

CITY OF DE SOTO
SITE PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE
City Hall, 32905 West 84th Street
Tuesday, February 7, 7:00 P.M.

MINUTES

1. The meeting was called to order at 7:05 p.m. by Committee Chairman Mark Crumbaker. Those present were: Toni Caldwell and Mary Guntert; Applicants Rex Allen and Don Parr; Kevin Vogt of Peridian Group, Inc.; Planning Commissioners Bob Friday and Richard Hemphill; Kim Gordanier, Planning Coordinator; and City Engineer Mike Brungardt.

2. Agenda Items:

- A. Review and recommendation of site plan for Lumber One, L.L.C., located at 9800 Sunflower Road. Chairman Crumbaker asked that the issues to be discussed be stated first so that every issue can be reviewed.

Brungardt stated his issues are location of septic tank and lateral fields; and, the stormwater runoff and drainage.

Gordanier stated she would like to discuss the landscaping and buffering requirements, and the location of a sign.

Applicants would like to discuss landscaping and buffering, and the parking lot layout.

Engineer Brungardt stated the property is served by a septic system and traffic should not be traveling over the lateral field. Applicant's engineer discussed the location of the field and said they will note the tank and laterals on the site plan. Discussion by Don Parr and Rex Allen that no vehicles travel over the lateral field.

Engineer Brungardt discussed the stormwater drainage. The existing graveled area, which will be paved, will require calculations on pre-development runoff and post-development runoff. Some grading at the edge of the parking lot may be necessary. Discussion by Mr. Vogt that his staff will provide these calculations to City Staff; the applicants will meet the requirements as set out by the City. Discussion by Brungardt on meeting the requirements, as well as the runoff from the parking lot.

Peridian's engineering staff will provide a report to Engineer Brungardt. Planning Commissioner Friday discussed the surface area not being substantially increased with asphalt. The applicants showed the area that will be asphalted, and the remaining areas that are gravel. The impervious area will not be increased substantially. Discussion by Engineer Brungardt.

Discussion by Planning Commissioner Hemphill on the materials used for the

building. Engineer Brungardt stated that the architectural drawings need not be required for the structures, though a materials list should be included as a note to the plan. Discussion by committee on the architectural details and standards. Planning Coordinator Gordanier stated this is not a new construction; there is a proposed lean-to that will be constructed on the side of the existing building. A discussion ensued regarding the open ends of the proposed lean-to and the buffering and landscaping. Parking spaces were discussed. Planning Commissioner Hemphill discussed the existing lighting that is on the site. Applicants will note the lighting and the wattages on the site plan.

Further discussion by Planning Commissioners Hemphill and Friday on the materials of the existing building. Discussion on the removal of the large door and then using some type of materials to "raise the bar" in the design standard to address the new door and the building wall. Engineer Brungardt stated, again, that this is not a new building construction.

Planning Coordinator Gordanier stated the sign, as it is located now, is 20 feet within the Sunflower Road of right-of-way. Discussion by Mr. Vogt on the location of the sign and the right-of-way that will be dedicated in future. The City has the right to remove or relocate the sign as necessary in order to maintain or improve utilities or infrastructure within the right-of-way. Engineer Brungardt discussed the legally non-conforming status of a sign.

Planning Coordinator Gordanier discussed the four areas of landscaping and buffering requirements. The buffers going from the industrial zoning district to the residential area. The staff reports addresses several ideas for how to relax the buffer requirements. The subject property and surrounding area are within the "Business Park" future land use category on the Future Land use Map. It is reasonable to assume that any further development of the adjoining properties, beyond the construction of one home to the south, would be to commercial or industrial land uses. Therefore, there would not be a need for extensive landscaping and screening in that case.

Discussion by Gordanier on the discussion with the applicant wherein the applicant proposed to reduce the size of the plantings. It is the applicants' opinion that a 1.5-inch caliper instead of the required 2-inch caliper tree would be adequate. The applicants stated the building has been in this location for 40 to 50 years. Chairman Crumbaker stated he doesn't understand why the landscaping and buffering should be so intense since this area will most likely be in a commercial area in future. This is a major expense in trees that may have to be removed in the next ten years. The applicant stated that a 1.5-inch tree will be the same size or larger as a 2-inch caliper tree in a five-year span.

Discussion by Mrs. Caldwell regarding the number of trees. Mrs. Guntert stated she agrees and stated there is no reason to have that many trees. Chairman Crumbaker stated there is a buffering requirement; however, this is an existing, long-term business, and not a new construction. Caldwell stated there is a substantial amount of trees. Gordanier stated staff would rather see some landscaping in front of the building rather than spending a substantial amount on trees. Crumbaker stated that an argument can be made that this is an existing

business. Brungardt said the site plan process has triggered some of these items being discussed.

Further discussion on certain areas that can have reduced plantings. The applicant discussed the rolled screening as opposed to the slatting of the fence. The committee pointed out the area that will not require buffering on the back area that has natural woods.

Discussion on the metal barn that blocks quite a lot of the view from the residential area. There are two huge trees that are on the adjoining property that do help screen the area. Discussion on the landscaping on the front of the building, and along the sides that border residential. Guntert stated that the trees along the front of the property could impair sight line onto the road. Staff stated the County's regulations are 1 house per 10 acres at this time. Also, the committee discussed the adjoining properties to the north and south of the existing business would most likely be non-buildable for homes due to the topography of the land and the flood plain considerations. Staff will refer to this in their report, and the applicants will prepare their proposal based on the alternative landscaping plans.

Chairman Crumbaker requested staff determine the alternative language for the landscaping and buffering requirements for an existing business. Planning Coordinator stated it is the "spirit and intent" of the applicants to meet the requirements. Discussion by Engineer Brungardt on the site plan application.

Chairman Crumbaker adjourned the meeting at 8:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Lana R. McPherson, CMC
City Clerk