

Plumas Development Site Plan and Architectural Suggestions

February 18, 2025 for Thompson Thrift by Marianne Merriam

Responses from Thompson Thrift

1. Please provide architectural elevations of the entire north, west, east, and south façades of the project, as seen 15' from the building(s) showing all retaining walls and sidewalks.

RESPONSE: This would be very time-consuming and expensive on the part of our civil and architectural team to prepare all of these exhibits.

2. What is the (proposed) contour interval on the Site Plan?

RESPONSE: Grading Plan includes 1-ft proposed contours and 5-ft contours are labeled with elevations for reference.

3. Show us how the site could be regraded to lower the west side and northwest corner of Building A by 10' so it would look closer to 3 stories tall, when seen from Plumas and McCarren (because most of the first floor would be below street level). This could help eliminate the 9.5' max height retaining walls on both the south and north sides of Bldg. A. and the 10.5' max height retaining wall inside the east half of Bldg. A, thus being less expensive to build and eliminating the need for a 5-story building façade midway as seen from McCarren Bl.

RESPONSE: This would be a very time-consuming and expensive grading exercise for our civil engineering team. Grades at our entrance from Plumas are approximately 30 feet higher than our access drive onto Lakeside. Regrading our access from Plumas to immediately slope downgradient would cause impacts to the existing parking to the south that shares our Plumas entrance drive. Our civil engineer has spent hours solving grades across our site resulting in our current proposed and approved site plan. The Grading Plan will continue to evolve through Final Engineering, but conducting this level of exercise at this time is cost prohibitive.

4. Retaining walls adjacent to Plumas should then be stepped in +/-3' intervals with landscaping between them. This would be less expensive to build, eliminate huge footings, and be far more attractive than one large retaining wall.

RESPONSE: One 6-ft retaining wall is proposed to avoid tree removal. The Grading Plan will continue to evolve through Final Engineering, but conducting this level of exercise at this time is cost prohibitive, particularly since our preliminary engineering plan has been approved.

5. The backs of the garage structures parallel to Plumas could be retaining walls dug into the hillside, eliminating free-standing retaining walls.

RESPONSE: The southwest garage includes a retaining wall integral with the back wall. See Sheet G-1.

6. Please provide a site plan showing where all fences and retaining walls are located and describe the height, materials, and colors of each.

RESPONSE: Proposed fence locations are shown on Sheet S-1. Proposed retaining wall locations and heights are shown on Sheet G-1. Materials and colors will be selected during final design as a part of the Landscape Plans.

7. Please provide a small site plan next to each rendering showing the direction and location of the view as seen in each rendering.

RESPONSE: The renderings are shown for purposes of demonstrating our intent to modify our building exteriors in response to neighborhood suggestions.

8. Please show us what the center part of the building facades' architectural renderings would look like if the eyebrow and parapet configuration were the same as the end portions of the buildings.

RESPONSE: We agreed to lower the middle parapet to be consistent with the end portions of the building.

9. Please show us what the corners of the buildings would look like if the corner vertical "timber" piece had a stone corner base of the same material as the stone lower building façade. This would continue the "mountain" theme around the project, which would help it fit the site and neighborhood better.

RESPONSE: We have made revisions as initially requested and will consider this suggestion.

10. Please show us what a slightly darker " stone " color would look like at the building's base.

RESPONSE: A new Color & Material Board will be provided in our Resubmittal Package to the City.

11. Please show us what the building corners would look like if the top balcony were open to the sky instead of having a covered, solid roof. This could eliminate solid mass from the visual weight of the building and make it appear less imposing while costing less to build.

RESPONSE: We will consider this suggestion.

12. Provide more than one pedestrian access point to the adjacent streets: three on McCarren, one in addition to the main entry on Plumas, and one on Lakeside.

RESPONSE: Our site plan meets pedestrian connectivity requirements as currently designed, including ADA access design standards.

13. Please show us the signage size and font standards for the building façade and any additional signage that would be proposed at the project perimeter, if any.

RESPONSE: Signage Plans are developed during Final Design.