

## Expert Judging Criteria



**Judging ID Number:** 03EJ-A \_\_\_\_\_

**Team Number of Entry** 03-01

**Design Category of Entry:** \_\_\_\_\_

Urban Redevelopment - Barnard Trace \_\_\_\_\_

Judges' Comments: Assumptions: PUD is approved allowing variances from standard lot sizes, set backs, road sizes and infrastructure materials. Site will be developed under one owner then lots to be sold to private owner for home sites. Because there are common areas there will need to be covenants creating some sort of governance body and funds for operations and maintenance of the infrastructure. Design assumes that some non-profit organization will take over the dedicated land, which will require a great deal of maintenance (1.6 acres & 40% of site), so as not to cost homeowners for upkeep.

This design submission works well incorporating LID features, plant material, and stormwater management. It preserves existing trees. And, it is well detailed in calculating codes, costs savings and marketability. It respects and celebrates the history of the site and educates the community about LID. The community garden is a nice touch.

The project design utilizes a cluster arrangement, which can be quite appealing to homeowners. This design, however, at times appears a bit clumsy with home sites that have been "shoehorned" into leftover spaces. Because so much of the property is developed as open space, many sites will be devalued because they do not optimize orientation. In the judge's opinion, a good development has both private areas as well as public or communal areas. Because of the limited area for 18 sites, a number of the sites lack definition or clear boundaries. Because of the location of retaining walls, it is evident why the large

Total Points Accumulated: 65 out of 100

## Expert Judging Criteria

proportion of the site was given to open space. If the gift of the open space was not quite so generous, the design could have better addressed creating a better layout for the home sites.

Additionally, this juror would have preferred to see more of a response to the surrounding neighbors. The applicant could have made the decision to either remove the retaining wall to the South or at least modify it so each of the southern lots has direct access to the street. By keeping the wall, it has almost made the design a “gated community” isolating the homeowners from interaction with their neighbors. Although the wall has historical significance, it serves as a barrier to the existing neighbors. It would have been a bold move to remove the wall. The materials could have been reused on site in some fashion to conserve materials.

- How well does this site conserve natural resources that provide natural functions associated with controlling and filtering storm water?  

\_\_\_8\_\_ of 10 points
- How well does this site use decentralized, small-scale landscape features and LID Integrated Management Practices (IMP) working as a system to:
  - Reduce the amount of runoff by mimicking the natural hydrologic function of the site and matching pre-development hydrology?  

\_\_\_9\_\_ of 10 points
  - Minimize the use of and/or reduce the size of pipe and other centralized control and treatment infrastructure?  

\_\_8\_\_ of 10 points
- How well does this site minimize and disconnect impervious surfaces, lengthen time of concentration and promote bio-filtration of runoff to improve the quality of storm water leaving the site?  

\_\_\_8\_\_ of 10 points
- How well does this site minimize or eliminate the use of potable water resources needed for irrigation and where practical provide for the reuse of rainwater?  

\_\_\_4\_\_ of 10 points
- How well does this site use enhanced quality of life values and reduced maintenance costs inherent in LID practices to increase marketability of the development and long-term property values?  

\_\_4\_\_ of 10 points
- How well does this site correctly identify current codes that prohibit the construction or implementation of your prescribed LID techniques?  

\_\_\_10\_ of 15 points

Total Points Accumulated: 65 out of 100

## Expert Judging Criteria

- How well does this site address the aspects of your area of expertise in architecture, landscape architecture, hydrology/hydraulics/civil engineering, stormwater quality, or planning/development/consulting?  
\_\_4\_\_ of 10 points
- How well do the team's submitted materials address grammar, editing, appearance, and verbiage ?  
\_\_\_4\_\_ of 5 points
- Does the team's design adequately compare the costs of LID versus conventional design? Is their design a better investment, in your opinion, than the conventional design?  
\_\_6\_\_ of 10 points

Total Points Accumulated: \_\_65\_\_ out of 100