

The regular meeting of the **Design Review Commission** was held on December 8, 2016, at 5:00 pm in the Board Chambers of Town Hall, 500 Poplar View Parkway.

The following staff members were present: Development Director, Mr. Jay Cravens; Town Attorney, Shea Oliver; Town Planner, Mr. Jaime Groce; Long Range Planner, Mr. Sean Isham; Planners, Mr. Scott Henninger and Mr. Matthew Wilkinson; and Administrative Specialist, Mrs. Sandi Robbins.

ROLL CALL:

Patton – absent, Donhardt – present, Lesnick – present, Sadler - absent, Lawhon – present, McCarty – present, Doss - present.

Quorum present.

Approval of Minutes

Chairman Doss asked if there were any changes or additions to the November 10, 2016 minutes.

Hearing none, he called for a motion to approve the minutes as presented.

Motion by Commissioner McCarty, and seconded, to approve the November 10, 2016 minutes as presented.

Hearing no further discussion, Chairman Doss asked for a roll call.

ROLL CALL:

Donhardt – yes, McCarty – yes, Lesnick – yes, Doss - yes.

Motion Approved.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

Chairman Doss asked if there were any changes or additions to the Agenda.

Mr. Groce stated we have some items on the Consent Agenda and haven't heard if they are controversial or need to come off. He stated if the items stay on the Consent Agenda, Staff will not make a full presentation on it and it will be approved exactly as it was represented in the Staff Report and without any type of discussion or debate. He stated he would like to switch item 6A. DRC16-22 with item 6B. DRC 16-28 of the Formal Agenda. There are no other changes from what was advertised in the newspaper.

Commissioner Lawhon joined the meeting at this time.

Chairman Doss asked for a motion to approve the agenda as presented.

Motion by Commissioner McCarty, and seconded to approve the Agenda as amended.

Hearing no further discussion, Chairman Doss asked for a roll call.

ROLL CALL:

**Donhardt – yes, McCarty – yes, Lesnick – yes, Lawhon – yes, Doss - yes
Motion Approved.**

CONSENT AGENDA:

Chairman Doss asked if anyone present would like to have these two items heard.

Hearing none, he asked for a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as amended.

Motion by Commissioner McCarty, and seconded to approve the Consent Agenda as amended.

999 Barbara Lynn Drive – Request approval of a Front Yard Fence.

To approve the request for front yard fencing at 999 Barbara Lynn Drive as shown on Exhibit 2 subject to the following conditions:

1. The fence shall be painted or stained in conformance with the Design Guidelines.
2. The transition from 6 feet in height to 4 feet shall occur over a distance of 8 feet to meet the Zoning Ordinance requirement that the transition in fence height must occur over a minimum distance of 8 feet and at a 4:1 ratio.
3. Any additions or deviations from the approved plans shall require the approval of the DRC and/or staff.

- | EXHIBITS |
|--|
| 1. Cover Letter (11/22/16) |
| 2. Staff Generated Site Plan (11/9/16) |
| 3. Fencing Diagram with distances (11/22/16) |
| 4. Existing Conditions Photos (11/17/16) |
| 5. Fencing Design Photo (11/17/16) |
| 6. Staff Photos (11/18/16) |

10786 Collierville Road – Request approval of a Front Yard Fence.

To approve the request for front yard fencing at 10786 Collierville Road as shown in Exhibits 2 and 3. Any additions or deviations from the approved plans shall require the approval of the DRC and/or staff.

- | EXHIBITS |
|--|
| 1. Cover Letter (11/18/16) |
| 2. Prop. Fence Design & Site Plan (11/18/16) |
| 3. Proposed Fence Photo |
| 4. New Fence Location (Ditch & Trees) |
| 5. Previous Fence Photo |
| 6. Area Fence Photos |

ROLL CALL:

**Donhardt – yes, McCarty – yes, Lesnick – yes, Lawhon – yes, Doss - yes
Motion Approved.**

FORMAL AGENDA

Request an appeal of a staff decision on November 7, 2016, related to tree removal from Common Open Space 6 in Schilling Farms PD, Phase 17 (Sterling Square).

Mr. Jaime Groce gave the staff presentation. He explained that there are 4 Key Questions to consider this evening:

- 1. Why did the HOA request removal of the tree?**
- 2. How did the HOA come to own the tree?**
- 3. Why did the staff deny the HOA’s request?**
- 4. Are there other alternatives than removing the tree?**
- 5. If the tree is removed, should the property owner be required to replace the tree?**

- EXHIBITS:**
- 1. Applicant’s Request to Remove the Tree (9/6/16)
 - 2. Town’s Consulting Arborist Opinion (11/5/16)
 - 3. Town’s Denial of Request to Remove Tree (11/7/16)
 - 4. Applicant’s letter of appeal to DRC (11/15/16)
 - 5. Proposed Replacement Landscaping Plan for COS#6 (9/21/16)
 - 6. Aerial Photo Showing COS#6
 - 7. Photographs of Existing Tree on COS#6 (12/1/16)
 - 8. Tree Preservation Plan for Schilling Farms Phase 17A (1999)
 - 9. Town’s “Tree Policy” (2013)
 - 10. Collierville Design Guidelines – Administrative Approvals (6/9/14)
 - 11. Letter from Adjacent Owner’s Attorney (9/1/16)
 - 12. Letter from Adjacent Owner’s Attorney (11/3/16)

Mr. Groce stated the tree in question is a 65” diameter white oak that is 75’ tall with a 75’ wide spread. This tree is likely 200 years old. The Town hired an independent arborist to aid in review for this request and he also included that the tree is in good health. The tree is next to 296 Schilling Park Blvd and the property owner there has expressed concern to the HOA about the tree causing damage to their house. The HOA informed us that the tree is 22’ from the garage and 18’ from the main dwelling on the 296 Schilling Park Blvd property. There are branches that clearly reach over the garage and dwelling.

He explained a time line to show how the Town has gotten involved with the request for the removal of this tree. He explained that after the applicant submitted their request with plans of how the Common Open Space (COS) would be landscaped without the tree, the Town hired a certified arborist, Wesley Hopper, to look at the tree to let us know if the tree is healthy. The tree was found to be healthy and not a hazard and Staff let the applicant know we could not approve their request. The Development Director has the ability to under certain circumstances approve certain changes to COS. The Design Guidelines state that the intent is to preserve and enhance the areas natural character.

He explained when someone wants to remove a healthy viable tree the Town asks them to replace the tree inch for inch. A 65-inch tree is equivalent to 33 new trees which are impossible to fit in the .075 acre COS. The applicant could make a payment into the Town’s tree bank which would be \$9,600 for 32 trees assuming they plant the one replacement.

He stated the applicant could trim the tree properly or appeal this decision to the BMA if the applicant felt aggrieved by the DRC’s decision.

Chairman Doss asked if there were any questions of staff.

Commissioner Lawhon stated he had a question for the arborist. He asked if the root system of the tree was in good shape.

Mr. Wesley Hopper 2588 Kilgore Cove, Memphis, TN 38133, he did not see any visible defects within the root system nor around the tree. He had seen one isolated spot where it showed ganoderma, which is a wood decaying fungus. This is something he sees very often and is not justification to remove the tree.

Commissioner Lawhon asked if the tree was generally healthy as a whole.

Mr. Hopper stated it is an extremely healthy tree.

Commissioner Lawhon asked how long can white oaks typically live.

Mr. Hopper stated white oaks can live very long if they are in the correct environment. Since this tree is already 200 years old and where it is located he believes it has about another 100 years left.

Commissioner Lawhon asked if it is a rare oak for the Collierville area.

Mr. Hopper stated it is a common oak. It generally likes dry areas which this is a good spot for that. This tree has survived the construction and has been here this long so he believes it deserves some respect. His approach to a tree risk assessment is to look for a reason to remove it. We can't save all the trees but can where they are viable.

Hearing no questions or discussion, Chairman Doss asked the applicant to come to the podium.

Mr. Charles Walker, 295 Schilling Park Blvd., stated he appreciates the opportunity to discuss this with the DRC and agrees with everything that has been said today. He stated it's a beautiful tree and believes it to be the soul of their community. The Tennessee Supreme Court ruling dated December 19, 2002, states if a tree is owned by one party and it encroaches upon the property of another causing a nuisance or property damage, the owner of the property has the legal right to remove the encroaching tree limbs and send the cost of the removal to the owner of the tree for reimbursement as well as reimbursement of any damages the encroaching tree limbs may have caused. He stated that's the situation we have here. He explained facts about the tree that has already been covered in Mr. Groce's presentation. He stated it is a beautiful tree and a healthy tree. The HOA had a meeting and as individuals would unanimously vote not to take the tree down, but as a board member they would unanimously vote to take the tree down because it was in the best interest of their community. The attorney representing the complainant has told them if the tree is not taken down he will do so by doing a radical pruning taking all the limbs north of the tree base and going straight up taking all the limbs encroaching upon their property off and send the HOA the bill. Both Mr. Hopper and another arborist from Woodland Tree Service have indicated that if that extreme pruning is done there is a high likelihood the tree will die. If the tree does not die it would create such an imbalance on the tree that it would cause a high liability situation for the community. They don't want to take the tree down, but if that attorney follows through with the threat to remove all the limbs then they will have a real liability on their hands and shouldn't be exposed to it. If there was a way other than to take the tree down they are willing to certainly consider that. They have approached the neighbor's attorney and told him they would be willing to comply with the recommendation of the arborists, but received a negative response. He wants the tree down. If the DRC grants authorization to remove the tree, they would also request a modification of the tree replacement policy. His request will be to replace trees at a rate of \$300 per tree and 3 trees per year for 10 years. It does impose a hardship on the community of 75 houses. He would like to mention the president and vice president of the HOA are in the audience if the DRC has any questions for them.

Commissioner McCarty asked if there was any trimming to the tree to remedy the problem.

Mr. Walker stated they did some trimming to the tree about a year ago, but it was minimal and obviously didn't satisfy the complainant.

Commissioner McCarty stated from your earlier statement, the homeowner is not willing to accept some more substantial trimming. They either want the whole tree down or they are going to cut off any part of the tree on their property.

Mr. Walker stated that is their statement to us, whether this is a negotiation tool or not he doesn't know. They have a claim that has been turned over to the HOA's insurance company for property damage and they are negotiating that now. Whether they are trying to mingle the requests together, he doesn't know, but his last demand, which was a week ago, was to take the tree down.

Commissioner McCarty wanted to confirm the DRC's one real option is to either reaffirm Staff's decision or turn it down. The real decision is, if they cut the tree down, they need to mitigate it inch per inch, or the outcome they are looking for which is to cut the tree down without mitigating it inch per inch.

Mr. Groce stated that's how this application started out, taking it out without mitigation and having a basic open space plan. Mitigation would be required by the property owner, regardless how we get there. The property owner is the Sterling Square HOA and that's who we would look to if the tree needed to be mitigated.

Commissioner McCarty stated that's the real point of the decision Staff made was if you do cut the tree down you will have to mitigate it. It wasn't whether or not you were giving them permission to cut down the tree.

Mr. Groce stated since the tree was healthy and not a hazard Staff didn't feel like they were empowered to cut down the tree. It was a question that was asked of Staff that they did not feel in good faith they could approve that.

Commissioner McCarty stated there is a definitely a good paper trail on why the tree is there. It's amazing a tree that is close to the curb survived and is doing well.

Commissioner Lesnick asked what kind of property damage the tree caused to the neighbor.

Mr. Groce stated they included some information in the packet about the roof and gutters. When thinking about this case, there are trees all over town and with human habitation so close in proximity to trees people will have to limb up trees and clean gutters. All that being said, the alleged damages clutter what's the DRC's role, which is the review of the tree healthy, has out grown its space, or is a hazard tree. Depending on your answer to those questions is how you find if the Staff acted inappropriately in their decision.

Chairman Doss asked Attorney Mrs. Shea Oliver to provide insight of the law that was cited and give the DRC any legal advice that might help them make the decision.

Attorney Mrs. Shea Oliver stated there are two competing interests. From what she understands from the report the adjoining landowner is asking to exercise the right of self-help which would affectively destroy the tree. Either take it down or destroy it by excessive pruning. There actually is law that says when exercising self-help or trimming a tree the adjoining landowner cannot unduly harm the tree. So

excessive or aggressive pruning to the extent it will destroy the tree is actually not allowed under Tennessee law. What is within the authority of the Design Guidelines and the DRC was pretty clearly outlined by Mr. Groce. If it is not a hazard tree and has not outgrown its space then there is no reason to approve an amendment to the original tree plan. The original tree plan was a covenant between the Town and the contractor to preserve the tree and was part of the original development. They could have negotiated taking down the tree at that time but they didn't. They made a covenant with the Town to save that tree. We are facing the question whether or not if it has out grown its space, which a certified arborist said it had not. Is it a healthy tree? It is. According to the Guidelines there is no reason to take down the tree. On the legal side of things, the Town has acted in their authority by Staff acting with their authority to deny that request.

Mr. Walker stated he did not know that in the law that the person taking action to remove the encroachment cannot damage the tree.

Chairman Doss stated that's what was said.

Mr. Walker stated well obviously the HOA's opposition would be if the adjacent owner tries to take the encroaching limbs down they are damaging the tree and their opposition would be to legally hold them responsible for doing so.

Hearing no questions or comments, Chairman Doss called for a motion.

Motion by Commissioner McCarty, and seconded, to overrule staff's interpretation of the Design Guidelines, provided that COS#6 be replanted via a landscaping plan approved by the DRC and that the existing tree be replaced in-per-inch per the Town's Tree Policy (see Exhibit 9), with payments made to the Town's tree bank for any trees that would not be planted on COS#6.

Hearing no further discussion, Chairman Doss asked Mrs. Robbins to call the roll.

ROLL CALL:

Donhardt – no, McCarty – no, Lesnick – no, Lawhon – no, Doss - no

Motion Denied.

Mr. Hopper given the DRC's decision, clarified that when the pruning takes place on this tree that it should be supervised by the town staff and by a certified arborist.

Chairman Doss stated that's a very good recommendation. The applicant will have to come back to Staff to tell them what they are going to do because they are not going to tear this tree down, unless they take it to the BMA and go beyond this. When they come back and tell Staff what they would like to do they need to follow Mr. Hopper's recommendation or they need to come back to the DRC.

Chairman Doss stated his son works for the landscape designer (Blair Parker Design) that is associated with this project. He stated because of this he will not be voting for this item. He asked the other commissioners and the applicant if they would like for him to recuse himself or to stay and act as chair but abstain from voting?

Commissioner McCarty recommended Chairman Doss stay on as chair for this item but abstain from voting.

All were in agreement to this recommendation. Chairman Doss stayed to act as Chair for this item but must abstain from voting.

Collierville Canine Club – Request approval of a Preliminary Site Plan for a 4,000 square-foot, canine spa and kennel on 1.238 acres, located on the north side of US Highway 72.

Mr. Scott Henninger gave the staff presentation. There are 5 key questions for this project. Key questions 1-3 were addressed by the Planning Commission and 4-5 will be address this evening before the DRC. He explained that the site indicates that there will be 11 parking spaces in front of the building. This parking is comparable to the Claridge pet spa. The applicant is well exceeding the 30% open space requirement with 76.68%. They have asked to use the alternative tree policy which is 18 trees per acre but because of the significant retainage of trees they will actually be well exceeding that with 52.5 trees per acre. There will be a large dog run area to the side and rear of the building along with a pool for the dogs to play in. In the frontage of the property there will be a 40’ buffer that will contain a detention basin. He explained the type of landscaping that will be used. He showed the elevations and some of the materials that will be used. A remote wall is only allowed in industrial zonings. He explained what kind of fences could be used. There were some complied with the noise ordinance from the PC meeting. He showed where the fences would go. The applicant was requesting a chain-link fence.

- | |
|---|
| <p style="text-align: center;">EXHIBITS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Cover Letter (received 11/08/16)2. Site Plan Exhibits (received 11/08/16)3. Color Exhibits (received 11/08/16) |
|---|

Key Question #4: Is a “remote wall” permitted outside industrial uses?

It is not. Remote walls are only permitted in industrial districts. There is potential, as trees are thinned out, some of the residential property to the east may see the remote wall. DRC Condition #16 will require the majority of the rear wall be of brick or stone.

Key Question #5: Is a chain-link fence appropriate outside industrial areas?

Generally not, an opaque fence with evergreen landscaping is needed to screen the dog run and trash bins from adjacent residential property. There are some DRC conditions to make sure it is screened. A 20’ buffer (adjacent to residential) and 10-foot buffer (commercial) should provide a sound and visual buffer in addition to the PC Conditions related to noise.

He explained the fencing plan for this application.

He explained the next steps for the applicant and the motion attached to the staff report.

Chairman Doss asked if there were any questions of staff.

Commissioner McCarty asked if the developer was okay with the other conditions of approval.

Mr. Henninger stated generally, yes.

Hearing no questions or discussion, Chairman Doss asked the applicant to come to the podium.

Mr. Mark Underwood., 784 Deans Creek Drive, stated they love the use of this property he thinks it is the perfect use for this area. He does have some questions and concerns regarding the buffers and some of the fence heights.

Chairman Doss asked if there were any particular conditions the applicant would like to discuss.

Mr. Underwood stated this is in regards to how dense this site is with existing vegetation. The vision the applicant has is to let the dogs run in the back. He asked why take out existing vegetation that acts as a buffer and screening and replace it with something that will take 10-15 years to grow into what they already have. The fencing on the site plan is being pushed back and on the northwest side the entire line is not residential only a portion of it is.

Mr. Brandon Doss, Blair Parker Design, 5159 Wheelis Drive Ste. 107, Memphis, TN, stated the three conditions, 3, 4 and 6, affect the buffers. He showed and explained some photos of the current view within the site looking out and the dense existing natural buffers. He stated due to the zoning, the portion of fence that Staff has asked to be 8' in height does not extend the entire east property line.

There was a discussion over the zonings around this property and how they affect the buffering.

Commissioner McCarty stated it is definitely hard to tear down a better buffer. If they do make a motion for a change to the buffer there would have to be some provisions that everybody meets out on site when the limited clearing occurs and when the fence is built to make sure all is adequately screened with existing vegetation. He is concerned because they can't expect the neighbors to provide the screening. There should be screening from both sides, provided by this property and future neighboring properties.

Mr. Underwood stated the applicant is in agreement to have Staff involved on site to determine if there is a view corridor and to make sure it is shielded. Instead of tearing out every existing buffer and replanting it, why not utilize what is there.

There was a discussion over the next steps for this project and making sure the applicant provides a plan with what existing vegetation they are keeping as buffering and which they will be removing.

Commissioner Donhardt asked if the applicant is proposing that do not use a fence.

Mr. Doss stated they are proposing to do a fence and would like for it to be a 6' fence along the entire length instead of a mixture of 6' and 8' for aesthetic reasons. To his understanding of the guidelines, an 8' fence is allowed but a 6' will also be acceptable. The proposal will be to do the 6' wood fence and to have the masonry columns along the frontage of Hwy 72 and not the entire property along the dog run.

Commissioner Lawhon asked if the applicant still proposed to have the shrubs along the fence line adjacent to the Sunset Motel or were they going to leave that natural.

Mr. Doss stated they would like to leave it natural but agrees with Commissioner McCarty's recommendation to revisit the screening with Staff once the clearing and installation of the fence have taken place.

There was a discussion over types of existing vegetation that will be used as a buffer on the site and why it is important to the applicant to not install new landscaping until after the clearing has taken place.

Mr. Groce stated he hears the applicant doesn't agree with condition 6 and would like to take out the part of condition 4 that refers to the 8' fence. If the DRC wants to go down the path of field vegetation it would be beneficial to have real clear perimeters such as prior to Certificate of Occupancy that plants are field located and the intent is to supplement exhibits to existing vegetation to screen off site residential uses.

There was a discussion over what was decided for landscaping on the Orgil property because it was similar to this request.

Chairman Doss started a discussion over the 21 conditions. It was determined that there were no issues with conditions 1-2, 8-12, 15, 19-21.

Concerning Condition 3, Mr. Doss stated they would like to ask that the fence be installed along the property line not along the 10' buffer and/or 20' buffer line so they can have that be usable space. The idea of the dog run area to be located in the back of the property is to allow the dogs to interact with each other and all the remaining natural vegetation.

A discussion ensued over placing the fence on the property line. It was determined the fence could be placed on the property line along with a landscape buffer inside the fence because the guidelines do not stipulate the placement of the fence.

Mr. Underwood asked of brick columns have to exist around the perimeter or can they exist only along the Hwy 72 frontage.

Mr. Groce stated he will have to do some research and will get back to the applicant.

Commissioner McCarty asked if it is a requirement to have an 8' fence adjacent to residential property.

Mr. Henninger stated there is no such requirement. It was more of a buffer for the noise.

Commissioner McCarty stated from an engineering stand point, he has been told that neither vegetation nor wood fences block any form of sound.

Mr. Doss stated they would like to request the ability to use a chain-link fence inside the wood perimeter fence to partition off smaller areas within the dog run space.

Commissioner McCarty asked what would be the height of the chain-link fence.

Mr. Doss stated it would not exceed the height of the 6' wooden fence and not visible.

There was a discussion over what the standard sizes chain-linked fences come in and if the chain-link fence is visible in certain areas the DRC could add in a condition to have it screened.

Mr. Doss stated they would like to not plant additional shrubs under the 27" oak tree dripline to prevent disturbing the root system.

There was a discussion over the areas on the property the applicant felt okay to plant additional shrubs and how the planting of the shrubs will actually be less invasive then putting up a fence.

Mr. Groce stated he can provide some insight on the brick columns have to exist around the perimeter. The Ordinance states any time you have a 50' run there must be some type of vertical piers. It must be a pier of a different material, a different width or different height. He stated people almost always use a masonry columns, but he has seen people use really big posts.

Commissioner McCarty asked if that applies to the whole fence and not just the Hwy 72 frontage.

Mr. Groce stated that is correct.

A discussion ensued over taking the word masonry out of condition 4 because the DRC felt a wider wooden column may be more beneficial in causing less damage to the oak tree.

There was a discussion over how the applicant can still add in landscaping to screen the fence without causing damage to the oak tree.

Another discussion ensued over having the site be visually verified for accurate screening prior to Certificate of Occupation.

Scot Woodard, Woodard Architecture, 1014 Courtfield Cove, asked for a possible variance to lighten up the load of this project to have EIFS on the back of the building. They are showing as a cream color but they can change it to brown or however to try and blend in with the existing foliage.

There a discussion over how there was still going to be 3 sides that were masonry and how the applicant will wrap columns by using controlled joints and change the color of the EIFS.

There was a discussion over what kind of CMU base that the applicant would like to use. There was concern over using this with the proximity to residential because the guidelines state facades of a building will not be visible to the public realm from a street, or primary entrance to the building or primary entrance to another building and to not abut a residential development or zoning district are considered remote walls. Because of this the wall cannot be remote and needs to remain 51% masonry. It was decided the CMU can be used if it's an architecture block and a full size sample is supplied to Staff.

Hearing no questions or comments, Chairman Doss called for a motion.

Motion by Commissioner McCarty, and seconded, to recommend that the BMA approve the request for a 4,000 square foot, canine spa and kennel on 1.238 acres, located on the north side of US Highway 72, subject to the following conditions:

1. With the Final Site Plan, provide manufacturers cut sheet of the bike rack and any other proposed site furnishings on the detail sheet and submit material and color samples for approval.
2. With the Final Site Plan, indicate all utility structures, transformers, generators, backflow preventers, rooftop units, etc. Locate such structures at the rear of the building where possible and indicate how they will be screened from public view, adjacent streets, and adjoining developments. Vents, meters, conduit, cameras, spouting and other roof and wall appurtenances shall be painted to match the surrounding architectural façade or roof color. Landscaping and screen walls can aid in concealing equipment (D.G. III., H). Roof elements and parapets shall be integrated into the building design and finished on all sides (D.G. IV., C., 4.).
3. Provide a 20-foot buffer along the property line shared with the residence and a 10-foot buffer along the property line shared with Sunset Inn (D.G. III., E., 7., f. & D.G. Appendix II). The fence around the dog run shall not extend into the buffer. *The fence can be on property line.*
4. The fence shall be constructed of cedar or equivalent material for longevity and shall include ~~masonry~~ columns no greater than 50-feet on-center, to match the materials on the building, at a spacing of no greater than 50 feet on-center (D.G. III., E., 7.). The opaque fence shall be at least 6 feet tall, ~~except for the portion abutting the east property adjacent to single family residential uses, which shall be 8 feet tall.~~ The trash bins shall be completely screen from view

by the fence and or evergreen landscaping. Label materials and provide dimensions on the details. *All of fence can be 6' tall, interior to the 6' cedar fence on the exterior of the development a green or black vinyl chain-link fence will be allowed as an interior cross fence. Columns do not need to be brick and can be any break in the fence as permitted by the Design Guidelines.*

5. Plant additional shrubs along the fencing northwest of the parking area fronting US Highway 72 to break up the long expanse of the fencing (D.G. III., E., 7.).
6. Extend the row of Liberty Hollies west along the entire boarder of the residentially zoned property and extend it east to wrap to the southeast property line to screen the property from adjacent land use and buffering both the residence and the Sunset Inn from the dog run (D.G. III., E. 7. & Noise Ordinance). *The landscaping is not to extend north of the fence and the area to the north shall be evaluated to ensure adequate screening of the facility prior to the CO of the building being issued.*
7. Provide evergreen foundation plantings around 30% to 40% of the foundation of the building including around the transformer and other structures that should be screened (D.G. III., E., 5.).
8. Show the backflow preventer indicated on the Utility Plan and any other structures requiring screening on the Landscape and Lighting Plan and provide the required evergreen shrubs for screening (D.G. III., H. & Site Plan Checklist).
9. Landscaping shall not encroach within 3 feet of any fire protection equipment.
10. On the Final Site Plans, provide manufacturers cut sheets of all pole, wall mounted, canopy lighting, as well as any floodlights for the monument sign. Indicate all selected options such as pole heights, shielding, as well as the fixture color on the Manufacturers Cuts Sheets as well as a Luminaire Schedule.
11. All light fixtures shall be full cut-off, recessed into the canopy, and shielded to prevent light trespass into vehicular and pedestrian areas and all fixtures shall meet the requirements of the Lighting Ordinance All lighting shall meet the Lighting Ordinance (§151.190) and intent of the Design Guidelines (D.G. III., F).
12. With the Final Site Plan, provide a photometric plan for all fixtures on the lighting plans as well as the Town of Collierville Standard Lighting Data Chart including foot candle average, minimum, maximum, and uniformity ratio. In addition, provide lighting notes and installation details (§151.190).
13. Provide the light “corridor” required by Zoning Ordinance on the Final Site Plan. Include emergency lighting on the plan at all entrances as well cut sheets. Emergency lighting should be painted to match the architectural façade, canopy, or trim on a building (D.G. III., H).
14. The articulation should extend around to the rear of the building as the rear may be visible from adjacent property. Wrap the columns to the rear of the building for articulation (D.G. IV., C., 2.).
15. On the Final Site Plan, provide a Roof Plan indicating all rooftop equipment, penetrations, scuppers, spouting, and parapets (Site Plan Checklist).
16. EIFS is indicated on the rear elevation as a primary material and is not permitted as a primary material in GC Zoning (D.G. IV., C., 5.). Use brick or stone matching other primary materials for the majority (at least 51% of the material used).
17. The EIFS indicated on the Material Board, bone white, shall be muted to a cream color (D.G. IV., C., 5., b.) similar or matching the misty gray cornice. Change the bone white to match the colors indicated on the Elevations in the Keynotes.
18. The CMU base indicated on the elevations appears to be a large block ~~and will not meet the intent of the Design Guidelines (IV., C., 5.) with regards to material if of a large dimension.~~ *The CMU blocks in question will be allowed if it is an architectural CMU block after a submittal has been received, reviewed, and approved by the Town of Collierville.*

19. The Exterior Finish Schedule on the Material Board will need to be revised prior to Final Site Plan application as needed to address the conditions of approval.
20. On the Final Site Plans, provide width and height dimensions for façade elements such as windows, doors, columns/pilasters, cornice, base/water table, parapets, canopies/awnings, and sign panel location on the elevations (Site Plan Checklist).
21. Signage is fully reviewed through a separate process. Submit sign application(s) prior to erection of any signage (Sign Ordinance).

Hearing no further discussion, Chairman Doss asked Mrs. Robbins to call the roll.

ROLL CALL:

Donhardt – yes, McCarty – yes, Lesnick – yes, Lawhon – yes, Doss – abstain.

Motion Approved.

Other Business:

Chairman Doss asked if there was any other business.

Mr. Groce stated they have not released the development activity map yet that reflects the activity from November. He stated we will be sure to forward it to you once we have. There are a couple of items to note on such as Kirkland's and some residential neighborhoods like Magnolia Preserve.

Mr. Groce stated this was Linda Lesnick's last DRC meeting.

Hearing no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:52 pm.

Cindy Sadler, Secretary