

---

**Carriage Houses of Johnson County  
Phase 2, Final Development Plan**

**Committee Members:** Mary Guntert, Toni Caldwell

**Absent:** Dave Servos, Doug Weis, Charlie McNemee

**Staff:** Mike Brungardt, City Engineer; Linda Bohnsack, City Planner

**Carriage Houses of Johnson County/GBA Architects Engineers:** Brad Burton

**ARCO National Construction:** Doug Wohltman

---

Mike Brungardt began with introductions and a short discussion of the Site Plan Review Committee's role in the Final Development Plan (FDP) approval process. A detailed Site Plan is required as part of the Final Development Plan.

Clubhouse/Restroom Construction. The issue of major concern was the provision of and timing of construction for the Clubhouse which will contain restroom facilities for the development. Approval of Phase 1 allowed the use of a portable toilet, under the assurances of the developers that the Clubhouse would be constructed in the next phase of the development and be available for use. At issue is the intention of the developers to construct a 2<sup>nd</sup> building before constructing the clubhouse building. Staff noted that the developers will need to present this issue to the Planning Commission for specific approval.

The basis for delaying construction of the clubhouse is financial. The developers stated that they cannot afford the expense of building the clubhouse and installing the plumbing and waste treatment facilities needed until additional storage units can be sold. The construction of the 2<sup>nd</sup> building is needed in order to sell the storage units and give them the cash flow to afford the clubhouse construction.

Both committee members present recalled the initial discussion concerning the use of a portable toilet in the first phase of the development. They were concerned about the continued use of a portable toilet.

Additional discussion then focused on the staff review of the initial submittal received on April 25, 2011. The review checklist was used as a guide for discussion.

1. Building colors were established on the Preliminary Development Plan, but the developers want the flexibility of bidding the buildings out in order to keep costs low. With different suppliers, color variations are likely to occur, but the developers will strive to keep them as consistent as possible. They will note on the Site Plan that colors will be as approved or similar.

2. Cupolas are mentioned in the PDP approval, but in checking the original plans, these two buildings to be constructed in this phase do not contain cupolas.
3. The 2 new buildings are labeled 'carriage houses' and thus will probably have the same roof pitch as the first building—if the same supplier is used. Other buildings in the development will be different and will likely have different roof pitches.
4. A note on the site plan will explain that Phase 1 improvements are 'under construction'.
5. Several lines on the site plan are similar, unlabeled and confusing. These will be improved when resubmitted.
6. Note use of structures and square footage of buildings on site plan
7. Add Landscape Legend and detail foundation plantings.
8. Additional fire hydrant(s) may be needed with current placement on site plan—too far from buildings.
9. Discussed vinyl coated chain link fence for permanent fencing along south property line.
10. Provide several detail drawings—lighting fixtures and poles, building signs
11. Small white island will be a grassy area for barbecues – will be labeled
12. Gravel drives to north of storage buildings will need easements similar to Phase 1
13. Denote area for location of waste treatment system

Site Plan Review Committee supports approval of Phase 2 with the needed revisions to the Plan, but defers a decision concerning the restroom to the Planning Commission.