

Commissioners of Leonardtown
Leonardtown Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting
Tuesday, February 21, 2006 ~ 3:30 p.m.

Attendees: Jean Moulds, Chairperson
Jack Candela, Member
Tom Collier, Member

Absent: Frank Fearn, Vice Chair
Gary Simpson, Member

Also in attendance were: Laschelle Miller, Town Administrator; Colleen Bonnel, Planning Director; Jackie Post, Fiscal Clerk, Teri Dimsey, Recording Secretary; Mike Mummaugh, Paragon Properties; Frank Jaklitsch, Marrick Properties; Marvin Oursler, Marrick Properties; Rick Bailey, Marrick Properties; John Oliff, COA, Inc.; Dean Talley, CSM, Leonardtown Campus; Daphne Brown, Property Owner; Delois Young, Property Owner; Kelly Hall, LES; Dan Burris, LBA; Chris Ho, WRA; Charlie Faunce, Town Council; Randy Guy, GUM; Jennifer Johnson, SMCPS; Richard Kleponis, WGM; Darrell Barrickow, SMCPS; Brad Clements, SMCPS; John Wharton, Enterprise; John Frey, CSN; David Whale, Melanie Hennigan, Dave Prevette, Grimm & Parker.

Chairperson Moulds called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

Approval of Minutes: January 17, 2006

The meeting minutes for the January 17, 2006 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting are presented for approval.

Chairperson Moulds entertained a motion to approve the January 17, 2006 meeting minutes, Member Collier moved to approve the minutes, seconded by Member Candela; motion passed unanimously.

Chairperson Mould entertained a motion to close the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting and open the Public Hearing, Member Candela moved to close the meeting and open the Public Hearing, seconded by Member Collier; motion passed unanimously.

Chairperson Moulds referred to the Town Planner for comments.

Ms. Bonnel stated the Planning and Zoning Commission is required to conduct a Public Hearing regarding the request for a Planned Infill Redevelopment District (PIRD) application. The properties have been posted and advertised in the Enterprise as well.

Case # 132-05 - Request for a Planned Infill and Re-Development District (PIRD)

Classification and Master Development Plan Approval. The applicant contractor / purchaser is Mike Mummaugh and Randy Guy of GUM, Inc. The location is the property located between Lawrence Avenue and Pope Street. Presently existing is the Wachter Apartment building and three single houses, Tax Map 133, Block 3, Parcel 252. Zoning classification is Residential Multi-Family (R-MF), existing non-conforming uses on the site. Lot size is .38 acres. Number of lots existing one parcel, proposed five parcel lots.

Proposal from the applicant is to renovate the one existing apartment building located in the middle of the lot, there is a site plan attached to the Commission's packet. They plan to demolish the three existing residential detached houses on the lot and construct two duplex units, subdivide the duplexes and sell them as four individual units. Enclosed in the Commission's packet is a project information packet as well as last month's Ordinance #123. The parcel is currently mapped within the PIRD area and they have enclosed a Master Development Plan. Included is a portion of the PIRD section for questions and comments for your review and annotations. There is currently existing dumpster areas that need to be included in the new site plan. We will be looking upon items 1-6 noted in your packets. We are opening the Public Hearing to hear any public questions or concerns. Mr. Mummaugh is here to present the application to the Commission, as well as, to the public. Ms. Bonnel turned the floor over to Mr. Mike Mummaugh and Mr. William Higgs.

Mr. Higgs began with a brief introduction and explained he is a land surveyor with LSR Inc. He explained that this is an existing parcel of land that is currently an existing apartment building and three homes and the plan is to renovate the existing apartment building, demolish the three existing houses and then build two duplexes. Mr. Higgs pointed to the design boards showing the existing apartment building and proposed duplexes. One set of the duplexes will have access off of Lawrence Avenue and the other duplexes will access off of Pope Street. The plan is to keep an entrance from Lawrence Avenue one way through and parking against the existing building and a one-way exit onto Pope Street.

This would create five lots and we would have duplexes that we propose to be 20' x 35' and they are all on 1,755 square foot lots, roughly 75' x 25' foot lots. We do realize we need to put in a dumpster site, the most appropriate space would be right beside the apartment building and that means we will lose a parking space. That would still leave us ten spaces and there are eight apartment units. Mr. Higgs explained that the houses are not restorable but the apartment building is and were looking for an alternative to make the project work and they felt that building duplexes would be the most feasible. Mr. Mummaugh is here to address any concerns regarding the proposed construction.

Mr. Mummaugh stated that the duplexes would be three bedrooms with 2 ½ half baths. They will sell for approximately \$220,000 to \$240,000. The apartment building was inspected by the Fire Marshal and he directed them as to the necessary items to bring the building up to code.

Member Candela asked if the setbacks on the duplexes were according to code, which is twenty-five feet. Mr. Mummaugh replied that they were presently at twenty-four feet on the closer corner and the other is over. The side yards are five feet from the property line.

Ms. Bonnel explained that this is multi-family zoning and already existing non-conforming use but setbacks would be within ten feet of the property. The houses would be new construction and that part of the PIRD development provides leeway for existing and proposed.

Member Candela remarked that he assumes the duplexes have normal side setbacks, which are five feet. He questioned if the fact with the PIRD in place, would they have to go through the appeal process? Ms. Bonnel responded no, you look at the entire site plan comprehensively as redevelopment of the parcel.

Member Collier asked where is the fire hydrant located? Mr. Higgs pointed to a grassy area on the design boards and will make sure it meets the fire code.

Member Collier also noted that the plans do not show any landscaping, and asked them to describe their landscaping. Mr. Higgs remarked that they do want to plant some trees and shrubbery along the front of the each of the duplex units and in these grass spaces we would place some trees around to beautify it some.

Member Collier asked if there was a minimum or requirement for parking spaces. Mr. Higgs responded that the parking spaces are 10' x 19', approx. 180 sq. ft. He also asked if the existing sidewalk along Pope Street and Lawrence Avenue would be taken away for these two entrances. Mr. Higgs responded that their plan is to depress the sidewalk for the entrances into the parking spaces and it will still be obvious there is a sidewalk.

Member Collier also noted that there is an existing fence on one of the properties and would they be disturbing that fence? Mr. Higgs responded that the fence is on the property line and they do not plan to disturb it. Member Collier then asked about the line along Pope Street which has bamboo growing along it, would that be coming out? Mr. Higgs noted that along that edge, coming out up to the parking lot and whatever is on our side, would be coming out.

Member Collier commented that the bamboo provides privacy for the adjacent property. As there is existing privacy there now, he would like to see some type of replacement provided. Mr. Mummaugh responded they could possibly put up a dividing fence.

Member Collier noted that the existing apartment building has a lot of tanks on the East side. Mr. Mummaugh responded that they are old heat pumps and will be removed and moved to the roof.

Member Collier commented that the existing apartments are in block and the design shows brick, will the brick be going around the entire perimeter? Mr. Mummaugh noted that it would just be located in the front. Member Collier asked what he would be doing for the backside? Mr.

Mummaugh responded it will be most likely be painted, possibly provide siding but cannot determine that at this moment.

Member Collier asked if they were required to have emergency fire exits on the second floor. Mr. Mummaugh explained that there are block firewalls and enclosed stairways and there will be fire doors.

Member Candela asked if the heat pumps would be seen on the roof? Mr. Mummaugh remarked that he will try to hide them but has not determined how he will do so.

Member Colliers asked if there would be full size trees or shrubs. Mr. Higgs responded that there would be a combination of shrubs and some full size trees such as Bradford Pears and Crape Myrtles. Member Collier would like to see a landscaping plan, as it is required, as part of the plan and the design plan does not show enough. Mr. Mummaugh replied he would do that.

Chairperson Moulds asked if there were any additional comments from the floor.

Ms. Daphne Brown spoke up that she lives in one of the houses and asked when this construction will take place? Mr. Mummaugh responded to her that it would be in the next couple of months. Ms. Brown asked if she would have adequate time to search for another place and he replied that the owner would be in contact with her, as they get closer to construction.

Ms. Rose Short spoke up that she is an owner of a town home along Lawrence Avenue and received a letter to attend the Public Hearing. Chairperson Moulds responded to her that she was informed to be aware of the activity next to her property and if she had any questions this would be the opportunity to do so. Mr. Higgs pointed on the design boards approximately where her town home is located and described to her the changes that will take place.

Dan Burris, President, Leonardtown Business Association, commented that he is in favor of renovations like this as it offers affordable workforce housing for the community.

Chairperson Moulds asked if there were any further comments, there being none, she closed the Public Hearing and re-opened the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.

Town Administrators Report – Laschelle Miller

Request for PIRD Designation - After the passing of Ordinance #123, Mike Mummaugh and Randy Guy requested that the properties they have under contract located at 22756, 22758 & 22760 Lawrence Avenue and 22765 Pope St. are designated as redevelopment sites. Per the Ordinance, the developer has the burden of proof to show the benefit of the redevelopment project. The site currently contains an apartment building and 3 homes. The proposal is to remodel the apartment complex and tear down the three houses and replace with four duplexes. Town Council referred this request to the Planning and Zoning Commission for a public hearing and recommendation.

Renewal of Delahay Contract- Was approved and extended to July 2007.

New Well Update- Received a presentation for the new Well that will be constructed along Greenbrier Road under the St. Mary's County Metropolitan Commission contract, we are required to do this to meet arsenic regulations that have gone into effect in January.

Our Town Award – was presented to Mr. and Mrs. Frank Holmes for working with the Planning and Zoning Commission for a number of years and being outstanding citizens.

New Business

Case #132-05 – Request for a Planned Infill and Re-development District Classification and Master Development Plan Approval, which we just discussed in the Public Hearing. The Planning and Zoning Commission will then send their recommendation to the Town Council for approval or approval with conditions, or denial.

Ms. Bonnel noted that another Public Hearing would be held at the Town Council meeting in March.

Member Collier asked if the driveway and parking areas would be all paved or gravel. Mr. Mummaugh remarked that the driveway and parking areas would all be paved.

Member Candela commented that he liked the presentation and feels this project will enhance the general area of the neighborhood and in general is impressed with the presentation.

Chairperson Moulds added that she is happy to see these types of renovations taken on, as it is good for the Town's overall growth plan and meets the requirements to help build a better neighborhood.

Member Collier agreed and is in favor of the project and would like to see it move forward but would also like to see a complete plan and have the paperwork catch up with the presentation.

Member Collier moved that Case #132-05 Request for Planned Infill and Redevelopment District Classification Master Approval Plan be approved with the conditions that the plans include a landscaping plan with a buffer shown for the adjacent house on Pope Street. It should also include the placement of the dumpster, fire hydrant and paving of the driveway and parking areas as a complete plan, seconded by Member Candela, motion passed unanimously.

Case # 156-05 – Burch Oil, Inc and Tri-County Federal Savings Request for a Lot Line Adjustment

Ms. Bonnel reported for that the applicants DH Steffens, Mike Bailey and Herb Redman regarding Burch Oil Company and Tri-County Federal Savings of Waldorf. They are requesting a lot line adjustment, Tax Map127, Block 16, Parcel 281. Recording of this boundary line adjustment plat will expand the existed deeded tax parcel of Parcel 281, also known as Lot 1 on your plat. The 13,156 square feet will not result in any additional building sites or increase the

density or intensity beyond the current land use as shown. Recording of this boundary line adjustment plat will expand the existing deeded tax parcel 286 by 12,658 sq. ft and will not result in any additional building sites or increase in the density or intensity beyond the current land use shown. This will not adversely affect the parcels or individual lots and the lots will continue to follow the Leonardtown regulations.

Ms. Bonnel referenced needed changes: Note needed on Lot 1 as CB zoning classification.

Before the board is a request for the lot line adjustment plat for approval, approval with conditions or denied.

Member Collier asked for clarification.

Ms. Bonnel remarked that the Bank is proposing possibly, in the long run, to add some additional parking and they have been working with the Burch Oil Company, as this is currently owned by Burch Oil. Burch Oil is working with the existing bank to move this line over and keeping this existing easement area, which is required per a prior recorded plat, which will remain there.

Member Candela moved to approve Case #156-05 Burch Oil Co. Inc. and Tri-County Savings and Loan Company, their request for a lot line adjustment be approved as presented, seconded by Member Collier, motion passed unanimously.

Case # 7-06 – College of Southern Maryland, Leonardtown Campus, New Wellness Center Building, Pre-Concept Site Plan and Building Presentation

Chairperson Moulds asked Ms. Bonnel to provide an overview.

Ms. Bonnel stated that the College of Southern Maryland, Leonardtown Campus is planning a proposed addition of a New Wellness Center building. A pre-concept and building plan presentation will be shown today. The location is at the intersection of Hollywood Road and Route 5 by-pass. The zoning category is Institutional Office. Included in your packet is an excerpt of Article 10 defining Institutional Office district, which allows for Colleges and expansion of the College as a permitted use and they have included a general site plan, which shows the preliminary location of the facility. Also shown on the general site plan are the existing buildings, as well as, the new proposed Wellness Center. They are also showing preliminary vehicular and pedestrian circulation system in and around the College and they are showing preliminary building exterior design. The Mayor and I met with Dean Talley last week and discussed the prospect of the college as a community based college. Dean Talley feels the college is a very important asset to the residents of Leonardtown, as well as, St. Mary's County and the Wellness Center will be used by many residents in Town, as well as, the county. Information that the Town will need as the project proceeds, is a preliminary development schedule, timing for the entire project and its different phases, building interior layout and square footage breakdown, pools, showers, locker rooms and classroom breakdown. Most importantly, preliminary water and sewer demand numbers that the Town will need to assess in working with the timeframe of upgrading its wastewater treatment facilities.

Dean Tally introduced himself and expressed it was good to be here to present a look at the new Wellness Center. He explained that they are not building a sport's facility. The College is trying to find a way to educate the whole person with traditional classroom education but also manage that with a healthy lifestyle and to serve as an asset for both students and the community. A committee was pulled together of folks from different areas, such as, the hospital, County schools, Leonardtown Planning and Zoning Commission and St. Mary's County Recreation and Parks. This committee looked at every aspect of the project of height design, exterior rooflines, and interior building design and with their help, the results better reflect the shared value to the community.

Ms. Hennigan with Grimm Parker shared some background and project status. She referred to the renderings and pointed out some of the characteristics of the existing buildings on campus and noted the traditional red masonry work, the architectural details, such as the cast stone elements and noted the different building heights. The challenge was to address and incorporate these design elements into the new building in relation to the size and location of the building site. It will have a pool, a fitness area, aerobics, a yoga studio and locker rooms.

The location also provided an opportunity for the building to be a vista at the end of an axis from the intersection of Route 5 and Washington Street as a primary focus as a visible beacon across the landscape. This presented us with an opportunity to use lots of glass to see what is going on inside and to control the natural light.

We wanted to soften the straight lines of this low building so we added a slight curve. We plan to screen the mechanical equipment and created some mechanical mezzanine areas that are enclosed to avoid visible roof top equipment. The landscaping will have concrete sidewalks connecting to existing sidewalks with some brick pavers to create a more special sense of place. Outdoor activity areas will be located on all four sides of the building, a quiet garden space outside of the yoga studio and more active outdoor activity areas, such as, sand volleyball, possibly a climbing wall in the building and some small garden areas some with shrubs, trees and low plantings.

Member Candela commented that at the moment, there are no buildings to obstruct the view from the intersection from Route 5 and Hollywood Road. Would plans for future buildings block this view? Ms. Hennigan responded that it is not determined at this moment the future use of that land but the plan is to keep the view, along with a lawn feature, that is popular with college campuses.

Chairperson Moulds asked if the idea is for this building to be the showcase of the campus?

Dean Tally responded that it would be adding an element to provide a bit more energy to the space.

Chairperson Moulds remarked that she could see what they are going for but that when she first saw the glass tower in the center it startled her. If there were financials restrictions put on this building would the glass tower be the first thing be modified?

Ms. Hennigan responded that the committee went through lots of value engineering exercises and described the purposes of the glass tower. Some sketches were done with and without the glass tower. The committee preferred the glass tower, but if necessary, the tower may go down in scale depending on financial issues. It is important to note that the glass spine is important to allow light into the building. The kind of glass proposed lets in visible light but keeps out the infrared part of the spectrum which is where you get heat gain and it also keeps out the ultraviolet light which causes fading, it is a kind of glass used in public libraries and immediately pays for itself. It is more expensive upfront but as you are not letting in the heat gain you can use smaller mechanic systems and not have as expensive energy bills. She also stated there is a Western and Southern exposure and in these areas propose using a translucent glass to block the pool area.

Member Candela commented that he served on the committee for the Wellness Center and the original designs were far more contemporary. His feels that the glass tower is too prominent but the committee felt it was a good compromise.

Chairperson Moulds stated that she is not sure she is in favor of the glass tower.

Ms. Hennigan referred to renderings showing the different elevations and noted that the Wellness Center is a long and low building, smaller than the existing buildings, it is not as high as it looks and does serve to bring the building up to scale with the existing buildings.

Ms. Bonnel remarked that they will be coming back to address the development schedule giving us a lot more specific information including wastewater treatment numbers so that we can work out the EDU's.

Member Candela moved to approve Case #7-06, College of Southern Maryland, Leonardtown Campus New Wellness Center building pre-concept site plan for them to more forward with more detailed plans, seconded by Member Collier, motion passed unanimously.

Chairperson Moulds thanked them for their presentation.

OLD BUSINESS

Case #104-05, Leonardtown Elementary School Request for Final Site Plan Approval.

Ms. Bonnel provided the following background information. St. Mary's Public School, Leonardtown Elementary School, located at 22885 Duke Street, is an existing school building with current zoning classification as Institutional Office (IO). On August 15, 2005, the Planning and Zoning Commission approved the concept plan but requested that the school pursue another entry off the new proposed parking lot. The property boundary encompasses 17.8 acres of land and the existing school building is 53,643 sq. ft. The project proposes to perform interior renovations, as well as, construct new building additions to the existing school site. The applicant will be removing the existing three classroom trailers from the site. The site will be redesigned for better efficiency and to facilitate a safe pedestrian, traffic and bus loading area.

Separating the bus loop and parent and faculty parking areas help balance the flow of traffic throughout the site. A service driveway is proposed at the rear of the school to isolate operational functions and separate operational traffic from the school site. New site amenities, including playground areas and recreational fields are proposed. ADA access has been addressed throughout the site, all walkways for the school will be ADA compliance, paved pathways will be given access to all recreational areas and a number of proposed handicapped spaces meet ADA requirements. The school was built in 1954 and the site currently does not appear to have any existing stormwater facility or storm drain facilities. Because of the building additional to the existing school, the school will increase by approximately 1.31 acres. The site pavement will increase by approximately 1.66 acres. Two bio-retention facilities, one adjacent to the new bus loop and the other adjacent to the service drive at the back of the school have been designed for water quality treatment of stormwater runoff from the site. Plans have been submitted to St. Mary's County Department of Public Works for stormwater management review and comments are pending. Plans have been submitted for Soil Conservation District for review and comment. Leonardtown Fire Department has reviewed the detailed plans and submitted comments with minor changes needed.

Action needed today is final site plan approval, approval with conditions or denial.

Mr. Brad Clements introduced himself and Principal Kelly Haas and noted that his architect and site engineering staff were here today as well.

Mr. Clements stated that the overall site plan has not changed a whole lot. They created a plan to show the entrance off of Church Street, as well as, the entrance aligning with the existing streets, Seymour and Duke. This allows us to align all of the entrances with the existing grid work of the Town. The bus entrance, faculty and visitor parking will be located in one area and the student drop-off loop in another area. One of the concerns was the canopy and coverage area. We have enhanced that and added a full canopy across the front of the site connecting the main entrance and the secondary entrance, as well as, extending beyond the building and connecting almost to the loop. As this was obviously important to the Town to provide protection during drop-offs for the students, we have included this in the base bid of the project.

The service road configuration has not changed. The kitchen and service areas, located in the rear, to avoid disruptions to the front entrance have changed a little bit in its configuration. The existing building is shown in a white tan color and there are five building additions located around the perimeter of the site. We have a colonnade type entrance that would have a fiberglass architectural façade, almost a cornice that ties in with areas of the Town. The main entrance has an elevated clear story to let a lot of daylight in and create some volume. Mr. Clements then described some of the key elements of the floor plan changes.

Member Candela asked to see the stormwater management pond. Mr. Clements pointed to the two areas on the plan and explained that two storage quality areas are proposed.

Member Candela commented that at the last meeting he had two concerns. One was the canopy, and thanked them for addressing that. Two, was security or fencing around the stormwater management ponds, which was not previously provided for in the plans. He mentioned that driving through Singletree he saw two boys playing in the pond. Especially with elementary

school children, it would be important to have some type of fencing as far as those ponds are concerned.

Mr. Ho responded that these are not the type of ponds that retain water for any period of time. They are actually bio-retention facilities. The plan shows a wet pond, wetland type of planting to help absorb a lot of the water and this facility has an under drain beneath it which helps to drain the water out. It is designed so that the water never sits in the facility for more than 48 hours. There will only be a maximum of a foot and a half amount of ponding.

Ms. Bonnel commented that this facility is completely different than what is in Singletree.

Principal Haas remarked that the children would always be supervised and kept within one of the three playground areas and the blacktop area.

Member Candela responded that his concern is during the off hours when there is no supervision. I lived in that neighborhood for many years and the community frequently uses the school grounds.

Mr. Ho replied that the type of water quality structure proposed is similar to the structure that has been installed at Lexington Park Elementary School to perform water quality management for the runoff and we have not heard of any problems.

Ms. Miller commented that the bio-retention pond is similar to our new parking lot. Member Candela remarked that the water may sit for no more than 48 hours but it takes one day for an accident to happen.

Member Collier asked what kind of rainfall would fill the pond in 48 hours?

Mr. Ho responded that it is designed to handle an inch of run-off and there is a ten to twenty-five percent chance it would fill the facility for any length of time.

Member Candela stated that he remains unconvinced.

Mr. Clements remarked that the major volume is stored underground and there may be a foot on top. They will look into how much is held and for how long and address that issue.

Member Collier mentioned that the school has existing fencing around the perimeter but would there be other areas of fencing?

Mr. Clements replied that there will be a combination of fencing running along the back perimeter and have some intermediate fencing along the service road and more fencing on the back side of the ball field. There will also be fencing from the corner of the building and around the kindergarten playground area. The intent is to keep the area as open and inviting as possible, but still provide security for the students as well as limit the amount of pedestrian traffic.

Ms. Bonnel interjected that the specifications required by the Town are chain link fence in black vinyl.

Member Collier asked if the Tudor Hall homes will come up to the property line at the back end of the school? He noted that it would be nice to allow that future community access to the school.

Member Collier moved to approve Case #104-05 Leonardtown Elementary School Request for Final Site Plan Approval, seconded by Member Candela, motion passed unanimously.

Case #14-05 – Clarks Rest, Concept Plan Update Presentation

Mr. Bailey stated that they appreciate the opportunity to return and provide the Commission with an overview and update of Clark's Rest Development Plan.

The overall design plan is progressing well but as the design progressed, we found there was an area that required some necessary revision that we feel is ultimately an improvement. We discovered there is a considerable grade differential between the existing homes in the subdivision and that we would have to grade these streets to tie into the main street. You require a four percent grade and these grades are locked in as we have a certain grade we have to meet for the adjacent subdivision. To eliminate this we would have had to build a retaining wall, which would have been between 800 to 900 feet long and could have been any where from 10 to 12 feet in differential. It concerned us to have a retaining wall against an adjacent subdivision. The houses affected are conventional homes, meaning they were side load not neo-traditional. We have created a road and eliminated the homes that back up immediately to the adjacent subdivision so that we have greater potential for buffering and landscaped areas. The unit count is the same for the total units, but we now have seven more neo-traditional units versus the conventional side load designs. This is the only difference from the original design and we feel it represents an improvement. It gives us more neo-traditional units versus conventional units and creates additional buffering opportunities between the new subdivision of Clarks Rest and the existing Singletree subdivision. We wanted to make you aware of it in terms of where we are heading to continue with our engineering design. We have established road grades for the storm drain designs and we will coordinate water/sewer to interface with the Town. Mr. Marvin Oursler will present to you the architectural components.

Member Collier asked how they are handling the grade/slope transition with the retaining wall.

Mr. Bailey stated that as the houses are laid out, we could grade it out a little shallower. Grade differential is 2' contour 92-94-96 percent and 100 percent grade becomes much shallower. Our problem was going to be lower elevation of 88 percent and if you compare the location at 88 percent there and existing elevations of 96 to 98 percent. This meant we would have had to put a fence along the top of the retaining wall for security purposes for the adjacent subdivision. This will now eliminate the need for that.

Chairperson Moulds asked what would be included in Phase I?

Mr. Bailey replied we would begin road construction first and then begin building the homes on the left hand side with a total of 67 homes. Phase II will incorporate a portion of the town homes and then another portion of homes in the back. There will be a total of five phases of 60 homes per phase.

Ms. Bonnel remarked that a phase does not mean a year. A phase can last more than one year.

Mr. Oursler provided an update on the architectural design for the units. All the conventional homes have side loaded garage unit and as with typical streetscape the driveways will all be on the same side which some exceptions at an intersection or change of grade (the garage is typically on the high side). We have two basic house types for the side load. As you can see from the renderings the garages are not visible from the front. They will be traditional in style. The neo-traditional styles will have four different models and each model will have two different elevations for a total of eight different looks and color schemes.

Member Collier asked to clarify the amount of space in between the homes.

Mr. Oursler stated that there is a 25 to 30 foot driveway turnaround area, then a five-foot building restriction line. Typically a side load has 30-35 feet between them. Neo-traditional will have anywhere from 25-30 feet and in some cases, 40 feet.

Member Collier remarked that some of the renderings show homes without porches and he thought we wanted to strongly encourage the use of porches in the neo-traditional.

Mr. Oursler noted that some have large porches, some small porches and some without. The majority of homes do have porches and each model will have two different elevations. There will be eight elevations total, two elevations have no porches and four elevations will have porches.

Mr. Oursler stated that for every two elevations with a porch there would be one without. They will predetermine all the house styles to create as many different looks as we can, therefore, every third or fourth house may not have a porch.

Chairperson Moulds thanks them for providing an update on the revisions and obtaining the Commissions input and looks forward to seeing them again.

Chairperson Moulds asked if the members had any questions on the Monthly Permits or the Town Council minutes, there being none, she entertained a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Member Collier moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Member Candela, motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted:

Teri Dimsey, Recording Secretary

Approved:

Jean Moulds, Chairperson

Frank Fearn, Vice Chair

Jack Candela, Commission Member

Tom Collier, Commission Member

Gary Simpson, Commission Member