

The regular meeting of the **Design Review Commission** was held on July 14, 2016, at 5:48 pm in the Board Chambers of Town Hall, 500 Poplar View Parkway.

The following staff members were present: Town Planner, Mr. Jaime Groce, and Administrative Specialist, Mrs. Shari Michael.

ROLL CALL:

Patton – present, Donhardt – present, Lesnick – absent, 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 June 9, 2016 minutes.

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

Motion by Vice-Chairman McCarty, and seconded, to approve the June 9, 2016.

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

ROLL CALL:

Donhardt – yes, Lawhon – yes, McCarty – yes, Patton – yes, Doss - abstain.

Motion Approved.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

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

Mr. Jaime Groce stated that staff would like to switch the order of items 6.C. and 6.D. so that the applicant of 6.D. does not have to sit through the third item on the agenda, which is a Town initiated presentation.

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

Motion by Alderman Patton, and seconded to approve the agenda as amended.

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

ROLL CALL:

Donhardt – yes, Lawhon – yes, McCarty – yes, Patton – yes, Doss - yes.

Motion Approved.

Formal Agenda

DRC16-12 – Villages of Porter Farms, Phase 16, Assisted Living Facility.

Mr. Jaime Groce gave the staff presentation. He explained that the application is for an assisted living with memory care facility with 99 units and will be located in Area 1 of the Villages at Porter Farms PD. He reviewed the color elevations and site data. The applicant shows 120 parking spaces on their plan, but that is more than what is required. Only 35 spaces are required, and they don't exceed the cap either. The applicant has other facilities like this in other communities and they realized after submitting that they don't need this many parking spaces. The Planning Commission (PC) adding a condition of approval the other night that essentially says that the applicant can eliminate parking spaces with staff's approval, but requesting anything less than 70 spaces must come back to the PC for approval. Commissioner Rice said he like that there was some extra parking to accommodate holidays and high peak times. Mr. Groce explained that there are two key questions to consider tonight and they are:

- Are the required buffers and fences provided?
- Does the landscaping meet the Design Guidelines?

The landscaping plates that the applicant has submitted does meet all of the Design Guidelines and the required buffers and fences have been provided. There is a greenbelt trail that will go across the back of the property. He showed the front and rear elevations and explained the next steps for the applicant and explained the conditions of approval contained in the staff report and the applicant is in agreement with them. There is a new condition of approval number 6 to follow along with what the PC's thought on parking are and it says, "Any additional landscaping that might be added as result of a reduction in the number of parking spaces shall be reviewed administratively by staff."

Chairman Doss asked if there were any questions of staff.

Hearing none, he called the applicant to the podium.

Mr. Michael Rogers, representative for the applicant addressed the commissioners. He explained that they are fine with all of the conditions, including the 6th one that has been added.

Chairman Doss asked if there were any questions of the applicant.

Vice-Chairman McCarty asked if they know which parking spaces they are taking out.

Mr. Rogers explained that they aren't sure which ones yet, but they will be conducting a study to see which ones can be eliminated, but they do know they will leave at least 70.

A discussion ensued regarding the main entrance to the memory care building. Mr. Rogers explained that there is no covered drop off area at the Memory Care facility and there are two separate buildings for that. They basically only offer an entrance for the family and friends to come and visit.

A discussion ensued regarding the area of the courtyard. Mr. Rogers explained that there will be certain

EXHIBITS:

1. Applicant's cover letter (6/13/16)
2. Preliminary Site Plan Package (6/13/16)
3. Color Building Perspectives (6/17/16)
4. Summary of building materials & colors (5/10/16)
5. Applicant's traffic generation letter (5/10/16)
6. Villages at Porter Farms Landscape Plates

plantings, seating structures and walking areas designed specifically for those type of patients. He stated that Ms. Link is in the audience tonight can address those concerns to the DRC.

Ms. Elizabeth Link, representative for the facility, addressed the commissioners. She explained that in the courtyard they are proposing a high wall and that courtyard area is to be a privacy and care containment center for patients and family members to enjoy the outside without wondering off. The design does offer shaded areas and places for people to sit comfortably. It will be a state-of-the-art area and they have used this type of design in other facilities around the country.

Commissioner Donhardt stated that she has sent staff a link with some plant and design suggestions for assisted living and memory care facilities so that they can forward on to the applicant.

Ms. Link stated that she will be happy to review it.

Commissioner Lawhon asked about landscaping back in the area of the greenbelt trail.

Mr. Rogers stated that they did add more landscaping and added a private pedestrian connection to the trail.

Hearing no questions or discussion, Chairman Doss asked for a motion.

Motion by Vice-Chairman McCarty, and seconded, to recommend that the BMA - To recommend that the BMA approve the request for a Preliminary Site Plan for the Villages of Porter Farms Assisted Living facility (Villages at Porter Farms, Phase 16) subject to the following conditions, adding condition number 6 as follows:

1. This development is subject to all applicable standard conditions of approval as adopted by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, Resolution 2006-54.
2. The approval of the Preliminary Site Plan shall be contingent on the approval of the amendment of the Villages at Porter Farms PD Outline Plan (Resolution 2016-23) by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen.

3. Provide the following on the Site Layout:
 - a. All landscape islands shall be a minimum of 200 square feet.
 - b. Provide details on the fountain that is called out on the north side of the site.
 - c. Specify the type of usable open spaces (Active Recreational or Formally Planned).
4. Provide the following on the Landscape Plan:
 - a. The flowering cherry trees shall be placed a minimum of 5 feet from the back of the curb.
 - b. Show the location of the detention area.
 - c. Remove all conflicts between trees and light poles.
 - d. Include symbols for the light fixtures on the lighting schedule.
 - e. The backflow preventer shall be screened with evergreens.
 - f. Show the location of the ground sign with the associated landscaping.
 - g. To meet the intent of the Design Guidelines regarding development entrances, provide ornamental shrubs, ground cover, and small trees of special detail, color, scale, and variety. The design of the entryway landscape features should respond in scale to the entry and buildings and in plant material to the rest of the site to reinforce the character of the development.
 - h. Provide landscaping at the South Shea Road entrance.
 - i. Provide adequate screening for all ground mounted HVAC units.
 - j. Provide landscaping within the courtyards which are usable open spaces.
 - k. All lawn areas shall be covered with sod. Seed is not allowed.
 - l. Use call outs for the shrubs.
 - m. Label the light fixtures on the plan.
 - n. Include the overall height of the pole lights, including the fixtures.
 - o. All meters and vents shall be screened with landscaping. If unable to screen, then they must be painted to match the building.
 - p. Show the location of any flagpoles and associated landscaping.
 - q. With the Final Site Plan, provide a cut sheet for the bike racks and fountain.
 - r. With the Final Site Plan, provide an updated color rendering of the landscape plan.
5. Provide the following on the Elevations:
 - a. Confirm all callouts on the rear elevation (Sheet A2.01). One calls out brick but is attached to what looks like stone.
 - b. Confirm the scale for the elevations on Sheet A2.0.
 - c. Provide the color of the vinyl gates and precast concrete cap on the trash enclosure.
6. **Any additional landscaping that might be added as result of a reduction in the number of parking spaces shall be reviewed administratively by staff.**

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

ROLL CALL:

Donhardt – yes, Lawhon – yes, Patton – abstain, McCarty – yes, Doss - yes.

Motion Approved

DRC16-13 – Appeal of a staff decision on May 24, 2016, related to exterior colors, building materials, lighting and landscaping for the Arby’s Restaurant (#86) at 987 West Poplar Avenue.

Mr. Jaime Groce gave the staff presentation. He explained that the applicant submitted a site plan modification and they are responding to the staff’s interpretation of the Design Guidelines in their administrative review denial in 3 areas:

- the use of muted, earth tone colors such as reds, browns, tans, grays, and greens and avoiding primary colors or bright accent colors and stark contrast colors,
- avoiding white by using cream colors, and
- the use of brick, stone, wood siding fibrous cement siding, and artificial stone as primary building materials.

EXHIBITS:

1. Staff comments provided by the Diana Dubois in response to application submitted May 10 and 18, 2016, (5/24/16)
2. Applicant’s letter of appeal to DRC with responses to staff comments (received 6/14/16)
3. Arby’s Restaurant #86 Building Remodel Plans (received 6/14/16)
4. Photos of existing building (7/8/16)
5. Arby’s Material and Color Sample Board (received 6/14/16)
6. Design Guidelines Section IV.C.5. Materials, Texture, and Color
7. Design Guidelines Section I.H. Aging Nonresidential Development & “Test” for Deviations from the Design Guidelines

Sometimes staff is able to work through the issues with the applicant; however, in this case the applicant is appealing the staff’s interpretation of the Design Guidelines. In their application the applicant has suggested using a bright red and white paint colors on the renovation, along with new EIFS applied on the front of the building. The current design was approved by the DRC in 1994. There was another request by the applicant in 2010 for changes to the building and the landscaping but that was withdrawn and never moved forward for any public review. He showed pictures of the existing elevations and the proposed elevations. He reviewed the 3 key questions:

- Do the proposed colors comply with the Design Guidelines Building Guidelines for color?
- Does the proposed building exterior comply with the Design Guidelines Building Guidelines for appropriate exterior building materials?
- What other improvement are proposed?

The applicant is proposing to use bright white and tan EIFS again on the façade and have different red canopy. The white painted EIFS, new EIFS and red color are what does not comply. When an applicant is remodeling, this is when staff typically asks for an upgrade of materials, especially when it involves a “re-skinning” of the building. The applicant would need to comply with the current Design Guidelines as much as possible as it currently calls for improvements to be made under the current standards. More currently, Burger King down the street, did a complete renovation of their site and they were able to work with staff to incorporate muted tones of paint along with brick and stone. Ultimately, the Board of Mayor and Aldermen are the ones to make the final decision on waivers from the Design Guidelines, so your decision tonight will be a recommendation to the BMA. The current application before you tonight does not warrant any exceptions according to the criteria in the Design Guidelines that would justify the BMA issuing a waiver. He reviewed next steps for the applicant and the example motion contained in the staff report.

Chairman Doss asked if there were any questions of staff.

Hearing none, he called the applicant forward.

Mr. Chaz Daugherty, construction project manager for Arby's, addressed the commissioners. He explained that he has photographs of the true design color of the building and submitted it to the commissioners for them to review.

Vice-Chairman McCarty asked if it was a total "re-skinning" the building.

Mr. Daugherty stated that they were only going to "re-skin" on the front and the rest of the building would remain the same, but painted to the new color scheme they submitted in their original application. It will be new EIFS on the front with a faux brick look with the grout in it, and the brown part at the top has a "v" groove. Below the red color will be a dark brown color and it is called Rockwood Brown, not tan as described by staff.

Chairman asked what the corporate opinion was of the staff's comments.

Mr. Daugherty stated that he did not know as he just got assigned this store last week.

Commissioner Lawhon asked if a landscaping plan was submitted.

Mr. Groce explained that they asked the applicant to submit a landscaping plan but that part of the site review was not appealed. They will be expected to replace any dead or out of conformance landscaping.

Chairman Doss asked Mr. Daugherty if he had even seen the letter from staff that the company was appealing.

Mr. Daugherty stated that he had not.

Chairman Doss stated that there were 20 items listed in staff's review that had issues, dated June 14, 2016. He suggested that Mr. Daugherty should get a copy of this letter to review.

Alderman Patton stated that this is definitely a non-conforming site and wouldn't it be prudent to work with the applicant to make some changes, rather than leave it the way it is now. He would like to find an easier way to help these applicant's conform, rather than just leave it alone.

Mr. Groce stated that if they are wanting to redo the building, then any new work has to comply with the Design Guidelines. There are many issues that do not comply on this application and so this must come before the DRC for a waiver of these staff concerns.

Alderman Patton said in the future we could just focus on the most substantive conversions and try to make it easier for the non-conforming sites.

Chairman Doss stated that he agrees with both sides, and feels that the staff's interpretation is concise and according to the applicant's response letter they are not willing to budge with anything. Based on what he sees tonight, if the applicant is not willing to work with staff then they need to go to the BMA if they want to appeal.

Vice-Chairman McCarty stated that he agrees with both sides but if we could get into a work session environment, there is a "happy medium" to be met here. We do not want to deter businesses from fixing up their store fronts. That is never the intent of the Design Guidelines, staff, or the DRC.

A discussion ensued regarding the proposed colors and what steps might be needed next before appealing it before the BMA.

Mr. Daugherty stated that he will go back to headquarters and convey with them that a work session may be in order to work out the details of what is acceptable and conforms to the Town's Design Guidelines.

Hearing no questions or discussion, Chairman Doss asked for a motion.

Motion by Vice-Chairman McCarty, and seconded, to recommend to overrule staffs interpretation of the Design Guidelines found in comments, 1, 2 and 3 of the Site Plan Modification/Exterior Alteration.

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

ROLL CALL:

Donhardt – no, Lawhon – no, Patton – no, McCarty – no, Doss - no.

Motion denied.

DRC16-16 – Appeal of a staff decision related to an opaque fence within a required landscape buffer and parking between the street and the principal building.

Mr. Jaime Groce gave the staff presentation. The applicant is proposing a 100,000 square foot, 4-story building on Houston Levee Road, just west of the FedEx Tech Center. This building is being considered as an Economic “fast-track” project and the have received a “PILOT” from the Town. Staff has reviewed their plan administratively, however, some issues were noted and the applicant is appealing them. This request is an appeal of staff's interpretation of the Design Guidelines in two areas:

EXHIBITS:

1. Planning staff comments provided by the Town Planner in response to application submitted May 31, 2016 (6/29/16)
2. Applicant's letter of appeal to DRC (7/5/16)
3. Proposed Orgill, Inc., site layout (7/7/16)
4. Proposed Orgill, Inc., landscape planting plan (7/5/16)
5. Aerial photo

- limiting the amount of parking between the street and a principal building oriented to the street to no more than one double row of nose-in parking between the building and the street to which it is oriented, and
- providing an opaque fence as part of the minimum landscape buffer requirement between an MPO Medical Professional Office Zoning district and a residential district.

He explained that he will cover three key questions for the DRC to consider. They are:

- Does the irregular shape of the lot and the orientation of the building justify allowing parking between the proposed building and S. Houston Levee Road?
- Should the development be exempt from the Design Guidelines fencing requirement to preserve the existing vegetation on the east side of the site?
- What does the 2040 Plan show for the future use of the property to the east?

The building will be located on the lot where it faces a curve in the road and this is not a triangular piece of property. While driving north on Houston Levee Road, it would appear that there is a lot of parking on the site and as you travel further north around the curve you will see more parking to the right. The building façade interpretation shows that the applicant is requesting more parking than what is typically allowed. The applicants argue that because of the curve in the road and the orientation of the building that the actual setback from the road is measured from the road and the corner of the building showing that they have very limited parking in the “front yard”. The site will be significantly landscaped and they plan on having lots of trees to help screen the parking areas. They have a heavy natural buffer of pine trees along the back property line going to the east and they plan to preserve that. If they are required to put in a fence in that area, they would damage the trees that are already there. It is very densely wooded on their side as well as the adjacent potential residential side. The 2040 Plan calls for this area to develop as a Mixed Use Activity Center and there could be other office buildings coming in later to the east, and if that happens then the buffer requirements would not apply. He explained the next steps for the applicant and the example motion in the staff report.

Chairman Doss asked if there were any questions of staff.

Hearing none, he called the applicant to the podium.

Mr. Mike Davis, designer for the applicant, addressed the commissioners. He explained that the orientation of the building is dictated by several factors. The triangular shape of the lot, the footprint of the building and the location of the required stormwater detention. In the northwest corner they have an average of 200 feet between the buffer and the street to meet the intent of the Guidelines. They did numerous layouts to try to fit everything onto this configuration and this was the most efficient design they could come up with. This plan preserves a significant amount of vegetation on the site and along the east boundary line of the site. Regarding the required fence along the eastern property line, they would have to disturb and remove an entire line of existing trees in order to put a 1,200 linear foot fence in. Since there is no residential development on the property to the east of them now, and probably not in the future, they do not feel that it is necessary for them to waste their time and money on a fence at this time, or needed in the future. They would appreciate the DRC affirming their appeal.

Chairman Doss asked if there were any questions of the applicant.

Vice-Chairman McCarty stated that he has concerns with the grading of the site.

Mr. Davis stated that are not really changing the grade of the site, but the bottom corner of the site is lower where the parking lot will be. The building sets on a ridgeline and is cut down a little bit. They are preserving a 30-foot area of trees. The north end has a little fill where the detention and other parking lot will be. They are building a berm or a dam to control the water flow in that area. He explained that he feels that the parking location is okay in that area and he doesn't see any issues as they are adding a lot of landscaping and architectural interests to the building. The applicant is only planning on occupying the first three floors for a while. They will be required to build the additional parking area in question when they occupy the fourth floor, but no one knows an exact date for that yet. Phasing construction will be a part of the development agreement. It will be graded initially and storm drainage will be put in on the front end.

A discussion ensued regarding the applicant having to disturb all the trees in order to install a fence on the east boundary line. They would plant upright evergreens along the area that may not be as dense to fill in and complete the buffer line.

Chairman Doss asked if there were any concerns with the parking issues.

Vice-Chairman McCarty and Alderman Patton stated that they do not see any issues with the parking location because of the orientation of the building on the site. Chairman Doss agreed, as long as landscaping is added to buffer it from the street view.

Alderman Patton stated that he feels staff should look at the Design Guidelines about how that is to be done and address that in the development agreement.

Commissioner Lawhon stated that he feels supplemental landscaping can address those issues in the future. As far as the fence goes, it is important to buffer an office building from a residential area, but given the circumstances that there is nothing there now, he feels that we should leave trees and existing vegetation when possible. Using evergreen trees closer to the where the future parking lots will be located, would help to screen it in the future.

Mr. Davis agreed and stated that a lot of the proposed trees are evergreen now and they will add extra where needed.

Chairman Doss asked what the solution is to the fence requirement.

Alderman Patton stated that the BMA has changed the direction of the future zoning in that area and he feels that in lieu of a fence, they can provide a landscape buffer along the east line with a row of evergreens that is acceptable of staff.

Hearing no questions or discussion, Chairman Doss asked for a motion.

Motion by Vice-Chairman McCarty, and seconded, to overrule staff's interpretation of the Design Guidelines found in the consolidated staff comments for the Orgill, Inc. Final Site Plan staff review dated June 29, 2016 (specifically comments #19 and #23) on the required parking and to allow the parking to proceed as submitted and to overrule the fence requirement along the east property line with the condition that staff approves an evergreen landscaping buffer in that area and the applicant will need to add extra landscaping where the parking is non-conforming.

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

ROLL CALL:

Donhardt – yes, Lawhon – yes, Patton – yes, McCarty – yes, Doss - yes.

Motion Approved

DRC16-15 – Resolution 2016-30- A Resolution to amend Chapter 1 of the Design Guidelines related to classifying the Town's built environment as being either a Traditional Area or Conventional Area and Appendix IV related to the setbacks and exterior building materials required for Attached Dwellings.

Mr. Jaime Groce gave the staff presentation. He explained that Resolution 2016-30 is an update to the

EXHIBITS

1. Resolution 2016-30, with Attachments A and B (July 7, 2016)
2. Example of Mostly Brick Building (Carrington I “hard corner” building)
3. Example of Mostly Siding Building (Carrington II courtyard buildings)
4. Appendix IV (Attached Dwelling Guidelines) adopted 2014
5. 2007 Dwelling Guidelines Related to Multifamily (prior to 2014 amendments)
6. Summary Table of Existing Stand-Alone Apartments (July 2016)
7. Map Showing Existing and Future Stand-Alone Apartments Development, May 9, 2016
8. Traditional and Conventional Development Forms Explained

Design Guidelines document initiated by the staff at the request of the Town Administrator. The changes only affect two portions of the Guidelines, Appendix IV, Design Guidelines for Attached Dwellings, and Chapter 1, which provides guidance as to the desired development form for various areas of Town. The BMA has the final decision on amendments to the Design Guidelines, after a recommendation from the DRC. There are 5 key questions to consider with this request and they are:

- How was the design of multifamily regulated prior to 2014?
- What action did the DRC and BMA take in 2014 due to the increase in stand-alone apartment applications?
- Why are further changes necessary to the 2014 amendments?
- What would be different if this amendment is adopted?

Mr. Groce gave an overview of the differences between “form” and “use”. He explained that the Design guidelines are a commonly used tool intended to balance the welfare of the general public with the interests of individual property owners. In their various forms since 1994, the Design Guidelines have been used by design professionals and applicants as they work to design a building and related site improvements that are compatible with their surroundings and appropriate for the Town. When the Design Guidelines were comprehensively updated in 2007, multifamily buildings were only broadly addressed, as the Guidelines were very general, and the guidelines about detailing and building materials were broad and mostly pertained to commercial examples. This meant that multifamily projects submitted after 2007, such as Westbrook Crossing and Signature, had to be carefully reviewed without specific guidance on building details, placement, parking, and buffering as it pertains to multifamily. Most multifamily projects are within Planned Developments (PDs), which almost always have specific design criteria.

The Collierville 2040 Land Use Plan was adopted in 2012. During its drafting, concerns were expressed by staff and the BMA that the current Collierville Design Guidelines are not sufficient to produce quality multifamily projects. The 2040 Plan was adopted with language stating that “the Collierville Design Guidelines should be updated to strengthen guidelines related to apartments, townhouses, and condominiums...to better implement the recommendations of the Multifamily Policy.” After several DRC work sessions, in 2014 the BMA adopted Resolution 2014-01, which established detailed Attached Dwelling Guidelines and usable open space requirements.

Three stand-alone apartments have been built/approved under the new guidelines, Carrington I and II and Meridian Park. Administration has received critical comments over the amount of horizontal lap siding used on the apartment buildings, as well as the proximity of the apartment buildings to adjacent roadways. For context, Carrington II will be 90 feet from Winchester Blvd., and Westbrook Crossing is 30 feet from South Shea Rd., while the closest structure in Bailey Creek Apartments is the leasing office and it is 200 feet from Winchester Blvd. Bailey Creek’s nearest dwelling unit is 230 feet from Bailey Station Rd. and 330 feet from Winchester Rd.

This leads us to the question of why are further changes necessary to the 2014 amendments. This change would insure that buildings that are mostly siding (wood or fibrous cement) would no longer be an option, as building facades will need to be comprised of brick, or stone for a minimum of 75 percent of the net facade area (excluding windows and doors). There would be larger setback for conventional area apartments and any multifamily dwelling (building containing three or more dwelling units, including units located one over the other) would need to be set back at least 200 feet from the nearest travel lane of adjacent public roads (per the Major Road Plan. As written, this larger setback would not apply to townhouses or duplex structures, and would not apply in Traditional Areas.

The map in Chapter 1 would amend the map to discourage, with the exception of the I-269 area, the possibility of Traditional development forms. The DRC and BMA may want to further eliminate Traditional Areas from the map, but it should be noted that the map is coordinated with polices within the 2040 Land Use

Plan. If further edits are desired, the Downtown Collierville and I-269 Small Areas should keep the Traditional designation, as traditional design elements are significant parts of these plans.

The 2040 Plan says that “stand-alone apartment complexes should be confined to...existing sites presently zoned within the Town, including currently-approved planned developments that presently have designated multi-family (stand-alone apartment) housing areas.” This policy was created so that the Town realizes no net gain in multifamily dwelling units at build-out. An exception to this policy is any stand-alone multifamily (apartment) developments that could occur in the Downtown Collierville Small Area Plan (2010), which was adopted prior to the Collierville 2040 Plan (2012). When read together, the Town-wide number of “stand-alone” apartments should not exceed 3,532 dwelling units, which does not include the 551 stand-alone apartments that could potentially be built in the Downtown area, although many of those could be duplexes, townhouses, or condos. This clarification serves as a maximum number of stand-alone apartments the community will see at build-out. Given the existing and approved (but not built) properties entitled prior to 2011 to build stand-alone apartments, the Town should expect to see only around 931 more stand-alone apartments built outside of the Downtown Area. There are specific areas where new stand-alone multifamily (apartment) developments could occur, and these units would be affected by the proposed amendments.

Chairman Doss asked if there were any questions of staff particularly the section covering mostly brick or stone areas.

Commissioner McCarty asked if making these changes will overrule the point system that was added in 2014 for developers to follow for new apartments.

Mr. Groce stated that this amendment would overrule the point system when it comes to building materials as it would be more stringent. He feels that the developers will get more creative to provide variety and the painting of brick will be an option to break up the large façade if they go with all brick in their design.

A discussion ensued about how the facades of apartments are around town now and the ones that have been recently built. The point system will not go away, but will work with this masonry rule.

Chairman Doss asked if the commissioners were comfortable with the larger setbacks/buffer requirements for conventional area apartments.

A discussion ensued regarding whether or not the choice of a 200 foot setback or a 50 foot buffer is appropriate for new apartments in a Conventional Area, unless it is in a PD that has other standards. It was the consensus of the commissioners that this was appropriate. If someone wanted to change it in the future for their certain development they could apply for a waiver from the Design Guidelines.

Chairman Doss asked if there was any discussion regarding changing the map to show only conventional forms to be allowed in the properties located on the south side of SR385, with the exception of the I-269 corridor.

Vice-Chairman McCarty asked if there were any existing properties in that area now that are traditional forms.

Mr. Groce explained that there are some that are single-family, but the DRC does not regulate those. If someone wanted to do a corner store then the conventional form standards would apply.

Hearing no more discussion, Chairman Doss called a citizen forward who wished to speak.

Mr. Les Binkley, representative with Schilling Farms. LLC, addressed the commissioners. He stated that Area 2 and 12 in Schilling Farms regulates both of the areas on the map in their property around the “horseshoe” and a portion on the west side, which is in the PD and a very traditional form. The entitlement package itself has very strong language about requiring traditional development patterns to be in this area. Their entitlements that are guiding their development says that it must be a traditional form in nature and this does not relate to now changing it to conventional. They would like for these two areas to be shown as Traditional on the map.

A discussion ensued regarding the form of development allowed in Schilling Farms PD as it was approved with use and form entitlements and it has been amended over the years most recently in 2009 to be more compact and traditional in form.

Mr. Rusty Bloodworth, retired employee with Boyle Investments, addressed the commissioners. He explained that he has been with this project since its inception and is very passionate about keeping this area a traditional form as it has been approved. He has been in planning for 48 years and his design views have changed and grown over the years. There was a lot of time and money and hard work put into this PD and he would really hate to see these two areas in their PD be changed to conventional forms when everything around it is Traditional. It just won't work in his opinion and would ask the DRC to approve the change as submitted by staff, but also change the resolution to allow their two areas to remain Traditional.

Alderman Patton stated that after hearing the testimony from Mr. Bloodworth and Mr. Binkley he doesn't have a problem with Area 2 and 12 of the Schilling Farms PD being shown on the map as Traditional.

The other commissioners agreed.

Chairman Doss asked if everyone agrees with the change of only allowing brick, stone or traditional masonry materials, excluding concrete block.

All agreed.

Chairman Doss asked if everyone was in agreement with having the larger setbacks/buffers for conventional area apartments, excluding Areas 2 and 12 of the Schilling Farms PD, to preserve the area.

All agreed.

Chairman Doss asked if everyone was in agreement with showing everything south of SR 385 on the map, excluding the I-269 corridor, as a Conventional Area.

All agreed.

Hearing no questions or discussion, Chairman Doss asked for a motion.

Motion by Vice-Chairman McCarty, and seconded, to recommend that the BMA approve Resolution 2016-30 (Exhibit 1), adding traditional masonry materials, and to allow Schilling Farms, Areas 2 and 12 to be shown as Traditional per the PUD even though it was shown in the 2040 Plan for conventional development.

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

ROLL CALL:

Donhardt – yes, Lawhon – yes, Patton – yes, McCarty – yes, Doss - yes.

Motion Approved

Other Business:

Chairman Doss asked if there was any other business.

Mr. Groce gave a brief overview of the recently submitted applications. An application for U-haul has been submitted and staff is working with them on their design proposed.

Hearing no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:37 pm.

Cindy Sadler, Secretary