

City of Springboro  
320 West Central Avenue, Springboro, Ohio 45066

Planning Commission Work Session  
Wednesday, December 15, 2010, 6:00 p.m.

I. Call to Order

Chairperson Marie Belpulsi called the Springboro Planning Commission Work Session to order at the Springboro Municipal Building, Council Chambers, 320 West Central Avenue, Springboro, Ohio

Present: Marie Belpulsi, Chairperson, David Vomacka, Janie Ridd, Chris Papakirk, Barb Gibson, Hans Landefeld, Becky Hartle (Ms. Hartle arrived at 6:13 P.M)

Staff: Chris Thompson, City Manager; Dan Boron, Planning Consultant; Elmer Dudas, City Engineer; Raj Sharma, Assistant City Engineer; Lois Boytim, Planning Commission Secretary

II. Agenda Items

**A. Revision to Approved Final Development Plan, 477-483 North Main Street PUD-B, Planned Unit Development-Business, addition to building/site**

**Background Information**

This agenda item is based on an application filed on behalf of Panna Chordia, property and business owner, for Final Development Plan approval for the property located at 477-485 North Main Street (SR 741). The property formerly housed L&L Plumbing and a number of subordinate businesses, most recently a vehicle repair facility. The subject property was rezoned, effective October 17, 2009, to PUD-B, Planned Unit Development-Business (Ordinance No. O-09-24).

As indicated in the materials submitted by the applicant, a second loading dock is proposed to be added to the south side of the existing building/site, an area depicted as a display/storage area in the Final Development Plan approved by the Planning Commission on April 28, 2010. Given that this is a PUD City staff is placing this on the Work Session agenda for Planning Commission consideration.

**Staff Comments**

1. Staff has no comments regarding this agenda item.

Dan Boron commented that this item is being presented to Planning Commission by staff for advice and direction for future development on the site. This Final Development Plan for the former L&L Plumbing site was approved in April 2010. The applicant wants to put a loading dock on the side of the building which is in an area that was identified as a display/storage area. This work is fairly minor but because it is a PUD, staff wanted to bring it to Planning Commission's attention. Staff requests that it be placed on the agenda for formal action at the 7 pm meeting. It will be behind a decorative fence. It is a transfer point; there will be no change to the exterior of the building. There

will be a ramp, they will regrade the area. Trucks will back up to the ramp at the transfer point and items will be put onto forklifts. There will be new concrete in the area.

Mr. Landefeld asked where it would be located.

Mr. Boron answered that it would be on the south side of the building and reviewed it on the plans with Planning Commission.

Ms. Belpulsi asked for any further questions.

There were none.

Ms. Belpulsi commented that with Planning Commission's approval, this item would be added to tonight's regular meeting agenda for formal action.

Mr. Boron commented that in the future, staff will continue to review these types of minor changes, but in a PUD normally these items are not brought to Planning Commission's attention. In the future, staff will handle any changes.

## **B. Revision to the Approved General Plan, The Springs PUD, Planned Unit Development**

### **Background Information**

This agenda item is based on an application filed by Fischer Development Company, seeking a revision to the approved General Plan for The Springs PUD, Planned Unit Development. As indicated in the submittal, the applicants are proposing to revise the General Plan for a portion of The Springs PUD, as indicated in the "property boundary" on the large-size map submitted by the applicant.

The property boundary includes an area where 19 single-family homes have been completed near the southeast corner of the property along with approximately 2,000 feet of the Springs Boulevard roadway, portions of five other local streets as well as infrastructure and development amenities. A partially complete clubhouse for the subdivision is also located in this area along with a partially constructed single-family home.

The property boundary excludes The Falls area of the PUD and its 145 apartment units located on the northwest corner of the property and the "continuing care area" that is proposed to be the site of St. Mary's Catholic Church.

This agenda item was discussed at length at the November 10th Planning Commission Work Session on a preliminary basis.

While this item is on the December 15th Work Session agenda the applicant, as indicated in their submission, has requested that this agenda item also be added to the Regular Meeting agenda on December 15th following the Work Session agenda. Staff has advised the applicant that this decision can only be made by the Planning Commission.

For the purposes of background, The Springs PUD was originally established in January 2000 by Coffman Development as The Glennon Farm PUD through Springboro Ordinance O-00-10. The General Plan was approved in 2002 and revised in major fashion in 2005 through Springboro

Resolution R-05-48. A General Plan Revision approved earlier this year by Planning Commission and City Council will change the "continuing care area" at the northwest corner of Springs Boulevard and Yankee Road to a church use.

Under the provisions of the City of Springboro Planned Unit Development Ordinance, Chapter 1272 of the Codified Ordinance, the proposed church constitutes a major change to the approved General Plan for the PUD. As such the proposed revision would require the approval of the Planning Commission and City Council.

### **Staff Comments**

1. Planning Commission in consultation with City staff will determine the time when a secondary access point is to be provided for the proposed condominium area in Area 1. Regardless staff recommends that the access point's construction be triggered by a construction number, not occupancy.
2. The proposed phasing of the development needs to be clarified so that internal and external connections are made in a timely manner in consideration of the needs of connectivity and emergency access needs.
3. For clarification purposes The Falls portion of the PUD was approved for 305 multi-family apartment dwelling units, not 300.
4. Staff recommends for the purposes of comparison of what is proposed to what exists in plan that the 2005 General Plan that is in effect for the "project area" be referenced, not previous plans that are not in effect for purposes of housing unit counts.
5. Referencing the architectural restriction discussion on pages 4-5 of the introductory text, exterior elevations are to be approved by Planning Commission as part of the General Plan revision in addition to the Declaration of Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions.
6. Also from the introduction, page 6, the table does not contain open space details, and the comparisons are not consistent while referring to both 2001 and 2005 general plans.
7. Verify that the existing sanitary sewer can handle the additional flows from the increased density.
8. Locate the existing sanitary sewer along Model Court, as these lots may not be buildable due to its location, as well as lots 1 and 2 in Area 4.
9. Revise the overall water main plan due to the revised street layout.
10. In Tab 3, proposed General Plan Revision map, retain the connection to the Sycamore Springs Drive as shown on the 2005 General Plan due to the existing water main location and future water main loop.
11. In Tab 3, a number of streets proposed in the plan are not in compliance with the provisions of the Planning and Zoning Code including the length of cul-de-sacs (600' maximum permitted) and centerline radii (150' min) which are not met at the locations of the knuckles.
12. In Tab 3, add access points to the open space areas through or near lots 13 in Area 3 and lot 107 in Area 3.
13. In Tab 3, is there enough parking at the recreational facility for the number of units in the development?
14. In Tab 3, replace the secondary emergency access drive to the condos and with a public cul-de-sac for access for emergency services as well as the traveling public.
15. In Tab 3, add a public cul-de-sac at the end point of Waterside Drive and at Springs Blvd at the recreational facility.
16. In Tab 3, the minimum lot areas in the Areas 2, 3, and 4 do not correspond to the lot dimensions. Verify the minimum lot width of 68' for the Area 4, being stated as 65' lots.
17. In Tab 3, what is being proposed to happen at the rear yards of the existing Area 2?

18. In Tab 4, prior to or at the December 15th Planning Commission Work Session please clearly delineate where dedicated open space is proposed to be located in the project area. Some of the areas appear to be green space—front yards, side yards between building, etc.—and not dedicated open space for the use of all residents and others.
19. In Tab 5, Please indicate the building materials for the community facility and the minimum square footage.
20. In Tab 8, for Areas 2-4, is the term “siding” synonymous with “vinyl siding?” Also for Tab 8, is Area One’s exterior vinyl as well?
21. In Tab 8, it might be useful to express use of materials in percentage terms (e.g., 20% brick, 30% stone, 50% vinyl siding, etc.) than in ratio terms. Also do the percentages cover just the front elevations or all elevations?
22. Tab 11, Provide size of the model home signage. Also provide mailbox specifications.
23. Clearcreek Fire District has no comments at this time.

Todd Huss, Jeff Hayes and Giles Patterson of Fischer Development Company were in attendance to answer questions of Planning Commission. Troy Messer of Kleingers Engineers was also in attendance.

Ms. Belpulsi asked whether the applicant had reviewed the staff comments.

Mr. Huss answered that they had and reviewed the staff comments as follows:

Comment #1 - Mr. Huss will work with staff to determine the number of units at which time the access road would be constructed.

Mr. Vomacka asked whether he had a feel about what the number of units would be.

Mr. Huss answered that they proposed 100 units which would be about half.

Mr. Vomacka commented that he is concerned about the number of cars that would need to get in and out at that single access point.

Comment #2 - Mr. Huss commented that the phasing plan would be discussed and they would commit to a certain order with staff. They cannot commit to when certain connections are going to be made because it depends on the rate of sales.

Mr. Boron stated that staff will work with the applicant, but the plan needs to be presented to Planning Commission for the record. Commitments do not need to be made for dates but for locations and where connections will take place.

Comments #3 and #4 - Mr. Huss stated that these items will be completed for clarification.

Comment #5 – Mr. Huss asked whether staff was looking for this document to be part of the General Plan approval.

Mr. Boron answered that the covenants and restriction were separate. The covenants are between the builder and the homeowners. The City will review it and hold a record of it in case issues come up. The designs of individual areas will be entered into the General Plan revision.

Mr. Hayes asked whether specific guidelines that are being proposed for different areas would be part of the General Plan.

Mr. Boron answered yes. He explained that the elevations need to be part of the plans that Planning Commission will be recommending on to Council. It is what the Building Department uses to approve buildings at a later date.

Mr. Huss commented that there are 160 elevations. They tried to simplify it and create a set of standards that those elevations would adhere to.

Ms. Belpulsi commented that staff generally has these elevations on file and asked whether the information could be put on a computer disk.

Mr. Papakirk asked whether the different elevations had different changes in materials; would the footprints be the same?

Mr. Patterson answered that the footprints would be the same. The changes would be, for example, to create depth on the front elevation or do a reverse gable. There are also optional items that can be added.

Mr. Hayes explained that there could be changes to the plans in the coming years. They thought that it would be better to have guidelines; they could look at individual plans and see that they meet the guidelines as opposed to having to do revisions.

Mr. Patterson explained that they try to alter the plans and elevations throughout the project so that people who have purchased in the project aren't self competing.

Ms. Ridd explained that she thought that they had a guideline package of acceptable materials from Settlers Walk. That way the homes were more custom and less cookie cutter.

Mr. Landefeld commented that with the variety of homes and the number of iterations, a general set of guidelines is the way to go.

Ms. Ridd stated that she would prefer to focus on the materials, the percentage of what has to be brick, etc.

Ms. Gibson commented that it should be clear for staff.

Mr. Huss asked whether a set of guidelines would be okay.

Mr. Boron answered yes; as long as the guidelines are part of the approval process.

Mr. Papakirk commented that the concern is that because this is a big development, that lots will be sold off and there will be a new crop of products that may not fit those guidelines.

Comment #6 - Mr. Huss stated that they will quantify the open space details.

Mr. Hayes asked whether they wanted the comparison to be to the 2005 plans.

Mr. Dudas answered that that was correct.

Comment #7 - Mr. Huss stated that they will verify the existing sanitary sewer capacity.

Comment #8 - Mr. Huss stated that they are aware of the existing sanitary sewer and may relocate a small portion of that sewer. They will work within the existing sewer and easements or submit an engineering plan to relocate it.

Comment #9 - Mr. Huss stated that they are working on the overall water main plan and understand that there are looping requirements and can accommodate them within their plan.

Comment #10 - Mr. Huss stated that they will make the connection with Sycamore Springs Drive. There is some thought to how they will make the connection, whether it follows the existing water line.

Mr. Hayes commented that there is a loop that was intended to go one direction; they are working on their options for extending that line so the loop can be made. They will work with the Engineering staff to work out a solution.

Comment #11 - Mr. Huss commented that this item points out that some features are not in accordance with the subdivision regulations and asks that they be approved as part of the PUD plan. He commented that these features are in some other areas of Springboro and Settlers Walk. He has shortened up the length of the cul-de-sac considerably. He feels that these features keep the through traffic away from the lots that are on the end of the eyebrows.

Mr. Papakirk asked whether this was a fire department issue more so than an engineering issue.

Mr. Boron answered that it was a public works issue.

Mr. Dudas commented that the islands and knuckles were issues. Without them public works can plow better. Engineering is looking at the minimum centerline radius.

Mr. Huss commented that they felt that it was an important element in the streetscape and they are prevalent everywhere else.

Mr. Boron commented that the regulations have been updated since the initial plan was implemented

Mr. Huss commented that the islands can be eliminated and whether that would be a solution. He will work with engineering.

Comment #12 - Mr. Huss stated that the access points will be added.

Comment #13 - Mr. Huss stated that the size of the parking is adequate and that most of the traffic would be pedestrian.

Ms. Belpulsi asked about the size of the clubhouse.

Mr. Huss answered that it would be 2500 square feet.

Mr. Vomacka stated that he felt that the parking lot was undersized. He compared it to the clubhouse at Settlers Walk Boulevard and commented on the issues with on street parking at that building.

Mr. Landefeld stated that should people not be accommodated in the lot then they will have to walk.

Ms. Ridd commented that they then park up and down the street instead.

Mr. Landefeld commented that he felt that the parking lot was big enough.

Mr. Patterson added that the parking lot is consistent with lots in similar size communities and has been adequate.

Ms. Gibson commented that one possibility would be to use green space as parking, bricks that allow grass in between. It will withstand the weight of cars, but look like more of a lawn.

Ms. Ridd asked whether the smaller clubhouse compared to Settlers Walk would mean that there would be a need for less parking.

Mr. Vomacka answered that there are functions held at the clubhouse such as a polling place that may include 50 people, only half of whom live in the neighborhood.

Comments #14 and #15 - Mr. Huss stated that these comments are asking for clarification of secondary access to the condos and the transition from public to private streets. He reviewed plans to solve these issues.

Mr. Vomacka commented that they could be underestimating the usage that the secondary access would receive. He would expect that a third of the condo community traffic would use that access.

Mr. Huss commented that envisioned it as a secondary emergency access, not as a public street for the condo community.

Mr. Landefeld commented that the staff comment is envisioning the road to be a secondary entrance for residents and emergency services.

Ms. Gibson agreed that there needs to be a secondary access.

Ms. Belpulsi added that it needs to be built to City standards.

Mr. Dudas stated that staff is calling for a redesign in that area with a public cul-de-sac and a private road off of it into the condos.

Comment #16 - Mr. Huss stated that the comment dealt with minimum lot areas.

Mr. Hayes commented that the 65' minimum lot widths are correct. This gives them the flexibility in design and engineering in case they have a lot that needs to be smaller. They do not have that minimum size lot but would like to have the ability to make slight modifications.

Ms. Ridd asked that it be stipulated that there be a maximum number of that small size lots.

Mr. Huss commented that they need to fix the math in the table.

Comment #17 - Mr. Hayes commented that the lots would be re-platted to make them deeper, 140 foot deep.

Mr. Huss commented that they are increasing the depth of all future lots.

Comment #18 - Mr. Huss commented that they had attempted to show where existing trees were located in the open spaces which they intend to keep. They will clarify the open space.

Ms. Belpulsi asked for the percentage of open space.

Mr. Hayes commented that they believe it to be about three acres or ten percent more than the previous plan.

Mr. Papakirk asked whether that includes the detention ponds.

Mr. Hayes answered that the ones on their property are included and were included in both calculations.

Mr. Vomacka asked for the total percentage of open space in their property.

Mr. Boron also asked for a comparison to the 2005 plan.

The definition of open space was reviewed.

Ms. Belpulsi commented that there should be a minimum of 25 percent open space.

Comment #19 - Mr. Huss stated that the community facility would be 2500 square feet and the materials would be stone, brick, wood and vinyl.

Comment #20 - Mr. Huss commented that siding does refer to vinyl siding and Area One's exterior would be vinyl.

Mr. Vomacka stated for the record that should they show any vinyl, that would be enough for him to say no.

Comment #21 - Mr. Huss commented that they can express the materials by percentages.

Comment #22 - Mr. Huss stated that they would provide the sizes of the model home signage.

Mr. Vomacka asked where the signage would be.

Ms. Belpulsi suspended the Planning Commission Work Session at 6:58 P.M in order to convene the regular Planning Commission meeting.

Ms. Belpulsi reconvened the Planning Commission Work Session at 7:08 P.M.

Mr. Patterson continued by answered Mr. Vomacka's question about the sign placement and reviewed the signage plans.

Mr. Vomacka asked about the number of signs.

Ms. Ridd counted 5 flag banners and 9 signs. She asked whether it would be possible to have one sign for some of the information.

Mr. Patterson answered, not one that would catch the attention of passersby. He added that the signs are not large or imposing.

Mr. Vomacka asked about the sign regulations.

Mr. Boron answered that this is in a PUD. He will consult with Dan Fitzpatrick, the City sign inspector.

Mr. Huss wrapped up the discussion by reviewing the changes that were made to the original submission in response to Planning Commission comments. They are working on the street connections and secondary access, have made adjustments to the types of lots and lot sizes, decreased the density and increased open space, eliminated a number of flag lots, proposed to expand the size and scope of the community facility adding a second pool, provided architectural standards that will carry with the project and the approval that commits to certain percentages of exterior materials and provided examples of the products that will meet those standards.

Mr. Huss added that they have been in discussion with the existing residents. They are working to keep them informed and have received feedback from the residents. In terms of materials and specifications, he stated that there are three elements that existing residents should be concerned with, visual; what the community looks like and they have taken steps to clean that up, amenities; without a viable plan these things are not possible, and property values. He explained Fischer Homes' plans for the community and how they can improve the area and property values for the community with sales success, completing amenities and the community facility and having a diversity of product that will allow it to be viable. He added that their product is comparable and compatible with the surrounding communities.

Ms. Belpulsi asked for comments from the Planning Commission.

Mr. Vomacka commented that he appreciates that they are intend to preserve the larger trees in the open space. He is concerned that the smallest lots are backing up to existing 80 foot lots. That is a substantial size differential. He is concerned about vinyl siding. He understands that the covenants would ask that the builder will seed or sod the front of any property. He would like to see what they plan in terms of other landscaping along the boulevard. He would like to see a requirement that the builder put at least one tree in front of every property. He suggested that sheds be allowed in the covenants to allow for more storage space. He asked that they consider allowing aluminum fencing.

Mr. Landefeld thanked the applicants and staff for the opportunity to tour Fischer Homes. His comments from that tour were that he didn't have any problems with the products with the exception of some exterior finish materials including vinyl. Side yard clearance was a concern. He asked Mr. Patterson whether the clearance would be even smaller.

Mr. Patterson answered that they had looked at 68' lots with 25' front setbacks; the minimum setbacks would be 5'. The setbacks would be consistent.

Mr. Landefeld commented that he felt that the product on the lots was fine but the side yard setbacks were too small.

Mr. Hayes commented that the current setbacks are 25' in the front, 5' on the side and 10' in the rear.

Mr. Landefeld commented that he would like to see dimensional shingles. He stated that the interior of the condos were attractive but that he felt that the outside needed some work. Exterior materials could be upgraded.

Mr. Papakirk commented that he was also concerned about the side yards. The original patio homes that were built are all single story; they are proposing some two story homes. That is where he is concerned about the density. The single family patio home concept has the feeling of less density. He

commented that he felt that they have a great product; they don't necessarily fit perfectly within this size lot. He would like to see part of the development with 5' setbacks as long as they are single story homes; the rest could take on a different form with wider setbacks.

Ms. Ridd commented that she would like to see a less crowded look.

Ms. Hartle agreed; they were too close.

Mr. Vomacka stated that he doesn't have a problem with it adding that trees will soften the appearance of it and asked that they compare this to Laurel Glen where there are 5' setbacks. He added that he wants this area to be successful.

Ms. Ridd agreed that the overbuilt feeling may come from his idea of putting the single story on the lower setbacks and the two stories with a little bit more.

Mr. Huss commented that there is a 5' minimum but that it would be rare for that to occur in the entire community. He commented that the trend is for larger homes on smaller lots. Not enough people want ranch homes to drive this community to a success.

Mr. Patterson commented that many of the existing residents may never see the prices that they paid. Forty seven percent of those homes transferred distressed.

Ms. Gibson commented on the economic and the market challenges faced by everyone. She understands that they want to put forth a product and development that is viable. She agreed with Mr. Landefeld and was impressed with the product. She stated that the applicant is asking them to make a change to an approved plan that will change the entire complexion of the development. While she understands the economic and market challenges, she has to worry about the increased density in addition that the focus of the development is totally different from the mature community, and minimal impact on the schools, the increased density and putting together a product that people want. People want that second story because they will put one, two or three kids in the second story. The Planning Commission needs to decide whether the product that they want to bring to this community is what we can live with in the long term. It is nothing against Fischer Homes they have a great product, in the right place. She stated that she is wrestling with the fact of whether this is the right place for it.

Mr. Huss commented that they mentioned school age children in their submission. The data shows that by area; Area One will have an average of 1.57 occupants per unit, Area Two, 2.73 occupants per unit and Areas Three and Four, 3.04 occupants per unit. With the assumption that these are two parent households, then you can figure out how many kids there are. He stated that he didn't feel that the demographic is as onerous as some people may think.

Mr. Vomacka stated that he has to understand that this is Springboro schools which are a magnet unto themselves.

Mr. Boron asked how many units they are planning to add to what is approved.

Mr. Hayes answered that there are 73 more housing units than the 2005 plan.

Ms. Ridd asked what the difference was in the condo numbers. She stated that she would like to see the density added in the condos if they are going to add it.

Mr. Boron explained that the number is the same but the area is smaller so the density is higher.

Mr. Hayes answered that they propose 194 condos as opposed to 192 in the previous plan.

Ms. Ridd stated that if she were going to approve any increase in density, which she is not in favor of doing, it would be in the condos.

Mr. Hayes commented that the original plan has the area as quads; the increase in density is driven by the change to single family. The original plan called for condos backing up to single family; the new plan is single family to single family. This drove 53 additional lots where there were quads before; there are also lots where the clubhouse used to be. It is driven more by efficiency of street layout.

Mr. Boron commented that this project area includes 415 units that were approved in 2005 as part of the last update to the approved plan for The Springs PUD. This excludes the multifamily area called The Falls and the area that is now proposed to be St. Mary's Catholic Church. This means that 415 units that are approved and could be built by Fischer under the terms of the current PUD ordinance. The developer is asking for 73 new units.

Mr. Boron commented that the City will receive more information on the City when the census information is received. He added for context that in Clearcreek Township alone there are 1,969 unbuilt but approved units in major subdivisions mostly within the school district. Part of the township lies in Wayne and Lebanon school districts but this would be 1,969 units undeveloped that could be built today. There is a comparable number that could be developed in mini plats which are in areas such as farms that could plat out at the maximum density. This information came from Jeff Palmer, the Township Planner. There is a number of undeveloped properties within the City but to be fair, there was a comment about the burden on the schools; this proposal would add 73 new units relative to 5,800 unbuilt but approved units in the school district.

Ms. Gibson stated that it is the increased density as well as the market that they are focusing on was her comment.

Ms. Ridd added that at the time they had a lot of give and take in density everywhere throughout Settlers Walk. The density there was approved because of the product.

### III. Guest Comments

Ron Woeste, 178 Winding Creek Drive, commented that he has lived in Woodland Greens for 22 years and has just moved to The Springs two years ago. Fischer Homes shows an increased density of 6%, his math shows a 17% increase. They didn't add any more open space. He asked that there be more consideration in the materials used. He stated that he feels that it will be a very tight community. He is in favor of taking the original PUD and making that work. They have reduced the lot size and can make the lot sizes larger by keeping the same density. They are lowering the square footage of the apartments that were originally proposed. They are taking the square footage for a single story and making it the same as for a two story. If they are making it a two story then it should be larger square footage so everything matches. They are looking for a consistent neighborhood where everything flows and there is room between the houses. He suggested placing the smaller homes in the back of the development. He mentioned the vinyl siding. He stated that they looked at a development that went through the same kind of thing that their development went through. They looked at Winding Creek. (It was pointed out by the Planning Commission members that this development while in the Springboro school district, it is not in the City of Springboro.) This was also distressed property. They changed the streets in the development but maintained the density. There was no change from the original PUD.

The homes have brick on all four sides. There is no vinyl in the development. They would prefer that. They would prefer to see six to twelve pitches in the roofs to give some architectural integrity to the neighborhood. They would like to see dimensional shingles. It adds consistency to the neighborhood. He mentioned making the garages deeper to solve the problem of the need for storage sheds. He would like to return to the original PUD where the front of houses faces the front of other houses and the backs face backs.

Myron Rheaume, 148 Winding Creek Drive, commented that he and wife were the first residents of Winding Creek. He commented that Mr. Woeste's summation was the culmination of working with other residents in the area and meeting with Mr. Patterson. The key in the earlier presentation was the term product diversity. They are happy that someone is coming in and all of the residents want this to work. They just don't want it to happen in the worst way. 160 elevations lends to the diversity of product, 5 different zones and vinyl is a staple of Fischer Homes. The existing homes do not have vinyl. Vinyl homes will not be consistent with what is there. The total density is a major concern.

Mr. Woeste added that they don't want to see a lot of small houses packed one on top of another. There is plenty of room to build a quality home.

#### IV. Planning Commission and Staff Comments

Ms. Belpulsi concluded by commenting that based on the comments that the applicant heard tonight they should revisit some of the areas of concern. She agreed with Mr. Vomacka that some of the lots that back up to Settlers Walk are too narrow. She is also not a proponent of vinyl. Another developer was recently denied the use of vinyl.

Mr. Boron asked whether it was an absolute exclusion or a percentage of the mix of material. Staff would like some direction as they move on in the process.

Mr. Vomacka and Ms. Hartle stated that they were opposed to vinyl.

Mr. Huss asked what the other developer had proposed. A mix of materials?

Ms. Ridd answered that they proposed vinyl in a neighborhood that did not have vinyl.

Mr. Boron commented that a portion of The Falls does have vinyl. He is not sure what the intent was with the clubhouse. It is his understanding that there is none in the original area but that there is vinyl in the development.

Mr. Patterson commented that everything that they found abutting with the exception of Sycamore Springs which was entirely Hardiplank had vinyl.

Ms. Ridd commented that she is a proponent of the different price points. They need to have different price points sectioned like Settlers Walk. Not everyone can afford a \$300,000 home. It can be done without sacrificing the look.

Mr. Landefeld stated that his aversion is to lap siding products. Trim and gable vents are not an issue.

Ms. Thompson stated that staff with work with the clients to get a reasonable percentage and definition. There are areas of the City that do have vinyl. Staff can present a reasonable accommodation. The applicant that was denied the use of vinyl was due to the location of that development.

Mr. Huss commented that the vinyl that they use exceeds the standard specifications. Appraisals need to be solid. A mix of materials is needed for a good appraisal.

Mr. Boron asked whether in terms of exterior materials there should be an emphasis on Area Four, the area in the immediate vicinity of existing homes and a gradient of the materials in Area Four to Area Two or Area Three.

Ms. Belpulsi stated that she would like to see the applicant work with staff. She would be willing to look at a percentage. She would prefer no vinyl other than as Mr. Landefeld suggested soffits. She would like to see more of the Hardiplank used. They had researched it and there did not appear to be much difference in cost between the vinyl and Hardiplank.

Mr. Patterson commented that their investigation was that the additional cost for Hardiplank would be \$6-8,000 per home.

Mr. Landefeld commented that he thought that it was \$1500.

Mr. Patterson asked whether they were talking about a ratio for the entire home or just the front.

Ms. Belpulsi answered that it would be for the whole house.

Ms. Ridd stated that the fire department had no comment and asked whether they were okay with the streetscape.

Mr. Boron answered that they will revisit the issue with the fire department

#### V. Adjournment

Ms. Belpulsi adjourned the Wednesday, December 15, 2010 Planning Commission Work Session at 8:05 P.M.

---

Marie Belpulsi, Planning Commission Chairperson

---

Dan Boron, Planning Consultant

---

Lois Boytim, Planning Commission Secretary