phrase, "as determined by the Developer".	The requested change has been made.
Page 10, Comment 9	Response
It has been suggested that this be decreased to 60'.	The requested change has been made.
Page 10, Comment 10	Response
Please clarify/define what constitutes an elevation being "unbroken". Bump-outs and corner breaks? If so, please clearly define all terms associated with this standard. Also, you probably don't mean "elevation". You probably mean "planes of the front elevation" (or similar).	The requested changes have been made.
Page 11, Comment 1	Response
It has been suggested that 35' max building height is excessive. The standard in the underlying zoning district is 25'. Please explain the need to increase.	The maximum building height in most of the residential districts is 35'. We think the 25' height specified in the SF-4 district will limit the architectural styles of homes that can be constructed. We believe a 30' maximum building height can allow the desired variety and have changed the PUD ordinance so.

Page 11, Comment 2	Response
Also, "accessory dwelling unit" is not really a use, but rather a structure (though it may depend on how the term is defined). The listed uses should be something like "one family residential" and "two family residential".	We added a definition of Accessory Dwelling Unit to clarify and limit what we are seeking to achieve.
Page 11, Comment 3	Response
Define "Mew alley load lot"	We added a definition of Mew Lot.
Page 11, Comment 4	Response
It has been suggested that 3,780 SF is small, especially after the setbacks are accounted for.	The Comprehensive Plan encourages a mix of lot sizes to meet a broad range of lifestyle needs in Westfield. On the smallest lots proposed in Harmony, you can still build a one story house that has a nearly 2,000 s.f. footprint. The proposed home and lot configurations are in line with the target empty nester buyers.
Page 11, Comment 5	Response
Is this ground floor only or total square footage? Please clarify.	Total square footage. This has been clarified on the table.
Page 12, Comment 1	Response
Define term. And provide standards/requirements and plan for the amenity area. What amenities will there be?	The requested changes have been made.
Page 12, Comment 2	Response
It has been suggested that pictures/elevations of all building types be added to the PUD Ordinance, and the ordinance include language that requires the buildings to be "substantially similar to" the pictures.	Our goal is to have distinctive, known architectural styles in the community. To this end, we have incorporated the design standards from "A Field Guide to American Houses" into the PUD ordinance. See Section 3.3(C) for more details.
Page 12, Comment 3	Response
It has been suggested that a minimum of 3 materials be required per building.	We want the home styles to be driven by known architectural styles. As such, we have not specified a minimum of materials out of concern that it would prohibit desired styles of architecture. See comment #2 above on how we are addressing architectural styles within Harmony.
Page 12, Comment 4	Response
It has been suggested that 3 is not a high enough minimum. 7-12 were suggested as a minimum number of arch. elements by a few reviewers. Repeated comment to make the text of the ordinance match the pictures that were shown in the presentation on May 7th.	We have limited the minimum number of elements to five out of a concern that more will not necessarily improve the architectural appearance of the houses and may, in many situations, actually make the appearance of the homes merely busy, and not attractive. See comment #2 above on how we are addressing architectural styles within Harmony.
Page 12, Comment 5	Response
Throughout entire document, please replace "facade" with "elevation".	The requested changes have been made.

Page 12, Comment 6	Response
Please clarify/define.	The requested change has been made.
Page 12, Comment 7	Response
Define "Primary Roof Pitch" and "Secondary Roof Pitch"	The requested changes have been made.
Page 12, Comment 8	Response
Please be clear when using the term "equivalent" throughout the entire document.	The requested changes have been made.
Page 12, Comment 9	Response
It has been suggested that this be increased to 50%.	We have not increased the required percentage out of concern that it would prohibit desired styles of architecture. See comment #2 above on how we are addressing architectural styles within Harmony.
Page 12, Comment 10	Response
Please clarify/define.	The language has been clarified.
Page 13, Comment 1	Response
Please clarify/define.	The requested change has been made.
Page 13, Comment 2	Response
Please clarify/define.	The requested change has been made.
Page 13, Comment 3	Response
Please clarify/define.	The requested change has been made.
Page 13, Comment 4	Response
See comments above. It has been suggested that 1 element is not enough on the sides. It has been suggested that this be increased to 5	We have increased the number of elements to 3.
Page 13, Comment 5	Response
See comments above. It has been suggested that 2 elements are not enough. It has been suggested that this increase to 7.	We have increased the number of elements to 5.
Page 13, Comment 6	Response
Please be clear when using the term "equivalent" throughout the entire document.	The phrase "or equivalent" has been removed throughout the document.
Page 13, Comment 7	Response
It has been suggested that this be increased to 48.	A 48" height would be out of proportion with architectural styles. The PUD has been changed to 30" to better match architectural styles.
Page 13, Comment 8	Response
Please clarify/define.	The requested change has been made.

Page 13, Comment 9	Response
Please clarify/define.	The requested change has been made.
Page 13, Comment 10	Response
See comments above. It has been suggested that 2 elements are not enough on the rear. It has been suggested that it be increased to 8. It has also been suggested by several that the preference is that rears of homes not face Ditch or 156th Street. If the rears do face Ditch or 156th, then they need the same level of architectural treatment as the front of the homes.	The number of elements has been increased to 3. For homes abutting Ditch Road, 5 elements are required. There are also additional landscaping requirements for homes abutting Ditch Road.
Page 14, Comment 1	Response
Please explain/clarify. Who decides?	The language has been clarified.
Page 14, Comment 2	Response
Please be clear when using the term "equivalent" throughout the entire document.	The phrase "or equivalent" has been removed throughout the document.
Page 14, Comment 3	Response
Please clarify/define.	A height of at least 24" above finish grade was set.
Page 14, Comment 4	Response
Please clarify/define.	The requested change has been made.
Page 14, Comment 5	Response
Please clarify/define.	The requested change has been made.
Page 14, Comment 6	Response
What if there is not an easement adjacent, but rather a common area or something else? Suggest re-wording this section.	If there is not an easement adjacent, but rather a common area or something else then windows would need to be provided. The lack of windows only occurs where use easements are located. The purpose of use easements is to provide a larger usable yard. In order to maintain privacy where use easements are used, the standard allows the windows to shift to one side of the building.
Page 14, Comment 7	Response
No comment	No response needed.
Page 14, Comment 8	Response
If ALL windows are required to have shutters and/or "treatment" per this requirement, then why are shutters/treatment included as options in the architectural elements lists above? Please remove from the architectural elements lists.	True. The language has been clarified and the window treatment language has been moved to the definitions section.
Page 14, Comment 9	Response
Please clarify/define.	The requested change has been made.

Page 15, Comment 1	Response
It has been suggested that this size is too small.	This is a standard stoop size. We did not change the standard out of concern that doing so would disqualify desired architectural styles.
Page 15, Comment 2	Response
Is this the same as "Primary Roof" used earlier in the document? Please clarify/define and use consistent terms throughout.	Yes. The language has been clarified.
Page 15, Comment 3	Response
Please explain/clarify. Who decides?	The phrase has been deleted to clarify the language.
Page 15, Comment 4	Response
It has been suggested that 20% is not enough open space for the density being requested.	The standard has been clarified to 34 acres of Green Belt Space. This equals 15% of the Single Family Residential District. This standard is equivalent to 25% Open Space in the Single Family Residential District. Furthermore, in Section 1.3 we commit to 69 acres of Open Space for the entire development. This equals 25% of the entire project area.
Page 15, Comment 5	Response
It has been suggested that there should be a standard requiring that the open space be "usable" and not just the the left-over spaces. It has also been suggested that this standard list an acreage amount rather than a percentage. It will be easier to administer as the project develops.	To clarify the language we use specific acreages of Green Belt Area for the Single Family Residential District.
Page 16, Comment 1	Response
Add a standard requiring variety in garage doors within a certain number of dwellings.	The garage door styles will be dictated by the home styles. The other standards in this section and in the architectural standards adequately address the garage door concerns.
Page 16, Comment 2	Response
Define.	The language has been changed to "floor plan" for clarity.
Page 16, Comment 3	Response
Define. Consider if a mirrored elevation is "different" or the "same"	A mirrored elevation would be considered the same.
Page 16, Comment 4	Response
Define. Consider brick colors as well as other material colors. If only the trim is a different color, does that constitute a different "color package"?	No. A different color package is required.

Page 17, Comment 1	Response
It has been suggested that bicycle parking should be required in the commercial and multi-family areas.	Bicycle parking standards have been added.
Page 17, Comment 2	Response
Would you classify multi-family as non-residential for the purpose of this standard?	Yes.
Page 17, Comment 3	Response
No comment	No response needed.
Page 17, Comment 4	Response
Please explain the need for this provision.	This provision provides a minimum number of parking spaces to be provided regardless of the ability for more efficient sharing. Doing so helps ensure that enough spaces are provided should the tenant mix change.
Page 17, Comment 5	Response
To clarify, it is your intent to use the City's parking space standards in addition to the two listed, correct? Are there other uses not covered by the City's list and this list that you anticipate needing space retirements for?	Yes. We did add standards for parking for multifamily uses based upon the approved Union Street Flats PUD.
Page 17, Comment 6	Response
Please explain the need to deviate from the City's 10'x20' requirement.	There are numerous reasons why 9'x18' spaces are being requested. It is the most common parking stall size across the nation because it effectively provides space for vehicles while minimizing unnecessary impervious areas and the increased stormwater runoff they create. The average size of cars is decreasing. The public has moved away from supersized SUVs so large 10'x20'spaces are no longer needed. A smaller size parking stall also helps maintain a pedestrian scale in the neighborhood commercial area. These are also some of the reasons why 9'x18' parking stalls were approved in the Union Street Flats PUD.
Page 18, Comment 1	Response
It has been suggested that ornamental grasses should not be used as a substitute for buffer yard shrubs.	We agree. This provision is to allow more suitable plant types for Low Impact Development practices than the Zoning Ordinance currently allows.
Page 18, Comment 2	Response
What are these and who decides when they are to be used?	These are addressed in a definition for Low Impact Development that was added to the PUD.

<p>Page 18, Comment 3</p> <p>It has been suggested that the buffer yard standards could be enhanced by requiring mounding and/or walls in certain buffer yards. It has been suggested that the buffer requirements against the Mixed-Use area should be enhanced.</p>	<p>Response</p> <p>We agree and provisions for such have been added.</p> <p>Additional buffer requirements for the Mixed Use District have been added in Section 5.4.</p>
<p>Page 18, Comment 4</p> <p>Is the buffer along Ditch Road intended to be a 100% screen? If not, then the rear facade of the homes need to look like the front facade. Please provide real-life examples of the proposed screening along Ditch, and tell how long it will take for the new plants to grow to maturity.</p>	<p>Response</p> <p>No. The architectural standards for homes abutting Ditch Road have been increased. Additional landscaping has also been detailed. We envision the buffer to be like that of Springmill Ponds at maturity. The time to maturity will depend upon the plant material selected.</p>
<p>Page 18, Comment 5</p> <p>Does this mean that buffer yards are not required internally to the Harmony project between different districts and/or uses? Please clarify.</p>	<p>Response</p> <p>Yes, but we are providing buffers anyway.</p>
<p>Page 18, Comment 6</p> <p>It has been suggested that a better/more defined transition and buffering occur between Harmony and adjoining agricultural property. It has been suggested that the transition element occur by either more open space in this areas or by having larger lots abutting ag land.</p> <p>It has also been suggested that a more enhanced buffer be established along 156th Street.</p> <p>It has also been suggested that the McCarthy property in the northwest area of the project needs more enhanced buffering. It has been suggested that locating a pond south and/or east of the McCarthy property (if feasible) may enhance the buffering of that property.</p> <p>Similarly, it has been suggested that locating a pond across from the Allen/Kirby properties (instead of homes/road as indicated on the concept plan) may enhance the buffering of that property.</p> <p>Does the term "perimeter" add anything to this standard? If so, please clarify what that is. If not, please delete the term.</p>	<p>Response</p> <p>The surrounding properties are shown as New Suburban in the Comprehensive Plan. While currently farmed (like the Harmony property today), the City anticipates this property will develop for residential uses. In fact, much of the surrounding property is already controlled by developers. Therefore, it is more appropriate to establish the buffer for the long-term use of the land rather than today's temporary use of the land. To this end, we believe the buffers in the Zoning Ordinance are more than sufficient to provide the desired transitions between properties.</p> <p>Regarding the McCarthy property, the Zoning Ordinance requires a 20' buffer. We are providing a 40' buffer around his property. Additionally, on the east side of the property we have placed a street with rear-load homes to space the homes even further from the property line. Given traffic patterns with rear-load homes we expect traffic volumes on this street to be low. The comment mentions the use of a pond. This does not work for several reasons. First, the hydraulics of the site do not allow it. Second, the Zoning Ordinance still requires a landscape buffer between the pond and the adjoining property owner.</p> <p>The Allen and Kirby properties are businesses with significant outdoor activity and outdoor storage. We feel a landscape buffer provides a better screen between these businesses and the homes of Harmony than a pond would.</p> <p>The word "perimeter" has been deleted as requested.</p>

Page 18, Comment 7	Response
It has been suggested that this may need to be amended to internalize the impact of Harmony on neighboring properties and apply the buffer standards in the event adjacent property contains a wooded area, gas pipeline easements, or ponds.	This provision has been deleted.
Page 18, Comment 8	Response
Please define.	The language has been clarified.
Page 19, Comment 1	Response
How does this definition work with mew lots?	The definition has been expanded to address mew lots.
Page 19, Comment 2	Response
Where is this exhibit referenced in the ordinance?	The requested change has been made.
Page 19, Comment 3	Response
This term is not used in the PUD Ordinance. Is it intended to be "Architectural Break"?	The requested change has been made.
Page 19, Comment 4	Response
Where is this exhibit referenced in the ordinance? It has been suggested that this definition include language that requires the project to build/develop in "substantial compliance" to the Illustrative Site Development Plan in Exhibit C.	The requested changes have been made.
Page 20, No Comments	
Page 21, No Comments	
Page 22, Comment 1	Response
It has been suggested that an additional round-about be considered in this location.	The future traffic volumes forecast in the traffic impact study do not warrant the construction of a roundabout at this intersection. We are willing to work with the City if it would like to construct one at this intersection.
Page 22, Comment 2	Response
A safety concern has been expressed for pedestrians crossing in the 5-point round-about. Please explain/show pedestrian crossing plans for this round-about.	The road widths of a 5-point roundabout are no different than those of a 4-point roundabout. Therefore, there is no difference in crossing the street between the two. The Illustrative Plan shows the conceptual locations of the crosswalks. Note that landscape islands are anticipated to provide refuge for people crossing the street.
Page 23, No Comments	