Conservation Development

Single Family – High Density
Tonight’s Discussion

• Overview of Conservation Development
• SAS/Public Comment Review
• Mixed Use Component
• Open Space
  – Natural Resource Consideration
  – Percentage Requirement
Conservation Development

A building strategy, which ensures that open spaces won’t be wasted. The development works with much of the similar steps as “conventional” building process go, but simply distributed differently.
Conventional vs. Conservation

- **First:** Streets are laid out
- **Second:** Lot lines are drawn
- **Third:** Houses are sited
- **Fourth:** Remaining space is designated

- **First:** Open space is designated
- **Second:** Houses are sited
- **Third:** Roads and pathways are planned
- **Fourth:** Lot lines are drawn

*Preserved open space is protected permanently through a conservation restriction*
## Conservation Development

### Benefits

**Community:**
- Lower impact
  - Water
  - Natural environment
  - Local features and views
- Reduced costs
  - Infrastructure
  - Maintenance
- Flexibility to discuss site specific conditions

**Developer:**
- Potentially more profitable and easier to sell
- Reduced infrastructure costs
- Flexibility to avoid costly difficult building areas
- Possibility to increase number of homes

### Limitations

**Community:**
- Learning Curve
  - More education necessary to negotiate well
- Resistance to change
- Perception of higher density
  - Due to more closely space homes

**Developer:**
- Extended approval process is possible
- Unknown elements of design approaches
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Characteristics of Conservation Development

- Open space requirement (preserves natural areas)
- No minimum lot sizes
- No setback requirements
- Allows equal density as conventional development

Conventional Subdivision

Conservation Subdivision
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The SAS Concept Diagram

- Core Residential Area
- Rural Buffer
- Historic Downtown/Cultural Core
- Cemetery
- Commercial Activity
- Institutional Activity
- Rural Buffer
- Small Scale Commercial
The SAS
Recommended Land Use Map
The SAS
Conservation Development
(Single Family – High Density)

• Location
  – Near nodes planned for mixed uses and/or commercial land use and arterial roads

• Purpose
  – Help create the synergy of populations needed to be supportive of nearby commercial land uses

• Densities
  – Can be increased up to 30 percent above the density of the underlying residential zone
The SAS

Conservation Development
(Residential with Mixed Use Overlay)

• Location
  – Along McCullum Pike between the nodes of mixed use

• Purpose
  – Clusters of mixed use development
  – Provide continuity between the two mixed use nodes on McCullum Pike

• Key
  – Design mixed use areas in coordination with the adjoining residential uses
Public Comments

• **Uses**
  – Single-family subdivision adjacent to Hartland with buffer
  – They are ok with townhouses
  – They thought patio homes could work.

• **Open Space**
  – They wanted the open space to be more like a city park than a nature area
  – Don’t need playground equipment everywhere
  – Preserve natural features and buffer Hartland Subdivision

• **Mixed Use**
  – No mixed use on McCullum. Keep it strictly residential
  – Thought the entire length of McCullum should be mixed use with residential behind it.

• **Connectivity**
  – Connect existing residential (pedestrian and street) with area
  – No road connection from Hartland to McCullum
Mixed Use
Staff Recommendation

• Set aside for now

• Focus on the mixed use in Courthouse Square and the Gateway area

• City to look for mixed use potential in the future
  – Keeping in mind the SAS recommendations

• Adopt (or modify adjacent) codes when the time is more appropriate
Open Space

• Yield Plan
• Passive v. Active
  – SAS envisions for potential park area
• Ownership and maintenance
  – Detailed management plan from developer
  – Potential Donation or easement
    • To City or local conservancy
  – Homeowners association
• Minimum open space requirement
• Minimum development area requirement
Yield Plan
Potential Areas for Preservation
Natural Resource Considerations

- Viewsheds
- Riparian
  - Blue Line Streams
  - Drainage and Hydrology
- Hillsides/PRDA
- Tree Canopy
- Others (not mapped)
  - Floodplain
  - Soils
Viewsheds
North Area (From Madison)
Viewsheds North Area
From Center of Site
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Viewsheds
South Area (From McCullum)
Viewsheds
South Area (From Madison)
Viewsheds
South Area (From Center of Site)
Riparian – Blue Line Streams
(With Drainage and Hydrology)
Physically Restricted Development Area
Tree Canopy
Natural Resources

• Natural features not likely inhibit land development

• Still need to be considered as part of the required open space
Minimum Open Space Requirement

- 30 – 70% discussions
- Densities to be discussed in the next meeting
Hartland Subdivision
110 Total Acres
Hartland Subdivision
Current Open Space – 3.5%
Hartland Subdivision
30% Open Space
Hartland Subdivision
40% Open Space
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