

**EXCERPT MINUTES OF MAY 18, 2017 WICHITA-SEDGWICK COUNTY
METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

Case No. ZON2017-00018 and CUP2017-00016 – Zone change from SF-20 Single Family Residential to LC Limited Commercial and creation of the R.D. Wood Commercial Community Unit Plan CUP DP-343 on property located approximately 1,000 feet north of 13th Street North on the east side of 135th Street West, property described as:

Lot 2, Pearson Farms Addition, Wichita, Sedgwick County, Kansas

TOGETHER WITH

Commencing at the Northerly most Northeast corner of Lot 1, Pearson Farms 3rd Addition, Wichita, Sedgwick County, Kansas; thence S 01 degrees 21'21"W, 327.63 feet to a corner of said Lot 1, for the Point of Beginning; thence continuing S 01 degrees 21'21"W, 268 feet to a point on the South line of said Lot 1; thence N 88 degrees 28'51"E, 200.25 feet to the Southeast corner of said Lot 1; thence N 01 degrees 21'21"E along the East line of said Lot 1 a distance of 257.86 feet to the Southern most Northeast corner of said Lot 1; thence N 88 degrees 38'39"W, 200 feet to the Point of Beginning.

BACKGROUND: The applicant is seeking LC Limited Commercial zoning on the SF-20 Single-Family Residential zoned 12.1-acre unplatted tract, subject to the development standards contained in the proposed R.D. Wood Commercial Community Unit Plan CUP DP-343. The proposed CUP will be developed with self-storage warehouses and neighborhood retail development.

The Unified Zoning Code (UZC) requires a CUP or a PO PWroughtective Overlay for LC and GC General Commercial zoned sites of six (6) acres or more, that are held under unified control at the time of initial approval. A CUP is intended to provide well planned and well organized residential, commercial and mixed development. The applicant provided the attached narrative indicating how the application meets these requirements.

The site is located approximately 1,000 feet north of 13th Street North on the east side of 135th Street West. The site is currently farmland. The applicant owns the abutting SF-20 zoned property to the north and east, which is also farmland with a stockpile of asphalt and concrete on it. The properties south and west of the site are developed with single-family residences and duplexes on properties zoned SF-20, LC, and SF-5 Single-Family Residential. The nearest properties zoned for commercial development are located at the northwest and southwest corners of 13th Street North and 135th Street West and approximately 500 feet east of 135th Street West on the north side of 13th Street North.

According to the applicant's narrative, the applicant's property to the north and east is proposed to be developed in the future with a residential subdivision. The applicant's attached development

plan (DP-343) shows that the site is proposed to be developed with a three (3) parcel commercial development with two (2) reserves to be used for drainage and open space. Parcels 1 and 2 are proposed for uses permitted by the NR Neighborhood Retail zoning district. Parcel 3 is proposed for uses permitted by the LC zoning district and self-storage warehouses, subject to the attached provisions of Article III, Section III-D.6.y. of the UZC. The CUP proposes additional restrictions on signage, access, circulation, lighting, landscaping, screening, and architectural design. The proposed architectural design of the self-storage warehouses is attached. The applicant's proposal does not meet the following UZC requirements:

1. Article III, Section III-C.2.b.(2)(a)2) requires a 35-foot building setback along north, south, and east property lines of Parcel 3. The applicant proposes a 10-foot setback along the north and east property lines and no setback along the south property line of Parcel 3.
2. Article III, Section III-C.2.b.(2)(d) requires a six- to eight-foot tall masonry screening wall along the north, south, and east property lines of Parcel 3. The applicant proposes that the walls of the self-storage warehouse buildings be used as screening with wrought iron fencing located in the gaps between the buildings. The walls of the buildings are proposed to have predominately metal siding with a brick veneer wainscot.
3. Article III, Section III-D.6.y.(4) requires a 15-foot deep landscaped yard along the north and east property lines and no setback along the south property line of Parcel 3. No landscaped yard is proposed along these property lines.
4. Article III, Section III-D.6.y.(4) requires architecture that is compatible with the surrounding residential development. The two western-most buildings are proposed to have architecture that is residential in character, but the remaining buildings are proposed to have architecture of an industrial warehouse character.

The development plan would have to be revised significantly to meet these requirements. Article VI, Section VI-C.4. of the UZC authorizes the Planning Commission to recommend modification of the above-stated UZC requirements. Article VI, Section VI-B.4. of the UZC authorizes the Board of County Commissioners approve such modifications upon receipt of a recommendation from the Planning Commission.

CASE HISTORY: The site is not platted.

ADJACENT ZONING AND LAND USE:

NORTH:	SF-20	Farmland
SOUTH:	SF-20, SF-5	Single-family residences
EAST:	SF-20	Farmland
WEST:	SF-5, LC	Single-family residences, duplexes

PUBLIC SERVICES: Access to the site is provided by the three-lane arterial street 135th Street West. Necessary street improvements such as turn lanes and access drives would be determined at the time of platting with the associated financial guarantees for the improvements provided at that time. Water and sanitary sewer service are available from the City of Wichita for extension of the site. Guarantees for the extension of water and sanitary sewer service would be submitted

at the time of platting and would require annexation of the property into the Wichita city limits. The site connects to a drainage channel south of the site. Necessary drainage improvements would be guaranteed at the time of a platting per a drainage plan to be established at the time of platting.

CONFORMANCE TO PLANS/POLICIES: The 2035 Wichita Future Growth Concept Map of the Community Investments Plan identifies the site as appropriate for “New Employment” development. In areas, like the proposed site, that are in proximity to existing residential uses, the Community Investments Plan indicates that it is appropriate to develop New Employment areas with convenience retail centers. The Locational Guidelines of the Community Investments Plan recommend the following:

1. Small, neighborhood serving retail and office uses should be located at the intersection of an arterial street and a collector street, like Kiwi Street to the west.
2. Pedestrian crossings of arterial streets should be provided between arterial intersections to connect such neighborhood serving uses to adjacent residential uses.
3. Non-residential developments should provide appropriate screening and buffering from residential uses.

RECOMMENDATION: Based on the information available at the time of the public hearing, staff recommends APPROVAL of the application with following additional recommended conditions intended increase conformance of the application with the requirements of the Unified Zoning Code and the recommendations of the Community Investments Plan:

1. The permitted uses for Parcel 3 shall be: All permitted uses in the GO General Office zoning district of the Wichita-Sedgwick County Unified Zoning Code, except those uses listed in General Provision #18, plus self-storage warehouse as restricted by Article III, Section III-D.6.y. of the UZC.
2. The building setbacks on Parcel 3 shall be 15 feet along the north, south, and east property lines.
3. General Provision #6 shall be modified to add: A financial guarantee for a signalized pedestrian crossing of 135th Street West near Kiwi Street to connect the development to the residential area to the west shall be provided at the time of platting. The pedestrian crossing shall be constructed prior to the issuance of a building permit on Parcel 1 or 2.
4. General Provision #12 shall be modified to add: A 15-foot landscaped yard shall be provided along the north, south, and east property lines of Parcel 3 and along the west line of Parcel 3 where abutting 135th Street West. The landscaped yard shall be planted with a landscaped earth berm containing one tree every 20 feet, with at least one-third of the trees being evergreen.
5. General provision #13C shall be modified to remove “wrought iron or similar decorative fencing and replace it with “screening wall or fence constructed of materials required by Article IV, Section IV-B.3.h. of the UZC.”
6. The architectural requirements for Parcel 3 shall be: Perimeter storage buildings in Parcel 3 shall have an architectural design that is residential in character with sloped roofs with roofing material consistent with surrounding residential uses and exterior walls

facing outward from Parcel 3 having a mixture of siding materials consistent with surrounding residential uses. Siding materials on outward-facing walls shall be predominately brick and shall include pilasters or other architectural treatments to establish a residential architectural character. Interior buildings may be all metal with consistent colors to match exterior buildings but shall not visible from ground-level view from adjacent properties.

7. The area of Reserves A and B on the site plan shall be corrected to match the parcel descriptions.
8. The applicant shall record a CUP certificate with the Register of Deeds indicating that this tract (referenced as DP-343 R.D. Wood Commercial CUP) has special conditions for development on the property. A copy of the recorded certificate along with four copies of the approved CUP shall be submitted to the Metropolitan Area Planning Department within 60 days of recording the plat for the subject property, or the request shall be considered denied and closed.

This recommendation is based on the following findings:

1. The zoning, uses and character of the neighborhood: The zoning of the neighborhood is a mixture of LC Limited Commercial, SF-20 Single-Family Residential, and SF-5 Single-Family Residential. The uses and character of the neighborhood are currently low-density residential with a mixture of single-family residences and duplexes. Small-scale commercial uses, like the proposed development, are likely to development in future in the neighborhood on existing LC zoning at the northwest and southwest corners of 13th Street North and 135th Street West and approximately 500 feet east of 135th Street West on the north side of 13th Street North.
2. Extent to which removal of the restrictions will detrimentally affect nearby property: The development plan as proposed may have detrimental effects on nearby properties. The conditions of approval requiring additional landscape buffers, screening, and architectural design that is residential in character should mitigate the detrimental effects on nearby property.
3. Conformance of the requested change to the adopted or recognized Comprehensive Plan and policies: The 2035 Wichita Future Growth Concept Map of the Community Investments Plan identifies the site as appropriate for “New Employment” development. In areas, like the proposed site, that are in proximity to existing residential uses, the Community Investments Plan indicates that it is appropriate to develop New Employment areas with convenience retail centers. The Locational Guidelines of the Community Investments Plan recommend the following:
 - a. Small, neighborhood serving retail and office uses should be located at the intersection of an arterial street and a collector street, like Kiwi Street to the west.
 - b. Pedestrian crossings of arterial streets should be provided between arterial intersections to connect such neighborhood serving uses to adjacent residential uses.
 - c. Non-residential developments should provide appropriate screening and buffering from residential uses.

The conditions of approval ensure that the development is consistent with the Locational Guidelines.

4. Impact of the proposed development on community facilities: The subject property will be platted to ensure the provision of adequate public services to site. A signalized pedestrian crossing of 135th Street West near Kiwi Street will connect the development to the residential area to the west.

SCOTT KNEBEL, Planning Staff presented the Staff Report.

RICHARDSON asked what the staff recommendation is with regards to landscaping and where and how high would the berm have to be.

KNEBEL said the way its recommended there would be a fifteen foot set back along the south, north and east property line. He added that the berms are typically three feet in height and planted with trees every twenty feet with one third of the trees required to be evergreen.

RICHARDSON asked if the exterior buildings would be residential in nature with pitched roof and building materials suitable to a residential neighborhood.

KNEBEL responded correct.

HARTMAN asked if there is a landscape buffer along the west edge of parcel 3.

KNEBEL said that is not required and it would be the back of the commercial development in parcel one and parcel two at some point. He said if the commission feels like, they the same treatment could be required long the west line.

RICHARDSON asked what the staff recommendation for zoning is.

KNEBEL said the entire zoning of parcels one, two and three would be limited commercial. Parcel 1 and 2 would be limited to neighborhood retail uses. Parcel 3 would be limited to general office uses in addition to general self-storage warehouse subject to the conditions of the supplementary use regulations.

RICHARDSON asked if the CUP would limit it to general office.

KNEBEL answered yes, for parcel 3. Reserves A and B would remain residential zoning.

CHAIR FOSTER commented that Staff has done a good job working to integrate it and thinking of long term relative to this being part of a neighborhood over time. Concerning the berm, he commented that fifty feet is tight regarding drainage issues and asked if the applicant has flexibility making sure all drainage works.

KNEBEL responded yes, the landscape buffer is mandatory by the CUP and needs to be designed by a licensed landscape Architect who would address those concerns.

CHAIR FOSTER asked if it would be possible to go to a solid screening between the units and if it could be a gate.

KNEBEL replied yes, solid screening fences can have gates.

ELLISON asked if there are future plans for the property.

KNEBEL said the applicant's narrative indicates that it will be a residential development.

RUSS EWY, BAUGHMAN COMPANY AGENT FOR APPLICANT said the applicant is the owner of the larger track of ground and is selling the 12-acre piece but will not be the developer of any part of the project. He wanted to state this for the record since there were concerns with a few neighbors who he has met with in the past few weeks concerning other elements of that particular property. He said the applicant is purchasing the 12-acre from the parent track, which will lead his discussion as it relates countering some of staff's recommendations. Starting with the general provision recommend to change number 3 that talks about the pedestrian crossing. He understands that this is a new requirement of commercial development and his first time seen this in the projects his office have done. He said they are looking at about a sixty thousand dollar pedestrian crossing, a median average and would like to make sure that is money well spent. He asked that item to be reconsidered or considered eliminating that particular guarantee as part of this project. With the bulk of the property he understands if that becomes a middle school or some other large pedestrian traffic generating use. He believes that particular investment would probably be somewhat wasted. From speaking with the neighborhood to the south there was no interest or concern for the pedestrian crossing being included in the final approval. He spoke with representatives for the HOA to the west and he did not hear concerns or comments about the project from them. Speaking with other neighbors, he said they had concerns concerning the architectural nature of the building, the proximity and how would drainage, screening be handled. He states for the record that drainage would be handled and explained it to them, whether there are modifications to their existing drainage pond system, it could be made part of this site development and agreeable. He points out that they have revised the drawing to show a fifteen foot set back along the north and east perimeter. This is a unique situation because they own and are protecting the development from themselves. He feels that it is a standard design practice to put the back of the building at the property line with Wrought iron. He has never been required in the conditional uses to have a masonry wall. He said this is a CUP and CUPS specified in the zoning code that they could be modified or waived. He believes the general practice would be to expect the outer perimeter buildings to have the architectural elevations on the exterior providing them the standard residential siding and brick veneer facades. He feels the wrought would also be favored by the fire department compared to a masonry wall. He would argue that aesthetically he would prefer as initially applied for the standard treatments for buffering and architectural consistency along the perimeter buildings. Reserves A and B will be owned by a consortium of lot owners or by lot/parcel 3. He said they are able to utilize the land in lieu of the 35 or 30 foot buildings that it

would typically have in a CUP where it matters the most, against property owners. The elevation of the buildings and the elevation of the site compared to the elevation of the homes is about the same. In addition to the financial guarantee to the pedestrian crossing and the prohibition of use of Wrought iron, they are also in disagreement with the slope roof with composite singles. He said the shingling material is paramount to the developer in this particular project. He has done other projects in other locations for other clients who had composite roofing materials and in this circumstance he is looking to use slow slope roof with metal roofing materials. He said there is no way to see a grade level what the roofing material is because of the low slope roof. He is referring to the interior buildings that are proposed and he said the exterior buildings have not been completed yet. The exterior perimeter buildings that will have different building materials to match to match residential areas around it.

ELLISON said drainage mentioned earlier to the south side of the property and that it might not be adequate. He would like to know if this is being reconsidered.

EWY believes everything is adequate. He added that this is Crystal Gardens Subdivision with a dry detention facility, and a structure that affects storm water drainage upstream and bleeds it through a concrete channel. He is proposing the reserve to capture the flow that comes out from the field that drains back to west and east, north to south into that particular point. He said it is a critical drainage system that they need to design once the project is approved and they are platting for it. He envision the need for a dry detention pond as well, that would capture the sites runoff and capture the natural flow from the existing field. The current landowner built a 4 to 5 foot berm along the back of their property that specifically diverts rainwater into the system. He added that the drainage is not a constraint to developing. He said from existing self-storage warehouse developments they are 95 percent paved and the rainwater will be captured in an internal system and directed through piping into the dry pond facility.

RICHARDSON asked what happened in reserve A.

EWY said reserve A is 50 feet in width and will be able to do a little bit of everting from having utilities if needed, a small swale to take water at a gradual incline back to the east and act somewhat as a dry ponding area/ditch , but primarily will be used as buffer. They are able to put the buildings on the property line and cluster planting at the wrought iron locations between buildings per standard developing practice, utilizing the reserves not only for drainage and utilities but also for screening and buffering.

RICHARDSON asked if the buildings along reserve A are proposed not to in residential character.

EWY said the office building upfront as well as the climate control building are both built in a different manor than the metal structure of the rest of the storage units, that would have pitched roofs with composite singles and be entirely developed with residential building materials on

the exterior. The buildings will share the same type of skeleton but with different building materials.

HARTMAN asked if the plan is to put the wrought iron between the buildings in lieu of the masonry wall.

EWY responded yes and it would be where ever there is gap between buildings about 10 to 15 foot runs.

HARTMAN asked if 15 foot would be the max amount of run.

EWY said he does not have an answer to that question but could have an answer by rebuttal time.

HARTMAN asked what is the total square footage for the retail uses in one and two.

EWY responded roughly twenty five thousand square feet each lot, with the standard ratio of 30% lot coverage.

CHAIR FOSTER asked if reserve B part of the CUP application.

EWY replied that was correct. It started with 12 acres and the configuration parcels one, two, three and reserves A and B. He said there is a legal description on the face of the CUP that will be slightly modified to eliminate reserves A and B for the final zoning ordinance.

CHAIR FOSTER asked if reserve B would be eliminated.

EWY said reserve B will not be zoned Limited Commercial as of applied for and it will be reserve B on the plat and controlled by the CUP being voluntary single-family residential property.

CHAIR FOSTER commented that the 10 foot is a little tight in terms of berming and drainage. Realistically if it goes point to point it maxes out at a three foot feet and will not get much benefit from the berming. He asked would the landscape requirement within the ten feet dimension with berm, drainage, landscape.

EWY said if the idea was a continuous berm, he would be against that requirement. He reinstates that this is like any another developments done within the last twenty years to modify the standards of the CUP which is a right to-do .It is a situation where they are being asked to screen from themselves nothing done previously just a conditional use for a similar type of self storage warehouse development at 29th Street , between Ridge Road and Hoover. He said that conditional use had none of the requirements that this CUP has. He is just asking for a level of fairness from similar types of development. He is not claiming they will be able to ditch drainage around it, he is claiming that they have the ability to come off site and dedicate additional land

for such purpose. He said when it's developed for single-family resident home the back yard will dedicate a twenty-foot drainage and utility reserve to marry up with the fifteen-foot space.

KNEBEL made one clarification that he staff reports requires a wall between the buildings and the report says wall or fence. It does not have to be a masonry wall.

VINCENT WESOLOWSKY 13206 W. HUNTERS VIEW WICHITA, KS 67235 said his concern is on reserve B that goes back to the residential area. When he built his house the property owner to the north put a berm about 3 to 4 feet, however behind his house it 8 feet. If reserve A is 20 feet, he believes the berm need to stay the full length all the way to the end of the property line to separate the residential to the south from the north. He added that a few people in his Crystal Gardens subdivision did not received any information about the rezoning case.

CHAIR FOSTER commented that he understood from the agent that the width on reserve A would be 50 feet. He asked Mr. Wesolowsky to show on the aerial where the 8-foot berms are located.

WESOLOWSKY showed where his property is.

CHAIR FOSTER asked what happens going westward.

WESOLOWSKY responded that it slopes westwards to the drainage area. He said at the drainage areas the Northside is flat and the berm gets bigger when you head east until it reaches the end at the owners field. He added that there is another dry drainage pond to the east side. He and other property owners would like the berm to be maintained.

LARRY WREN 13402 W. HUNTERS VIEW; WICHITA, KS 67228 said he is not bothered by having the self-storage as neighbors but he would like the developer to follow the guide lines that are recommend by staff specifically the ones referring to landscape. It is important to him that the outside buildings have a residential look to them including the roof. He added that landscaping is also very important specially if the rest of the site will be developed into residential, it would be a great investment. He would also like a solid wall because it will be better aesthetically and keep the nature of residential

ELLISON asked what was the reason for an 8-foot berm

WREN said on the site plan the drainage issue can be seen.

ELLISON asked if Mr. Wren's house have any water or flooding issues during high rain periods.

WREN said it has growing water issues.

ELLISON asked Mr. Wren what he is talking about when he refers about a concrete wall.

WREN said when they refer to a wrought iron between buildings; he would like to see a solid wall per recommendation of the planning staff. There is a bigger gap between some buildings and a wall would be more conducive to a residential look.

BILL SMITH 13106 W. NANTUCKET; WICHITA, KS 67235 said he is a member of the board for Crystal Gardens Home Association who brought up the drainage issue. He said that Scott Knebel and Russ Ewy have done a good job at addressing the issues that the neighbors currently have and those that might arise from the proposed development. He wants to confirm that the Planning department and the developer are committed to come up with a drainage plan that will help with the drainage issues. He adds that 38 duplexes built on 135th street were done without a retention pond and the water eventually drains into their pond that creating an additional volume of water preventing the outflow. He said home owners who live near the retention pond are now having to buy flood insurance because FEMA as of December 2016, said that is a flood plain possibly cause by the additional water . He added that even though the pond most of the time does not have water in it, the County said there is a water view and as a result they have increased the value of the properties and residents pay higher real-estate tax although they do not have a view of the pond. Because of the design of pond, he is not able to access the west side of the pond or get across the pond because of rain and other times homeowners have to look at unmown grass and weeds. He appreciates the commitment to help rectify the issues and looks forward to working with them.

RICHARDSON asked Mr. Smith if it is the homeowner's responsibilities to maintain the pond.

SMITH responded, correct.

RICHARDSON asked if the last flood plain map put the houses on the west side and if for financial purposes need to have flood insurance.

SMITH responded, yes.

CHAIR FOSTER mentioned as he recalled the agent description the drainage planning would include zero runoff coming into the direction of the homes based on using the reserves that will be platted.

GREENE said that based on the public speakers comments it seemed like Mr. Smith is anticipating some help with the drainage concerns on his property. He does not see that anything that could be decided with the property to the north would help alleviate any of the HOA responsibilities about the drainage problems and asked if that was Mr. Smith's understanding.

SMITH said talking with the developer's agent it is a possibility in working with the neighbors there might be some relief to the drainage problems.

GREENE said he does not see whether approved or not they would not have any oversight or ability to require the applicant to provide any kind of drainage alleviation.

CHAIR FOSTER commented an offsite improvement could be required.

GREENE said that would be taken care off in the platting process if he is not mistaken but the commission does not have say over drainage concerns.

CHAIR FOSTER said they have required in the past and believes it should be discussed as its part of how it interrelates and its part of the purpose of the commission.

JANNA DENNIS 13314 W. HUNTERS VIEW; WICHITA, KS asks that the 6 to 8 screening wall be included in the project. The homes facing the units are owned by a majority of single or elderly women and are designed for the windows, patios, decks to face the units. She worries that the wrought iron fence would not provide the security as well as privacy that she needs. Security is a concern to her, as she knows that the facility units would be open 24 hours.

EWY said he would address other drainage concerns that they may have and adds that as talked about last week with the neighbors there will be certain amount due to the close proximity location of their drainage facilities and the fact that they will have to connect by pipe. He would like to clarify that they would do some berming as part of site development of parcel 3 for the self-storage units but there is also the existing berm that the property owners built. They would not remove that berm but rather incorporated into a larger berming system. He said they would agree on a solid masonry wall in-between buildings along reserve A the southern face of the buildings where is does directly affect the neighborhood. He mentioned that the facility will not be open 24/7 and will have standard operating hours of 6:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. adding that it is a very secure project and he feels the visual design of the building with wrought iron and landscaping provides an improved aesthetic to the neighborhood.

MCKAY said they heard about the 8 feet berm behind the single-family houses east of the project and Ewy made the comment that it was probably put there to keep from flooding the land to the north and asked if reserve B would be for retention of water and what the size of the retention pond is. He thinks it would help with water going south to the houses on the west and if the applicant would want to work with the neighbors, it would help the situation.

EWY said at site development they would be able to stop the intensive flow, bleed water and there will be less velocity into their system. Their system would be retrofitted back to its original design.

MCKAY asked if the applicant would work with the neighbors on the design.

EWY responded absolutely.

RICHARDSON commented that the areas outside the redline that are not being considered today, it will have to have its own drainage plan and more than likely retention ponds as well. He asked if that's a reasonable statement.

EWY said he would argue against it in part. There will be drainage plan that will not focused just in the red area but there will be drainage plan that calculates the basin that come through the property affecting the applicant. They are starting with reserve B being about 1.5 acres and if it becomes necessary in the course of platting the property that the pond requires a secondary pond so be it.

RICHARDSON asked if reserve B would take care of the drainage that goes south and west.

EWY responded yes.

RICHARDSON said that it would help the situation taking into account not only what is being proposed but everting that flows thought there.

EWY said they feel they have an obligation and would readdress that.

CHAIR FOSTER asked if the office building and other buildings be in residential character.

EWY responded correct.

CHAIR FOSTER said he does not see any concern on being metal roof, and asked if they could do something different like raise the pitch slightly to give it a different feeling versus the low pitch, making it more compatible with the other structures.

EWY responded yes and said they would propose three sets of masonry walls to protect the neighbors to the south.

RICHARDSON asked staff as the proposal of the five conditions, if he could point out what buildings would be residential in character as opposed to the applicant.

KNEBEL said it would be all of the buildings around the exterior and it would be the exterior wall of such buddings.

RICHARDSON asked if a different roof be required.

KNEBEL said he would be looking for roof to have a slope common with the residential roof materials and the ones showed previously are industrial buildings not residential.

RICHARDSON said there are two buildings they are agreeing would be the office and the climate control perimeter buildings with a residential look.

KNEBEL said they are shown that way in the drawings.

RICHARDSON said staff would recommend that the entire perimeter be residential in nature and the 15 foot setback does it concede with recommendation.

KNEBEL said he has not seen the drawing and is not certain on the proposal as he understood it was 15 feet on the north and east but not the south.

GREENE said something not being discussed is the pedestrian crosswalk.

KNEBEL responded that it is consistent with the locational guideline in the comprehensive plan indicating that there should be arterial pedestrians' crossings of arterial streets provided between arterial intersecting to connect neighborhoods to neighborhood serving commercial uses as well as a safety issue. He said if there is concern about the specific nature from a staff standpoint if the recommendation needed to be modified and add pedestrians crossings to the list of traffic improvements that would be explored and guaranteed through the platting process he would be ok with it.

GREENE asked if that would be signalized or marked with pavement markings.

KNEBEL responded that it would be determined at the time of platting and there could be a traffic study to base it on the size of development indicating the likely volume of pedestrian crossings. They would work with the Traffic Engineer on what the correct marking or signalizing would be.

WARREN said the idea of pedestrian crossing is important but who would pay for what since this is small commercial. He adds that if the buildings are residential in nature than the aspect of screening the entire property does not become necessary and vice versa. He comments its refreshing to see a neighborhood that is not opposing to the aspect of storage but just want it to look nice. He appreciates the attitude and they need to put some protections for the neighborhood whether it be screening or the look of the buildings.

RICHARDSON asked if staff or the applicant proposes a separate wall all the way around.

KNEBEL said that is accurate and the only solid wall would be the building walls and whatever solid screening material i.e. masonry wall or wooden fence.

RICHARDSON commented that neither one of those proposes the building as the screening.

KNEBEL said that would be correct. He adds that the landscape buffer would be between the building walls and the property line also a code requirement.

RICHARDSON said the applicant is saying no to the landscape to the south and staff is suggesting the sure be one.

KNEBEL said he is flexible with that and potentially there could be building on the property line and require that the 15 foot landscape to be buffered be located in reserve A. The reason he did not recommended it to be that the applicant admitted that they do not know what the drainage plain is going to be and he did not want to take potential land needed for drainage purposes by putting landscaping on it.

RICHARDSON comments that staff has done a great job at trying to mitigate some items. His position on the buildings directly behind the commercial that would be up to the applicant whether they are residential materials. However, on the perimeter, the buildings should be residential materials and he would like to propose a motion that uses staff's recommendation for landscape, requiring it to be in the 50 feet of reserve A as opposed to a separate 15 feet. He would also go with the suggestion of the pedestrian study, platting and getting traffic engineering involved. However he would not make it a requirement of the applicant not knowing what else will go up and down the street on the east side. A solid screening in-between the buildings having residential buildings on the north, east and south but not on the west.

MCKAY asked if recommendation number three is eliminated regarding the signalized pedestrian deal.

RICHARDSON said he would eliminate requirements for signalized.

MCKAY commented that it would be a study on the pedestrian walk way and he seconds the motion.

ELLISON asked if wording is needed on the proposal regarding the drainage issue because what happens if nothing is done.

RICHARDSON said that would be looked at the platting stage regarding the drainage and he believes that is the correct place to address it.

KNEBEL said he did not add a recommendation regarding drainage because it is already in the CUP as a provision that they would do a drainage plan.

RICHARDSON commented that he is concerned that there is requirement for flood insurance along the west side of the existing pond and now that he is aware along with other member of the Subdivision Committee can look at it and take care of it.

CHAIR FOSTER said there is a motion by Richardson and second by McKay.

WARREN asked if the aspect of residential feel and materials tie to the roof materials and the pitch on the roof. He would like to know if they have to dictate the amount of pitch on the exterior buildings.

RICHARDSON thinks yes but would like comments from staff.

KNEBEL said it is the intent that it would be a greater pitch than what shown.

B. JOHNSON said the houses to the south is 400 or 500 feet to the north and he could stand a panel, residential stuff, and not one could tell what it is. He believes they are getting off base and thinks they should go with recommendations like all other mini storages Mr. Wood has built with

landscaping and drainage and taken care of issues, flat roof where is metal. He makes a substitute motion to eliminate that part.

DAILEY seconds motion

CHAIR FOSTER said that kind of distance the eyes tend to go past a lower pitch element. If the pitch is up then it becomes more of a vertical element attracting the eye. He asked what kind of low pitch it is being talked about.

B. JOHNSON said it is depending on roof panel, it could be down to a quarter and twelve pitch and looking at the pictures, they could be steeper but still not more and a one twelve. It is a deal, where they try to keep them flat so they are not seen.

CHAIR FOSTER would it be lighter color on the roof panels to deal with issues of heat.

B. JOHNSON commented that is what Galvalume roof is for.

MCKAY said looking at the pictures it looked like it was about two-pitch roof and thinks that would be enough. He agrees with B. Johnson and if you look at the distance is close to a quarter mile away and he would recommend not having it more than two percent pitch roof.

B. JOHNSON said he approves the applicants approved residential style construction and metal roofs with low slope roof lines. He suggest working with the drainage, landscape is a good idea not matter what is made of and the solid walls on the south side with the same information on the sidewalk.

CHAIR FOSTER asked if it includes solid screening to the east and north.

B. JOHNSON thought they agreed to the south with the drainage.

CHAIR FOSTER said this would be between the buildings.

B. JOHNSON agrees.

MCKAY said if the first motion could be amended to deal with the roofing.

CHAIR FOSTER asked Richardson if the substitute motion included all his motion elements.

RICHARDSON said it includes all the elements except not requiring residential materials or roofline on the east and the north and one building on the south.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION: To approve as requested by applicant with metal roof and residential character.

B. JOHNSON moved, DAILEY seconded the motion, and it carried (12-0).