

## PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

March 24, 2004

A special meeting of the City of Powell Planning and Zoning Commission was held on March 24, 2004, and called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Chairman Don Emerick. Other Planning and Zoning Commissioners present were Kevin Futryk, Donell Grubbs, Tom Counts, Roger Coville, and Dan Wiencek. Brian Murphy was absent. Also present were David Betz, Director of Development; Shawn Leininger, Development Planner; residents; and representatives of the press.

### HEARING OF VISITORS FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

There was none.

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of February 11, 2003 were approved.

The minutes of March 10, 2004 were amended and approved.

### ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW

**Applicant:** Signcom  
**Location:** 556/546 West Olentangy Street  
**Zoning:** PC, Planned Commercial District  
**Request:** Approval of exterior wall signs, shared free-standing sign, and miscellaneous directional signs for Graeter's Ice Cream and City BBQ

Maury Levine, Graeters, reviewed their sign plan. He identified signs for both businesses on the side of the building. He said the signs on the south face are shown larger than the allowed 25 sq. ft., but they will reduce them to bring them in line with the code requirements. He reviewed the signs that face the parking lot and noted they are within the code requirements for size. He said that the sign on the east elevation for City Barbecue is also less than 25 sq. ft. He said there was discussion during the development plan stage that it is desirable to include some directional signage. He reviewed their proposal for such signs on either end of the service drive that connects Galloway to Sawmill Parkway. He reviewed their proposal for a ground sign. He said they originally proposed a single ground sign with both logos. Staff has suggested that they have two separate ground signs with square footage of 25 sq. ft. each to make the signs more consistent with the area, particularly the adjacent bank. He said the only question they have now is whether they should do two identical signs or two that reflect the architectural style of each building.

David Betz, Director of Development, gave his Staff Report on this item (Exhibit). He said that Staff has no problem with the externally illuminated wall signs given that they will be within the code requirements. He reviewed the Staff Report comments regarding the divergence being requested in allowing two monument signs. He said that Staff would like the Planning and Zoning Commission to discuss whether two identical signs are desirable, or whether architecturally different signs are preferred.

Rick Malir, City Barbecue, reviewed that the First Citizens bank has a stone base on their monument sign to match the stone on their building, so even if they do the Graeters and City Barbecue signs in the same brick, they will differ from the bank sign.

Commissioner Emerick opened this item to public comment. Hearing none, he closed the public comment session.

Commissioner Coville said he is "overwhelmed" with all of the signs. He noted the signs on all sides of the buildings, and said his preference would be for a single, smaller monument sign.

Commissioner Counts said that each sign has a different purpose, and one issue of this property is that there is parking in the back, signs needed for pedestrians, and signs needed for vehicular traffic. He said he thinks the signs proposed are appropriate, and he likes 2 monument signs. He asked if the color proposed for the City Barbecue will match the building. Mr. Malir said that it will. He noted the slope on the sign will match the slope on the building. Commissioner Counts said he thinks the intention was to make the two businesses distinct architecturally, and the signs can do the same. He said that these signs are a good transition between Sawmill Parkway signage and Powell signage. He said that his only concern is that if this property should ever be for a single user, he would like a condition that one of the signs would have to be removed.

Commissioner Futryk said he shares Commissioner Coville's concern about overkill on signage. He said that in Big Bear Farms and the Kroger complex, there are no monument signs, but rather just wall signs that clearly identify what each business is from the street. He questioned why a street sign would be necessary when the distance from the building to the sign isn't that great. Mr. Levine said that it is actually 100 ft. between the sign and the building, and there will be a lot going on between the road and the building, including the bikepath, the fence, landscaping, and the patio. He said the purpose of the monument signs is for vehicular traffic. He questioned whether the wall signs will be visible at night.

Commissioner Futryk asked if these buildings are set back any further than those on the other side of Sawmill Parkway along the north side of Powell Road. Mr. Betz said that they are slightly further back to accommodate the drive for the bank and the patio for this building. He agreed that there aren't ground signs west of Sawmill Parkway but said there are heading into Powell. Commissioner Futryk said there is a ground sign for the Recreation Building proposed for this area, but not a building sign as well. Mr. Betz said that is correct, the tenant signs are lower. He noted further down Olentangy Street that 4 Floors has a monument as well as building sign. He said that Rutherford Funeral Home also has a monument sign. He reviewed that each of the signs have different purpose, and the overall package fits.

Commissioner Futryk asked if the applicant consider doing smaller, ground lit rather than internally lit signs to maintain consistency with that parcel of property. Mr. Malir said they tend to avoid internally lit signs, but he questioned what could be accomplished by making it smaller when it is already small. He said that internally lit signs work for Graeters.

Commissioner Grubbs asked if the applicant is amenable to including the landscaping recommended by Staff. Mr. Levine said they are. Commissioner Grubbs asked if there is a reason that the directional signs must be 5' in height. Mr. Levine said he thinks they need to be high enough to be seen by someone in a car. Mr. Betz referred to traffic signs, which need to be of a certain height. The original proposal had these signs added to a stop sign, but that is not permitted due to the Uniform Traffic Code. Commissioner Grubbs said ground signs are more aesthetically pleasing. Mr. Levine said that plantings around the directional signs will help to soften them. Commissioner Grubbs asked how tall is the bank's monument sign. Mr. Leininger estimated it at 5-6 ft. tall. Commissioner Grubbs said that the monument sign here could be reduced. Commissioner Grubbs said his greatest concern with this sign compared to the bank's is that it is a white opaque sign internally lit with a logo. He said the entire sign is lit. Mr. Malir said they are proposing just to light the logo. Mr. Betz said they are two different Zoning Codes, and that this would only be the logos that is lit. Commissioner Grubbs said he personally likes the signs of different design, but modified from that which is proposed.

Discussion ensued regarding the directional signs and their size and location.

Commissioner Fusch said he thinks the building signs are appropriate. He said he likes the idea of two signs, and he doesn't have a problem in a difference in the signs, but he would like to see them lit the same way. He said City Barbecue would be ground lit, and he asked if that could be done with Graeter's. Mr. Levine said it could be, although he would prefer that it be interior-lit.

Commissioner Fusch asked if it is correct that the Commission isn't approving the separate sign locations. Mr. Betz said they can be approved pending final review by Staff.

Commissioner Emerick said he is fine with two signs of a different design. He said he supports the additional landscaping Staff is recommending.

Commissioner Counts asked if Commissioner Futryk is fine with the signs if they are externally lit. Commissioner Futryk said it appears from the rendering that the base of the sign is pretty tall. He asked if it can be shortened and still create the visibility. For him, it is a concern regarding the massing. Mr. Levine suggested that the signs be two, externally lit, and shorter to be consistent with the bank.

Commissioner Coville said, regarding the South elevation and the East elevation City Barbecue sign. He asked if the Commission is comfortable with three large City Barbecue signs heading west.

Commissioner Counts moved to approve the signs as proposed with the following conditions:

1. That the ground sign be a maximum of 25 square feet in area.
2. That a divergence is granted allowing two ground signs to be placed on the property at locations approved by Staff, provided, however, that if the property ever has only a single user, then only one ground sign will be permitted.
3. That the landscaping shown around the base of the ground sign includes plantings providing year round coverage with a mix of seasonal color.
4. That the applicant is encouraged to add plantings providing year round coverage with a mix of seasonal color to the two directional signs located along the access drive.
5. That the concept of the City Barbecue Sign is approved with Staff to approve the final sign subject to the restrictions identified and alignment with the other signs.
6. That staff coordinate the location of the directional signs.
7. That the height of both ground signs be consistent with the height of the bank ground sign.
8. That the City Barbecue sign be externally lit.

Commissioner Futryk seconded the motion.

VOTE:            Y   6              N   0  

**COMBINED PRELIMINARY AND FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN / ZONING MAP AMENDMENT**

**Applicant:** Centex Homes  
**Location:** 5.125 acre tract on the north side of Rutherford Road between Trail Lake Drive and Flagg View Drive (Parcel 31924013015000)  
**Current Zoning:** I, Industrial District, Liberty Township  
**Proposed Zoning:** PR, Planned Residence District, City of Powell  
**Request:** Approval of Combined Preliminary and Final Development Plan and Zoning Map Amendment for three (3) single-family lots on 5.125 acres with 4.16 acres of open space.

Jack Reynolds, attorney for the applicant, and Terry Andrews, Centex Homes, were present to discuss this plan. Mr. Reynolds reviewed that this property was left off the Golf Village development and it remained in Liberty Township zoned for industrial use. He said the property owners contemplated an office/warehouse use for this site, but it has been purchased by Centex, which has homes on properties adjacent. He said this request is to approve the development plan and change the zoning from industrial to residential. He noted that Centex corresponded with the current homeowners to let them know the plan for this parcel. He reviewed the development plan as submitted and the intention that this development will meet the development standards of Golf Village. He noted that as part of the plat, they will include a parcel of land, lot 4429 that is open space, a "devil strip," that is already zoned and will provide vehicular access. That part will eventually become part of three lots in the area.

David Betz, Director of Development, gave his Staff Report on this item (Exhibit). He said this is a simple plan that makes sense, particularly because it will join the Golf Village financing authority. He noted the desirability of the additional bikepath. He said that the Planning and Zoning Commission should note in any approval the inclusion of lot 4429 and the change of that property from open space to vehicular access.

Commissioner Emerick opened this item to public comment. Hearing none, he closed the public comment session.

Commissioner Fusch said he would like to see bikepaths extended throughout the community as rapidly as possible, and he would like to see this path go out to Sawmill Parkway. Mr. Betz said that there are design challenges with such a proposal. Commissioner Fusch expressed concern about the proposed layout. Mr. Betz said at the very least, the path could be extended to the property line so that it will be easier to extend if a design solution is found. Commissioner Fusch said he would like that as a condition. Commissioner Grubbs agreed.

Commissioner Futryk asked if the requirements for installation of cement fiber siding need to be added to the architectural design criteria for this development. Mr. Betz said that those issues were taken care of through the building code.

Commissioner Coville said his only concern is that the people in the lots to the northern might prefer easier access to the open space than this development provides. He asked if an easement between the lots can be considered or the area limited to two larger lots.

Mr. Andrews said that there is probably 700 feet from the north lots to the open space and that usually one doesn't want to encourage pedestrian traffic between homes. Commissioner Counts said that he thinks even with additional pathways there will still be kids going through the lawns.

Commissioner Counts said his only comment is that this development increases the open space from what it used to be Liberty Township, and that is a good thing.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Counts moved to approve the Combined Preliminary and Final Development Plan and Zoning Map Amendment for this development with a notation that lot 4429 is included in the plan and is being changed from open space to part of the identified lots. Further, this approval includes the condition that the applicant work with Staff to connect the bikepath shown along Rutherford to Sawmill Parkway. Commissioner Fusch seconded the motion.

**VOTE:** Y 5 N 1 (Coville)

**SKETCH PLAN**

**Applicant:** 3 Pillar Homes, Zenios Michael Zenios  
**Location:** 50 South Liberty Street  
**Zoning:** OPPCR, Old Powell Planned Commercial and Residence District  
**Request:** Review of a Sketch Plan for a mixed-use development consisting of approximately 4,555 sq. ft. restaurant, 14,040 sq. ft. retail, and 17,905 sq. ft. office on the second story in the first phase, and 12 residential condominium townhomes in the second phase. Applicant would like approval to submit a Combined Preliminary and Final Development Plan for the first phase.

Brian Kinzelman, Kinzelman Kline, was present to represent the applicant. He said that this proposal doesn't contemplate the residential development in the rear that was discussed at the last meeting. He reviewed the parking proposal. He said that another change from the last meeting is a shared drive with the adjacent property owner. He said they currently have no proposals related to residential development.

Craig Gossman, Kinzelman Kline, was present to discuss the architecture for this development. He said they have been working with Kevin Knight, AIA representative for the HDC regarding some of the issues discussed at the last meeting. He reviewed the following changes to the plan:

1. An offset has been introduced in the underpass area. The amount of square footage has been removed from the bridge and replaced with an open balcony and 8-foot wide corridor.
2. The building has been pushed a little further to gain some square footage on the end. The scale on the wings have been deleted have now gone to one-story on the back.

Mr. Gossman reviewed the changes in elevation, noting illustrations of existing developments in the downtown Powell area.

1. The context of this form has been determined to be relevant to town, particularly the odd-fellows building, in its Italianate design.
2. They have tried to modulate the roof line to identify more than one large building.
3. The twin tower approach has been changed. One tower has been removed.
4. They have incorporated and maintained the residential architecture.

Mr. Gossman said that each individual building wing is not much larger in square footage than the existing commercial building on this property.

David Betz, Director of Development, gave his Staff Report on this item (Exhibit).

Commissioner Emerick opened this item to public comment. Hearing none, he closed the public comment session.

Commissioner Coville said he wasn't at the first meeting so he can't recognize the differences, but he was excited to see this kind of development come before the Commission. He said his only comment regarding the elevation is that the windows all look the same, and the goal of this development is to appear as if it has evolved over time. Mr. Gossman said he thinks those details will come out when this issue is reviewed by the Historic District Commission (HDC). He said they did vary the sizes, but it is a minor difference that may need to be made more prominent.

Commissioner Coville said he would agree with Staff's comment regarding changing the roof on the most northern part of the structure. Mr. Gossman said they are trying to be aware of vertical scale, which will be impacted with a change in the slope of the roof. He said the impact on neighboring buildings may eventually be a concern. He said that this is a larger building than the residential buildings that neighbor this project. Commissioner Coville commented that this is an exciting project.

Commissioner Counts said he is concerned that the flat roof will cause more massiveness in the residential-looking end of the building. He suggested that more mass may be more appropriate closer to the four corners. Mr. Gossman said that is very much about context. They are trying to respect the current context but also suggest the possibility that buildings of larger stature would have been closer to the four corners had they been allowed downtown. Commissioner Counts agreed that he would like to see more wood, but he likes the variation that some brick provides. He said that brick would have been a likely material for development at the four corners.

Commissioner Counts said it appears that the square footage has increased. Mr. Gossman said it has increased slightly because the building grew a little to the south. He said that square footage taken from the bridge was added back in elsewhere. Mr. Kinzelman said that overall, it is "a wash." Discussion ensued.

Commissioner Counts expressed a desire to determine that the retail areas can be allotted in a way that ensures success of the development. Mr. Kinzelman said that the illustration shows the type, size, and scale of shops, but they are non-load bearing walls, and the interior will be flexible.

Commissioner Futryk said he is excited about the project, and he likes the overall design, but he questions why the residential was removed. He said that portion is important to consider for access, etc. Mr. Kinzelman said that they felt after the last meeting that the Commission was concerned about approving a development that hasn't been fully designed without access to the rear. He said his client feels residential will be appropriate in the rear if and when some access is striped in along the east property line. He said his client has no business deal available for that at this time. Commissioner Emerick said that historically, the Commission is hesitant to approve "future proposals" as part of the plan, as things have a tendency to change.

Commissioner Futryk said he still feels the most northern building is too much of a "wild west theme." He asked if there is a reason to have a three story building in one section and a small one-story building for another area. Mr. Kinzelman suggested that be considered further during the HDC review of this process. He noted that what Commissioner Counts called "western" is really Italianate, and a practical design appropriate for the time period of other houses in the area. Commissioner Futryk noted that there are many businesses in Powell that look residential in nature, and he is unsure whether this is architecturally appropriate. Mr. Kinzelman said that the building they are proposing is functionally modern to meet the needs for space that exist downtown. He agreed that the question about what is appropriate architecturally is an important one. He said the information they want from the Commission today are really in relation to the site plan, as the architectural details will be worked out through the development process. Commissioner Counts asked when the HDC will look at this. Mr. Betz said it will be before the Planning and Zoning Commission reviews this again. Commissioner Futryk referred to attractive developments in Dublin and Westerville and asked that everyone "think out of this box" with this first big re-development project of the downtown area. Mr. Gossman said he hopes to have some of these discussions with the HDC, and he expressed concern that being held to an historical standard will limit possibilities.

Commissioner Grubbs said that he thinks all of this has to be reviewed in the context of the downtown plan. He said that being first in this process will require a lot of discussion because it will be a springboard for the rest of the area. He said that if the applicant is having problems with the HDC review, he should communicate that,

because consideration to their role in this process is very important to the Downtown Committee. Commissioner Grubbs said he tends to agree with Staff's comments regarding architectural detail. He noted that the gables on the existing houses face the road in many instances, and incorporating that with this development may help lessen the impact. He said if the flat roof is done properly, he doesn't have that much difficulty with it.

Commissioner Grubbs expressed an interest in determining how far the building units will step in and out. Mr. Kinzelman reviewed the difference in the differentiation from façade to façade. Commissioner Grubbs said he would like to see that carried through. Mr. Gossman said that they would include streetscape in this development and use container plantings.

Commissioner Grubbs said he would like the plan to account for streetscape. Mr. Gossman said they discussed this with Kevin Knight and determined that ideally, it would be brick pavers from this development to the four corners.

Commissioner Grubbs asked if the 133 spaces of parking proposed is within the code requirements. Mr. Betz said it will be better determined as the uses are determined, further along in the development plan. He said that consideration must be given to the portion that is retail, office, and restaurant. He said that the current ratio is close to meeting the code.

Commissioner Grubbs said that typically the commission tries to start with code and reduce parking to provide a development with as little asphalt as possible. He said in this case, he thinks it is important to consider even over-providing parking to serve the whole downtown area. Mr. Kinzelman said that another train of thought is limiting parking so that people park once and then walk throughout the downtown to pass other commercial opportunities. Mr. Betz said that an analysis of west Olentangy Street space and parking ration indicates that that there is currently a ratio of 1 parking space per 300 sq. ft., which is currently adequate.

Commissioner Grubbs said that he would like for the applicant to consider at least partly installing the road to access the residential in the rear. Mr. Gossman said at some point, they will identify how residential will fit in this plan as well as how access will be addressed.

Commissioner Grubbs said he is not in favor of a Combined Preliminary and Final Development Plan for this development because the applicant is "first" and there are many details to be considered. Mr. Kinzelman said they are prepared to go into detail discussion with the HDC, meet their approval and come back before the Planning and Zoning Commission. He said that just because there is a lot to look at, that doesn't mean it has to be a long process. He said their client would like to have good feedback for each step to determine that they are going to move forward.

Commissioner Fusch said, as a current member of the HDC, he thinks this is great and very much needed downtown. He said he likes the flat roofs. Most of the buildings in this area were built between 1885-1910, and flat-roofed architecture is very common. He said that much of downtown Delaware has Italianate style architecture. He said that flat roofs on the north end bring it in line with the odd-fellows building.

Commissioner Fusch said his one concern is the massiveness of the building, and the bridge is what creates that mass. Mr. Gossman said they are trying to only have one elevator, and this connection would be required to do so and be ADA compliant. Mr. Kinzelman said they have also heard that there is a lack of large commercial spaces downtown, and with this connector, the top floor could be held by one user. Mr. Gossman said he could even see this portion as a complete transparent bridge, but concerns of historical architecture may be expressed. He said that modern designs have been put in historic areas before, and have been successful.

Commissioner Grubbs expressed a desire to see some 3D drawings that identify both wings of the facility from a corner angle. He said it is important to see this building in the context of the adjacent bank building.

Commissioner Emerick summarized that everyone seems to like the concept but feels many details need to be worked through.

Commissioner Counts noted that most groups only have one Sketch Plan and this applicant has gone through two. If a Combined Preliminary and Final Plan is permitted, and the applicant runs off track, the commission needn't vote in favor of it. He said that given that they have been here before and based on what has been heard tonight, they are on track and there is every expectation that they will come back with something that can be approved.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Counts moved to allow the applicant to submit a Combined Preliminary and Final Development Plan. Commissioner Futryk seconded the motion.

**VOTE:** Y 5 N 1 (Emerick)

Commissioner Grubbs asked if the residents who spoke about this previously will be notified of the combined plan. Mr. Leininger said they will be, as they were notified of this evening's meeting as well.

### SKETCH PLAN

**Applicant:** Matthew Hwang  
**Location:** 10331 Sawmill Road  
**Current Zoning:** Farm Residential District, Liberty Township  
**Request:** Review of proposed condominium development with two (2) buildings containing three (3) unit in each on 1.52 acres

Jim Lubinski was present to discuss this proposal for the southeast corner of Zion Drive and Old Sawmill Road. The Newbury condominium community under construction will surround this site on the south and the east. He said this is currently a home that hasn't been annexed into the City. It was built in the 1960's and is made of brick. Mr. Hwang has discussed an office use with staff at one point, but it has been determined that residential is more suitable. He said the density they are proposing will be 3.95 d.u./acre, which is fairly consistent with the surrounding area. He said that rather than the materials shown, they are interested in using stone and Hardiplank siding. He reviewed the site layout, parking, and landscaping. He said they can increase the landscaping as proposed by Staff. He said they are also requesting an easement to continue the bikepath out of the Lakes of Powell. He noted a correction to the plan and said that there are no views of the garages from Zion Drive and only one from Old Sawmill Road. Mr. Lubinski showed pictures of the existing house on this property, which is currently being rented.

Sam Strickland said that when he was approached about this site, Mr. Hwang didn't think they could get more than 4 units on this property. He said that he has designed other similar developments, and this layout works out well. They are 1-story but can have a loft. They are 1377 sq. ft. per unit. They are ideal for people 55 and above for a ranch unit that is not too big, and has a screen porch. The design can be completely handicap accessible. He said the purpose of the angle of the layout is to protect the views from other areas. Regarding the Staff Report, he said he is unsure if there is enough room for a 20-foot driveway and landscaping on the south property line. He suggested a 16-foot driveway that connects to Zion Drive so that there isn't just one entrance in and out of this property.

David Betz, Director of Development, gave his Staff Report on this item (Exhibit). He reviewed the surrounding developments. He reviewed the proposed layout. He reviewed a desire to work on the layout and preserve trees. He said it is desirable to have this as part of Powell since it is already surrounded by the City.

Commissioner Emerick opened this item to public comment.

Vince Margello, 1900 W. Powell Road, said that he is an adjacent land owner and he likes what he sees. He said that it is perfect for the area, is very much like what Newbury Homes is doing, and it has a low impact on Zion Drive.

Commissioner Fusch asked what property he owns. Mr. Margello identified the property he owns and said he developed Lakes of Powell and Woods of Sawmill.

Commissioner Fusch said he thinks this is a correct use of space and he will appreciate Staff's input on the correct locations for the houses.

Commissioner Grubbs asked what is the setback for the closest Newbury Homes condominium to Sawmill Road. Mr. Betz said that it is at about 50 feet. Commissioner Grubbs said he thinks it is much too close to Sawmill Road, and he wouldn't like any of these units to be so close. He said he thinks the closest they will be is 112 feet. Mr. Betz said it will be substantially further back. Commissioner Grubbs asked if the setback from Zion is just 20 feet. Mr. Betz said it is about 20 feet from the fence, which is at the right of way. He asked if that would require a variance. Mr. Betz said it would. The setback depends on the density, typically 25 feet is required. He said some setback may be gained by turning the unit, but he expressed an interest in trying to preserve the trees in that area that may require pushing the units toward Zion Drive.

Commissioner Grubbs said he talked to "some people who saw this and had some concerns." He said that any connection to Zion Drive should be discouraged. He asked if this can be connected to the Newbury site. Mr. Betz said it could be done, but he doesn't know whether it is important to do so. Commissioner Grubbs said that other important issues are keeping as many trees as possible, particularly on the frontage, and connecting the bikepath. Commissioner Grubbs asked how the design for these structures compares to Newbury Homes. He suggested that the architecture be consistent. Mr. Betz reviewed the elevation drawings of the Newbury condominiums for comparison purposes. Commissioner Grubbs said he likes the fact that these units will be more affordable than the Newbury condominiums. Mr. Strickland said that at another location, such units are anticipated to cost \$169k as a starting point.

Commissioner Grubbs commented that people at Woods of Sawmill and further down won't see these structures, so that will not be a concern. He said that the impact is minimal to the existing homeowner to the north because of the way they are being turned. He said there is definitely a need nowadays for more affordable housing. He said that this will be an improvement to that which is already here.

Commissioner Futryk concurred that the layout is good considering the constraints of the lot. He said he prefers that the mature trees be saved, and the applicant should work around that. Commissioner Futryk asked why two units are shown with basements and two are not. Mr. Strickland said that represents the various options that are available. Once they get the three units sold, they will determine what kind will be built.

Commissioner Futryk said he would like to see lofts on one of the units facing Zion, to break up the design a little bit. Mr. Strickland said that the window can be added without a loft. Commissioner Futryk asked if landscaping and mounding was required for the Newbury Homes condominium. Mr. Betz said it was. Commissioner Futryk expressed an interest in installing such landscaping here. Mr. Betz said Staff will look into it, but it may not be appropriate because the fronts of the houses will face the street. He said these units will look like a large single family house. Commissioner Futryk said he would like the theme to be similar to the rest of the area. Mr. Strickland agreed that there is no real back facing the road.

Mr. Strickland asked what is requested for parking. Mr. Betz identified a need for 4 spaces per unit, two in the garage and two outside. Mr. Strickland noted that those requirements are already met.

Commissioner Counts said that at 3.95 d.u./acre is what has been identified for this, but Newbury Homes has a density of approximately 3.0 d.u./acre. He asked about the Staff Report comment regarding adding the developments together to determine density. Mr. Betz said that it is the total Newbury development.

Commissioner Counts said that there is no question that this is appropriate for condominiums, and he would like to see them consistent with the Newbury Homes development. He said he is concerned about the density. He said he thinks 4 d.u./acre work, with 2 units per building is more consistent. He said there are too many units on this parcel. He said with 3 d.u./acre, only 4 ½ units are appropriate. 4 units would be a density of 2.6 d.u./acre. He said he can't support 3 units per building.

Mr. Strickland said that in this case, they only have one driveway down the side, where in Newbury Homes, there are many drives, and that is one reason for lower density. He said he doesn't believe there is less green space on this development than in the Newbury development. Mr. Strickland noted that lower density drives the cost of the unit up. Commissioner Counts said it is unfortunate this wasn't included in the Newbury development.

Commissioner Coville said that he is more concerned with the look than with the density. He said this needs to be an upscale design to achieve this density. Commissioner Futryk asked how much the Newbury

condominiums sell for. Mr. Betz said it is approximately \$250k per unit. Commissioner Futryk asked where the development is that these units are fetching \$269k. Mr. Strickland said it is in Logan, where the option is for 2-, 3-, and even 1-unit designs. He said that rather than 6, there could be 5 units for this development.

Commissioner Coville said he agrees with Commissioner Grubbs comments regarding the distance from the road to the Newbury condominiums. He said he thinks these units need to be at least 100 feet from the road.

Commissioner Emerick noted that the commission reminded Newbury Homes to have stone fireplaces. He asked about requiring such here. Mr. Strickland said these units don't have fireplaces, but they could be incorporated.


#### **OTHER BUSINESS**

Commissioner Coville asked if the benches at Handel's Ice Cream are supposed to be blue. Mr. Betz said he approved them but he didn't expect them to be that exact color. He noted that the fence will block it once it is installed and the owner has agreed to do some plantings around the benches.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The Commission adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

**DATE MINUTES APPROVED:** *April 14, 2004*

 *6-23-04*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Don Emerick                      Date  
Chairman

