SYMPHONY PUD
Summary of Issues Raised at September 20, 2010 APC Meeting

Case No.	**1001-PUD-01**
Petitioner	**Estridge Development Company**
Description	**800 Sycamore Street; Petitioner requests a change in zoning on approximately 1,409 acres from the AG-SF1, SF-2 and Centennial North PUD districts to the Symphony PUD District.**

1. Is the Symphony proposal consistent with the Comprehensive Plan? If not, has the petitioner supplied sufficient information to warrant a departure from the Comprehensive Plan?

2. Has the buffering issue around the Laughter property been adequately addressed in the proposed PUD?

3. By moving the originally proposed homes along the east side of the golf course, have the adjacent property owners' concerns been adequately addressed? If so, have appropriate modifications been made to the Symphony PUD ordinance to require this change?

4. Has the realignment of Towne Road, as revised, adequately addressed the neighbors' concerns? If so, have appropriate modifications been made to the Symphony PUD ordinance to require this realignment?

5. Is the proposed maximum number of dwelling units/density acceptable to the APC?

6. Is the proposed maximum size for a single retailer adequate to address the APC's concerns regarding the proposed scale and intensity of commercial/retail uses at this location?

7. Have the identified "prohibited uses" been adequately defined?

8. Are the proposed restrictions on lot sizes, home sizes, and quantities of home types (including accessory dwelling units) by village adequate to address the APC's concerns regarding predictability?

9. By changing the minimum lot sizes of the residential areas of the PUD to be more consistent with the existing residential zoning districts in the zoning ordinance, have the APC's concerns regarding minimum home size been addressed?

10. Does the Symphony PUD include adequate illustrative architectural examples of the various home types and commercial buildings?

11. Are the architectural requirements included in the proposed PUD ordinance adequate to address the APC's concerns? Are the architectural standards proposed in the PUD too subjective and open to interpretation?

12. Has adequate evidence pertaining to the economic impact of Symphony been provided?

13. Are the petitioners commitments to require all vinyl siding used in Symphony to be at least .090 in thickness and used on no more than 30% of the surface of any structure adequate to address the APC's concerns related to the use of vinyl siding?

14. Is the APC satisfied with the amount of greenbelt space and open space being provided by the petitioner?

15. Are the non-residential development standards adequate to address the APC's concerns?

16. Has the petitioner provided enough information pertaining to the timing of the construction of amenity and infrastructure improvements in the various villages? Does the proposed PUD ordinance include enough requirements pertaining to the timing of these improvements?

17. Is the APC comfortable with the concept of accessory dwelling units? Does the proposed PUD ordinance contain enough standards related to accessory dwelling units?

18. Is the APC comfortable with the concept of identifying lot types at the platting stage or does the petitioner need to provide more certainty in its proposed standards at the zoning stage?

19. Should the mixed use district include a building height limitation to address the Laughter concerns?

20. Are there enough restrictions in the proposed PUD against sign illumination to reasonably protect the Laufters?

21. Is the PUD designed to permit the petitioner to use the Laufters' property to serve as part of the required buffer yards?

22. Should the petitioner be permitted to construct retail uses all the way around the Laughter property?

23. Are there enough standards included in the mixed use district pertaining to (a) what can be built, (b) when it can be built (c) how loud the activities can be, (d) signage, (e) lighting, (f) noise and (g) parking, in order to protect the Laufters?

24. Has the petitioner adequately responded to the land use concerns expressed by the residents in Centennial South? If so, have appropriate modifications been made to the proposed PUD ordinance to require any commitments related to this issue?

25. Is the golf course counted as open space? How does this compare to the traditional open space requirements included in the zoning ordinance today?

26. What impact will this project have on the school system?

27. Is Symphony being proposed in a wise location where existing public infrastructure is in place to accommodate the proposed development?

28. What impact will approving the proposed Symphony project have on the various other PUD projects in the area that have not been initiated or completed? Why should the City zone additional land for development when there is already a significant amount of land nearby that is already zoned and ready to be developed?

29. With all of the foreclosures happening, why does it make sense to approve a development for more homes?

30. Are appropriate land use transitions provided between proposed uses within the PUD and also between proposed uses and existing adjacent residences?

31. Have adequate requirements been included into the proposed PUD to ensure that what the petitioner is proposing actually gets developed?

32. Has the petitioner provided enough detail in the way of a traffic impact analysis?

33. Should the petitioner be required to incorporate buffering standards in the proposed PUD that are more significant than those provided in the zoning ordinance today?