

Q. Could the allowable construction on slopes proposed in the Camelback PUD be reduced to a reasonable amount in such a manner that existing neighbor view corridors would be protected?  
COUNCIL MEMBER KITCHEN'S OFFICE

A. In response to questions from Council about the issue of allowable impervious cover on various slope categories in the proposed Camelback PUD, Watershed Protection Department performed an alternative analysis and created the attached exhibit. To minimize construction on slopes, development could be directed to the flatter areas within the PUD. However, there was concern that locating development on the flatter areas would adversely impact neighbor view corridors.

Watershed Protection Department staff assessed the view corridor analysis generated by the applicant, and concluded that the Mixed Residential District was the district in which construction on the flatter areas would be most likely to adversely affect neighbor views. The attached slope analysis map estimates a reasonable amount of impervious cover on slopes in the proposed PUD while also minimizing adverse impacts to neighbor view corridors.

The slope analysis map uses the slopes on site and an assumed amount of impervious cover for each district given the maximum allowable impervious cover of 18.86 acres exclusive of Bridge Point Parkway. As a public road right-of-way, Bridge Point Parkway would not count against the allowable construction on slopes per current code.

The attached exhibit provides impervious cover acreage in each slope category and for each district. By locating the majority of development on steeper slopes (which are the lowest areas) within the Mixed Residential District, this analysis demonstrates how impervious cover on slopes could be reallocated while minimizing potential adverse impact to neighbor view corridors.

Allowable Construction on Slopes				
MINIMUM SLOPE	MAXIMUM SLOPE	TOTAL AREA (AC)	MAXIMUM IC (AC)	PERCENT
0.00%	15.00%	31.07	1.5	5%
15.00%	25.00%	38.38	9.92	26%
25.00%	35.00%	31.32	7.55	24%
35.00%	100.00%	37.42	1.09	3%

**\*\* No Cerebral limit on 0.15% slope**

Note:  
1. Slopes within Bridgepoint Parkway, R.O.W., and the anticipated 3.0 acres of impervious cover therein have been excluded.  
2. Construction on slope acreage can be transferred to lower categories but not higher.  
3. Mechanical access is excluded from construction on slope limitations.

#### Existing slopes per District

O-MU District: 6.3 acres

0-15% = 1.3 acres

15-25% = 2.5 acres

25-35% = 2.5 acres

35+% = 0 acres

C District: 7.46 acres

0-15% = 3 acres

15-25% = 3 acres

25-35% = 46 acres

35+% = 1 acres

MR District: 37.37 acres

0-15% = 15.37 acres

15-25% = 16 acres

25-35% = 4 acres

35+% = 2 acres

#### Slopes with distributed IC per District

Assumed impervious cover: 3.3 acres

0-15% = 1 acre

15-25% = 1.55 acres

25-35% = 7.5 acres

35+% = 0 acres

Assumed impervious cover: 3.56 acres

0-15% = 1.5 acre

15-25% = 1.5 acres

25-35% = 46 acres

35+% = 0.1 acres (for creek crossing)

Assumed impervious cover: 11.5 acres

0-15% = 1 acre

15-25% = 7 acres

25-35% = 3 acres

35+% = 0.5 acres

\*.5 acre of additional impervious cover for park improvements, clubhouse, and tram

**Total: 18.36 acres\***

0-15% = 3.5 acres

15-25% = 10.05 acres

25-35% = 4.21 acres

35+% = .6 acres

\*.5 to parks and other development

