



AGENDA

Site Plan Review Committee

City Hall, 32905 West 84th Street
Tuesday, December 14th, 2009 at 5:00 P.M.

1. Roll Call
 2. Agenda Items:
 - A. Review of the Site Plan for the Final Development Plan for Phase 1 of Carriage Houses of Johnson County. Development will provide storage buildings as a condominium type development located at 29230 West 83rd Street.
 3. Adjournment
-

MINUTES

Carriage Houses of Johnson County, Phase I, Final Development Plan

Committee Members: Mary Guntert, Toni Caldwell, Charlie McNemee.

Absent: Dave Servos, Doug Weis.

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

Carriage Houses of Johnson County: Greg Earlenbaugh, Brad Burton

GBA Architects Engineers: Brad Burton

ARCO National Construction: Doug Wohltman, Chad Meyer

Mike Brungardt began with introductions 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.

Linda Bohnsack continued with a discussion of the previously approved Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) and the Planned Development Zoning, pointing out the exhibits prepared from these documents. She noted that once these are approved, they provide the basis for all development on the site. If a change is made or requested, unless of a very minor nature, a rezoning will need to be required.

Mike Brungardt continued by pointing out several issues that will need consideration by the Committee such as the portable toilet, the drive aisle to the north of the building, and finalization of architectural.

He noted that the applicants are requesting that the extension of the waterline be delayed until occupancy of the first building. The Ordinance for the approved PDP clearly states that the water line must be completed prior to issuance of a building permit for the development. Staff will need to do some research and consult with the City Attorney to determine if this is a significant enough change to the approved plan to trigger a rezoning hearing.

Mike then asked the members of the Site Plan Review Committee to bring up any issues they wished to discuss. The following issues were discussed and considered by the committee, staff and developers.

1. Traffic Issues *No additional recommendations.*
 - a. Increased Traffic Levels. The traffic generated by this Phase of the development will not be such that street improvements will need to be made. It was noted during the PDP review that a traffic study would be needed in a later phase. Triggers for such a study may be higher levels of traffic to and from site, connection with Gardner Road and/or higher traffic levels. It was determined that after the construction and occupancy of a few buildings, the City and the developer would have a better grasp of the traffic levels that will be generated by each phase.
 - b. Site Entrance. The entrance drive has been designed sufficiently to allow large vehicles enough turning radius and access to and from 83rd Street. Sight distances are also good in this location.
 - c. Site Circulation. Mike pointed out the area to the north of the building that is graveled, noting that he would rather see that included in the plat. The applicant would prefer to wait and avoid the need to remove the paving for future development. Applicant will discuss this point with the rest of the development group.
2. Portable Toilet. *Submit request for portable toilet to Planning Commission.*
 - a. Ms. Caldwell was against to the portable toilet initially. Linda explained that Mike, Steve Chick, the City Building Official and herself had discussed the subject extensively. Linda had polled other municipalities with a mixture of results—some do not require a restroom, some only if an office is provided or at a specific development level or size, others require only one unisex restroom and others require two restrooms. Mr. Chick checked the City Code and it does not specify that a restroom must be permanent, but that facilities need to be provided. Ms. Caldwell pointed out that information from other municipalities concerning mini-storage facilities may not be relevant to this use. She noted that this is not the atypical of that use and that a permanent restroom facility should be installed. Mike noted that acceptance of a portable toilet may be acceptable, on the condition that construction of a permanent facility is determined and agreed upon in writing—what phase or by a specific date (if the development is not completed).

Mr. Earlenbaugh stated that this is a private development, not open to the general public, only individual owners; there are only 22 units in this phase, as opposed to the earlier proposal for more than twice that many units; and that regular maintenance of the toilet can be arranged. He requests a compromise on this item.

Mike pointed out that in order to approve the portable toilet, the City would need to be comfortable with the idea that it could be there forever, unless a reasonable agreement can be reached concerning its replacement.

3. Fencing Issues. *Extend wrought iron fence and add temporary fence.*
 - a. Wrought Iron Fence. The approved PDP indicated wrought iron fence along the front (south side) of the property from the east property line westward past the entrance gate for a distance estimated staff to be about 290'. Therefore the fence should be noted as extending along the entire south line of the proposed Phase 1 of the development instead of only the few feet on either side of the entrance gate as noted on the Final Development Plan.
 - b. Temporary Security Fence. The balance of the area involved in Phase I will need to be fenced, but this is not indicated on the FDP. The approved PDP indicates black vinyl covered chain link fencing with brick pillars around the balance of the site—where it is not edged by wrought iron. This or some other type of fencing sufficient to provide security for the site needs to be indicated on the FDP. Maximum fence height is six feet unless approved by the Planning Commission. A detail of the fence should also be added to the FDP.
4. Platted Area. *Provide easement for off-plat areas; add curbing.*
 - a. Staff would prefer to have the noted gravel turnaround area north of the building included in the plat. However, the developers want to limit the area of the plat and the area of paving as much as possible. If not included in the plat or paved, the developers must provide sufficient alternative area for fire trucks to turn around—possibly in the southwest corner of the area. Either location may be covered by an easement instead of being included in the plat.
 - b. Committee members pointed out that the edge of the pavement needs to have some type of barrier to prevent vehicles from straying out into the rest of the development site. If the fence is not placed at the edge of the pavement, it is recommended that curbing be provided to keep vehicles on the paved area.
5. Security/Lighting. *Note cameras on Site Plan, provide detail of street lights.*
 - a. Security Cameras. There will be security cameras mounted at the corners of the building to provide security for the site. The cameras will be accessible for any condo owner to check at anytime day or night.
 - b. Lighting. The street lights shown on the FDP will be similar to those approved in the PDP. In addition, there will be smaller light fixtures mounted to the sides of the building. These will provide both site lighting and contribute to the Carriage House aesthetic of the development.
6. Trash Disposal. *Submit request for no dumpster to Planning Commission.*
 - a. Staff was concerned about providing a screened area for a dumpster on site, but the developers do not think this is necessary for the first phase. It is expected that owners will want to keep the area clean to protect their investment and that trash can be disposed of individually by taking it with them. This will keep maintenance fees for the owners down. In addition, a dumpster would require regular access to the site by non-owners and it would be an 'eyesore' for the entrance area of the site (Phase I). They would like to wait to put a dumpster in a later phase.

7. Landscaping. *Provide detail drawings, change tree notations.*
 - a. Trees. There are several existing trees identified in the Landscape Plan that designated to remain and contribute to the landscaping of the site. Most of these are cottonwoods. In addition, there are two Bur Oaks noted on the Landscape Plan, but these will be replaced with red maples.
 - b. Entrance. The entrance to the site will be well landscaped as approved in the PDP. A copy of the approved drawing from the PDP was provided to the Committee and applicants agreed that the entrance would look as shown.
 - c. Other Landscaping. It was requested that a detail drawing be submitted depicting the proposed 'rock landscape area'.
8. Building Appearance. *Appearance is acceptable.*
 - a. Per developer, the colors of siding and design for the building is expected to be as depicted in the submitted 'Rendering'.
9. Signs. *Proposed signage acceptable, recommend master signage plan.*
 - a. Individual signs on the sides of the building will identify the unit's 'address'. Since this is a condominium development, each unit must be identifiable.
 - b. Entrance/Directional Signage. The main entrance sign depicted in the approved PDP is not part of the proposed development for this Phase at this time. It could be added with a simple sign permit at a later time. It will match the approved design. At some point, directional signage will be needed as well. It is recommended that a master signage plan be approved to coordinate the site signage.
10. Sidewalk. *Submit request for waiver.*
 - a. A sidewalk is required when platting property. Staff recommends that the developers request a waiver of the sidewalk for this Phase of the project.

At the conclusion of the meeting, the Site Plan Review Committee was satisfied with the overall proposal. The developers were requested to revise the Final Development Plan for Phase I of the Carriage Houses of Johnson County accordingly before submittal of the Plan to the Planning Commission for final approval. The revisions to the FDP will result in revisions to the Final Plat as well.