

A. CALL TO ORDER

Four Planning Commissioners were in attendance. (Justin Gollob, JP Nisley, Dave Karisny, Cullen Purser were present).

B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Dave Karisny led the Pledge of Allegiance.

C. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA

None.

D. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

COMMISSIONER GOLLOB MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA

COMMISSIONER NISLEY SECONDED THE MOTION

MOTION PASSES 4-0

E. WITHDRAWN ITEMS

None

F. CONTINUED ITEMS

None

G. CONSENT ITEMS

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

February 11, 2020 Planning Commission meeting

COMMISSIONER NISLEY MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA.

COMMISSIONER PURSER SECONDED THE MOTION

MOTION PASSED 4-0 IN FAVOR TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA

H. HEARING ITEMS

Application #:	2020-03
Application Name:	Dwell Planned Unit Development
Application Type:	Concept Plan
Applicant:	Vortex Engineering, Inc.
Location:	1136 17 ½ Road & 796 N. Maple Street
Zone:	Community Residential
Description:	This is a request for approval of a Concept Plan for a 70-lot subdivision over approximately 8.8 acres. The overall plan contains 4 filings with a mix of attached and detached housing types and approximately 1.59 acres of open space.

Commissioner Karisny gave the attendees an overview of how the procedures work for the hearing portion of the meeting. He read the description of application 2020-03 Dwell Planned Unit Development.

Dan Caris, Planning and Development Director went up to give the Staff presentation. Mr. Caris entered his Power Point into the record.

Slide 1 - Introduction – Dwell PUD

Slide 2 - Application Information

Slide 3 - Project Description

- This is a Concept Plan for a proposed Planned Unit Development Subdivision. The purpose of a Concept Plan and the intentions of the applicant is to submit a plan to get valuable feedback from the public, the Planning Commission, City Council and Staff on the project.
- Total project acreage of 8.8 acres with a density of approximately 7.95 dwelling units/acre (53 attached units and 17 detached units).
- Primary access from Wildwood Drive (existing street stub) and North Maple Street (17 ½ Road).
- Internal streets within the subdivision are proposed to have approximately 25 feet of asphalt with a detached sidewalk on one side with landscaping between the street and the sidewalk.
 - Alley Access proposed as well for approximately 21 of the units.
- Approximately 1.59 acres of open space proposed (nearly 20% of the overall acreage).
 - Open Space consists of benches, trails, and playground equipment.
 - A large park is centrally located in the subdivision. Approximately 50% of the homes will have views of this park.

Mr. Caris pointed out that Title 17 was the Chapter and the Municipal Code that encompasses the Land Use Code. He continued that Chapter 17 is the Planned Unit Development application and submittal process and how it gets reviewed. He said a Concept Plan is a what they call in Major Subdivisions a Sketch Plan. It is an opportunity to bring a plan proposal in front of the Planning Commission and City Council to get feedback and disseminate the information that the Planning Commission submits to the applicant and the same with City Council and be able to move through a Preliminary Plan application. He continued that all of these are encompass a Preliminary Planned Unit Development and a Final Planned Unit Development. In the final stages the code speaks to how the zoning entitlements get flushed out for the entirety of the subdivision. Something that is unique to the City of Fruita is that they have a Concept Plan, a Preliminary Plan, a Final Plan, and the zoning taking place at the latter stages of the development. What they see is the zoning entitlements are a part of the Concept Plan and Preliminary Plan. They establish what the zoning perimeters will be if the project is viable and if it gets approved by the Planning Commission and City Council and there is a filing plan associates with those. They are not platting the entire subdivision without any of the

infrastructure in place to support those legally entitled lots. He said that this is where there is a little deviation from how they see it happen with those conventionally zoned districts.

Commissioner Karisny said it would be helpful to point out they are looking at an idea and a Sketch Plan. It will be approved or not approved. There are steps that follow that before it would become a real project. He continued that one of those steps would be moving on to City Council and then it would then go to a Preliminary Plan which would be another meeting for Planning Commission and City Council to approve or not approve. Then it would become an administrative process for the Final Plat.

Mr. Caris said that the improvements agreements would be approved by Council. He said that with a Planned Unit Development there are deviations from what is already conventionally residential zoned district. He said that typically a request for a PUD is going to have adjustments to the zoning code. The burden of proof is on the applicant that the public benefit is articulated and adheres to their guiding principals and Master Plan in order to establish the zoning entitlements. He said that this is a great first step for the public to engage the project and a useful step for the applicant to see if the project is viable moving forward. Mr. Caris said that there is a definition in the Land Use Code that defines a Sketch Plan. He said it is maps of a proposed subdivision and supporting documents submitted to evaluate concept, feasibility and design characteristics at an early stage in the planning subdivision.

Slide 4 - Project Description

- Planned Unit Developments (PUD's) allow for modification of the normal use, density, size or other zoning restrictions for the development which would otherwise be standard with other zone districts.
- The purpose of the Concept Plan is to get an overall idea of the concept of a proposed subdivision and whether the modifications proposed meet the intent of the Land Use Code and Master Plan.
- Since the applicant is proposing a Planned Unit Development zone, a Rezone application will need to be submitted along with or prior to the Preliminary PUD Plan application. This is to ensure the property is zoned accordingly.

Slide 5 - Planned Unit Development Process

1. Concept Plan Review.
2. Rezone the property to Planned Unit Development along with or prior to Preliminary PUD Plan.
 - The zoning of the property prior to or along with the Preliminary PUD Plan will ensure the Preliminary PUD Plan meets the zoning criteria.
3. Preliminary PUD Plan.
4. Final PUD Plan.

Slide 6 - Map of Zoning Districts

Mr. Caris described the map and points of location.

Slide 7 - Aerial View of the Subject Property

Slide 8 - Review of Land Use Code and Master Plan

- For Planned Unit Development Subdivisions, the Land Use Code sets forth 15 criteria that must be considered during the review.
- The following approval criteria shall be considered by the Planning Commission and City Council in its review of a proposed Planned Unit Development and no Planned Unit Development shall be approved unless the Council is satisfied that each of these approval criteria has been met, can be met or does not apply to the proposed Planned Unit Development.

Slide 9 - Review of Land Use Code and Master Plan

1. Conformance to the Fruita Master Plan;

- The following portions of the Master Plan - Fruita In Motion: Plan Like a Local Comprehensive Plan can or have been met:
 - Plan Themes of Efficient Development and Connectivity.
 - Chapter 3 - Land Use and Growth
 - Chapter 5 - Parks, Health, Recreation, Open Space and Trails
 - Chapter 6 - Transportation
 - Chapter 7 - Services and Infrastructure

Slide 10 - Review of Land Use Code and Master Plan

2. Consistency with the purposes as set out in Section 17.17.010, above.

Subsections A-H below are directly from Section 17.17.010 of the current Land Use Code.

17.17.010 GENERAL PURPOSES. Planned Unit Developments allow for modification of the normal use, density, size or other zoning restrictions for the development to accomplish the following purposes:

A. More convenient location of residences, places of employment, and services in order to minimize the strain on transportation systems, to ease burdens of traffic on streets and highways, and to promote more efficient placement and utilization of utilities and public services;

- This purpose has been met

Mr. Caris added that one of the elements that is not specific to this application was an employment center. He said that you see a lot of Planned Unit Developments that set aside commercial lots as a part of being a neighborhood centers or amenities for coffee shops or shopping services or things of that nature. He said that this was not being proposed in this application. He continued that as the staff evaluated that they felt that there were other amenities that were encompassed into the project that met the intent of that approval criteria.

B. To promote greater variety and innovation in residential design, resulting in adequate housing opportunities for individuals of varying income levels and greater variety and innovation in commercial and industrial design;

- It appears that the majority of this purpose either has been met or can be met.

C. To relate development of particular sites to the physiographic features of that site in order to encourage the preservation of its natural wildlife, vegetation, drainage, and scenic characteristics;

- It appears this purpose can be met.

Mr. Caris said that in some fashions this could be interpreted as not applying because it is an infill lot.

D. To conserve and make available open space;

- This purpose has been met.

Mr. Caris said that setting aside 20% of the development for a park amenity specific to this development this approval criteria has been met.

Slide 11 - Review of Land Use Code and Master Plan

E. To provide greater flexibility for the achievement of these purposes than would otherwise be available under conventional zoning restrictions;

- It appears this purpose can be met.

Mr. Caris added that they want projects like this to go through the proper vetting process in order to make sure that the amenities that are going to be in the subdivision warrant the densities that are being requested.

F. To encourage a more efficient use of land and of public services, or private services in lieu thereof, and to reflect changes in the technology of land development so that resulting economies may inure to the benefit of those who need homes;

- This purpose can be met.

Mr. Caris talked about highest and best land use and from a cost perspective that this makes sense. The amenities and type of development and location and its compatibility is a subjective component of this process. He continued that from public services and infrastructure it seems the proposed development can meet this.

G. To conserve the value of land and to provide a procedure which relates the type, design, and layout of residential, commercial and industrial development to the particular site proposed to be developed, thereby encouraging the preservation of the site's natural characteristics, and;

- This purpose can be met.

Mr. Caris said that part of the Planning Commission and Council process for PUDs, those architectural renderings, floor plans, how the building address the street matter and are elements that are riddled throughout their packets as far as what that is going to look like.

H. To encourage integrated planning in order to achieve the above purposes.

- This purpose can be met.

Slide 12 - Review of Land Use Code and Master Plan

3. Conformance to the approval criteria for Subdivisions (Chapter 17.15) and/or Site Design Review (Chapter 17.13), as applicable; except where Adjustments to the standards of this Title are allowed, and;

Subsections 1-5 below are directly from Chapter 15 of the Current Land Use Code.

1. Conformance to the City of Fruita's Master Plan, Land Use Code, Design Criteria and Construction Specifications Manual and other city policies and regulations;

- This criteria can be met.
 - 2. Compatibility with the area around the subject property in accordance with Section 17.07.080;
 - This criteria can be met.
- Mr. Caris spoke to compatibility and said that there was no commercial or industrial identified in the PUD but they are residential units that are attached, detached and multifamily units. They believe the variety of housing is important in the community and this was heard in the Master Planning process. They feel that attached units can be intermixed with and around Community Residential subdivisions.
- 3. Adequate provision of all required services and facilities (roads, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, parks, police protection, fire protection, domestic water, wastewater services, irrigation water, storm drainage facilities, etc.);
 - This criteria can be met.
 - 4. Preservation of natural features and adequate environmental protection; and
 - This criteria can be met.
 - 5. Ability to resolve all comments and recommendations from reviewers without a significant redesign of the proposed development.
 - Since this application is not a technical review of the subdivision. This criteria does not apply with this Concept Plan.

Slide 13 - Review of Land Use Code and Master Plan

- 4. Where the applicant proposes one or more Adjustments to the standards of this Title, consistency with the Adjustment criteria set forth in Section 17.11.020(B), is required. This subdivision will need to meet Section 17.11.050 of the Land Use Code. During the course of reviewing this Concept Plan, it does not appear that the applicants are requesting any adjustments. The Guiding Principles within Section 17.11.050 are as follows:
 - 1. New development and redevelopment should support walkable and attractive neighborhoods with a variety of housing types that are designed to be compatible with adjacent uses.
 - 2. Architecture should provide for compatibility with historic structures where applicable.
 - 3. Provide for street connectivity and pedestrian access and safety both within new developments and between new and existing subdivisions.
 - 4. Integrate open space and parks into the design of new neighborhoods and subdivisions.
- As supported in this Staff Report, this Concept Plan proposal appears to meet all of these Guiding Principles and thus meets this criteria.

Slide 14 - Review Comments & Public Comments

Review Comments

- All review comments have been provided. No significant concerns on the Concept Plan submittal.

Public Comments

- No written public comments have been received by Staff at this time.

Mr. Caris said that although there have been no written comments there have been conversations at the front counter.

Slide 15 - Legal Notice

All Legal Notice regarding this application was accomplished in accordance with Section 17.01.130 of the Fruita Land Use Code.

Paper – February 5, 2020 (34 days prior to Planning Commission)

Property – January 28, 2020 (42 days prior to Planning Commission)

Postcards – January 31, 2020 (39 days prior to Planning Commission)

Slide 16 - Staff Recommendation

- Staff recommends approval of the proposed Dwell PUD Concept Plan application with the condition that all review comments and issues identified in the Staff Report are adequately resolved with the Preliminary PUD Plan application.
- CITY COUNCIL HEARING DATE: Tuesday, April 7, 2020

Commissioner Karisny thanked Mr. Caris and they moved onto the petitioner's presentation.

Mr. Robert Jones II of Vortex Engineering at 861 Rood Avenue in Grand Junction. He said that he is the owners for the Concept Plan review. He presented a Power Point presentation.

Slide 1 – Introduction Dwell Planned Unit Development Concept Plan Project 2020-03

Slide 2 – Location Map

Slide 3 – Future Land Use Map

Mr. Jones pointed out that this map is from the Comprehensive Plan Update and the map's classification is 4-8 residential. He said that the goal was to encourage infill development within the city to limit and make more efficient use of existing infrastructure and encourage a variety of housing types and discouraging sprawl development at the edge of the city limits. He said that those densities identified in the community range from 4-8 were done in an effort to achieve the community goals of the new Comprehensive Plan that was recently adopted.

Slide 4 – Zoning Map

Mr. Jones said that the zoning map depicts the current zones. He said that this property is presently zoned Community Residential (CR). The applicant is seeking to rezone the site from CR to Planned Unit Development in an effort to achieve the goals and policies of the new Comprehensive Plan. He said that the Land Use Code has not been updated, the only avenue for them is to provide for this Planned Unit Development to implement those new goals and policies. He continued that there are various PUD zoned properties to the northeast, south, and west. They believe that Dwell provides infill development with that variety of attached and detached single family homes with open space and trails for the community and the general public.

Slide 5 – Map of the proposed Concept Plan for the Dwell PUD

Mr. Jones said that this map shows the proposed 70 attached and detached single family homes which would be constructed in 4 plan filings. He said that there are 2 points of access, Wildwood Drive to the east and North Maple to the west side. He said that Dwell would include

attached and detached units in a variety of configurations shown above. He pointed out pictures of each on the slide. He said it was discussed that Staff wanted the central amenity of the Planned Unit Development, the large park which is 20% of the site, be constructed sooner rather than later. The applicant agreed that the park would be constructed by filing 2.

Slide 6 – Map of the filing plan

Mr. Jones said that this map shows the filings. Filings coming in on the west side of the development off of North Maple going in a counterclockwise pattern.

Slide 7 – Map of the Landscape Plan

Mr. Jones said that this slide depicted as stated approximately 1.59 acres of open space and trails which does exceed the requirements of the Fruita Land Use Code. He said that the park amenities will include a tot lot with play equipment, picnic table and shade shelter and a bench. He said that there have also been designed within the project parking lots which will provide for guest parking for residents and the general public that would be coming to the park. He said that on the north end they could see the tot lot area, some of the playground structures and items that were designed into this and the shade structures and benches. He said that there are trail connections throughout, there is an east west trail connection and detached sidewalks on the east side into the park and to the west as well as a trail connection to the northeast corner which would tie into Vintner's Farm trail system. He continued that in the southwest corner there is a stormwater quality basin that would be landscaped. He pointed out another potential connection and a landscape buffer adjacent to North Maple Street.

Slide 8 & 9 – Pictures of architectural depictions

Mr. Jones said that the exterior of all the dwelling units would be that of a modern urban cottage type roadhouse design. He stated that the developer, who will also be the builder within the project, plans for clean lines with interaction with the street will be emphasized. He said that all of the dwellings would have at least one front facing porch or deck with a minimum of 60 square feet. He said that the roof pitches shall be a minimum of 6/12. He said that flat roof accents would not be allowed. He said that roofs for all structures will be asphalt or architectural shingles, metal tile or slate material. The outside façade of each structure shall be constructed of primarily wood or wood composite siding but not vinyl or other siding. Wood, stone, brick, metal and/or stucco accents are allowed and encouraged. Exterior color schemes will be primarily of earthen tones. Mr. Jones said that the pictures give them some illustrative examples of the type of architectural standards that are envisioned within the project. All design standards related to construction of homes and relating to improvements on each lot will be governed by the CCR's and an HOA architectural committee which shall review and approve proposed plans for compliance for all PUD design standards prior to issuance of approval for a planning clearance and building permit for construction.

Slide 10 – Proposed Dwell PUD Standards

Minimum Lot Area:

Single-Family Detached:	2900 Sq. Ft.
Single-Family Attached:	2100 Sq. Ft.

Setbacks for Single-Family Detached Homes (principal/accessory):

Front: 15'/25'
 Side: 8'/3'
 Back: 15'/3'
 Max. Lot Coverage: 40%/4%
 Max. Height: 40'/16'

Setbacks for Single-Family Attached Homes (principal/accessory):

Front: 15'/25'
 Side (detached): 8'/3'
 Side (attached): 0'/3'
 Back: 15'/3'
 Max. Lot Coverage: 60%/4%
 Max. Height: 40'/16'

Allowed Residential Uses:

Single-Family Detached Homes
 Single-Family Attached Homes
 Home Occupations*
 Home Childcare**
 Home Daycare**
 Residential accessory uses**
 Short Term Residential Property Rental***

*Permitted as accessory to any permitted residential use subject to the Home Occupational standards of Section 17.07.070(B) of the Fruita Land Use Code in effect on January 1, 2020

** As defined and regulated by the Fruita Land Use Code in effect on January 1, 2020

***Short term rental of property shall be allowed subject to the permitting requirements of the Fruita Land Use Code in effect on January 1, 2020.

Commissioner Karisny asked about the figures that had slashes. He used the front setback of 15'/25' as an example and asked if that meant that the house could be as close as 15' and 25' means a front driveway and that would be that setback?

Mr. Jones said that the slashes was for those accessory uses. For example, for a side setback the primary structure has a minimum of 8' side setback and accessory is 3' which is pretty standard in typical Community Residential zone.

Slide 11 – Continuation from Slide 10

Dwell PUD Residential Standards:**Community Residential (CR):****Downtown MU (DMU):****Minimum Lot Area:**

Single-Family Detached:	2900 Sq. Ft.	7000 sf	5000 sf or 6000 sf corner lot
Single-Family Attached:	2100 Sq. Ft.	10,000 sf - 2 unit attached	7500 sf duplex/10,000 sf MF
		15,000 sf – 3 unit attached	2500 sf each Townhouse

Setbacks:

Single-Family Detached Homes (principal/accessory):

Front:	15'/25'	15' w/alley or porch or 20' regular setback	Same as CR
Side:	8'/3'	16' total; 5'/3' minimum	15' total; 5'/3' minimum
Back (Rear):	15'/3'	15'/3'	Same as CR
Max. Lot Coverage:	40%/4%	50%	35% or 60% w/Mixed Use, alley, porch

Max. Height: 40'/16' 35'/16'

Same as CR

Setbacks:

Single-Family Attached Homes (principal/accessory):

Front:	15'/25'	15' w/alley or porch or 20' regular setback	Same as CR
Side (detached):	8'/3'	16' total; 5'/3' minimum	15' total; 5'/3' min; 0' w/ common wall
Side (attached):	0'/3'	16' total; 5'/3' minimum	15' total; 5'/3' min; 0' w/ common wall
Back (Rear):	15'/3'	15'/3'	Same as CR
Max. Lot Coverage:	60%/4%	50%	35% or 60% w/Mixed Use, alley, porch
Max. Height:	40'/16'	35'/16'	Same as CR

Allowed Residential Uses:

- Single-Family Detached Homes
- Single-Family Attached Homes
- Home Occupations*
- Home Childcare**
- Home Daycare**
- Residential accessory uses**
- Short Term Residential Property Rental***

Mr. Jones said that this is slide that is meant to show a comparison of what the proposed Dwell PUD residential setbacks are, what the Community Residential setbacks are, and the Downtown DMU setbacks. He said that they did this for a couple of reasons. He said as Mr. Caris pointed out that in PUD's there is an underlying base zone to call back. He said that this one is somewhat of a hybrid. He continued that the minimum lot areas of single family detached in Dwell is 2900 square feet, it is 7000 in CR and Downtown is between 5-6000. Single family attached is 2100 and what closely mirrors this project would be what the Downtown DMU standards are which is 2500 square feet for townhomes. Setbacks is all standard. He said that the maximum lot coverage is for single family detached what is being proposed as a restriction, which is more restricted than what is allowed in the current CR zone of 50%, they are at 40% and Downtown DMU fluctuates between 35-60%. Maximum height that is being requested is 40' and that is a deviation from the Community Residential zone and the Downtown DMU zone. Mr. Jones said that the developer does plan to utilize and accommodate for efficient use of space and townhomes are likely to be 2 story and they have that desire for that steep pitch, thus the minimum 6/12 that they had placed in the architectural control guidelines within the PUD guide. Mr. Jones continued that given the current desire for taller ceilings, 9-10-foot ceilings, when you stack those and start putting 6/12, 8/12 pitches on roofs you exceed that 35' and thus the request for 40' maximum height. Mr. Jones went on to the setbacks for the single family attached, he said that they closely mirror what is presently allowed in either the CR or DMU zone.

Slide 12 – Analysis of Proposed Deviations

Minimum Lot Area:

One of the key goals of the Dwell PUD is to create a community with a variety of housing types that meets the new R 4-8 land use classification of the Comprehensive Plan. In order to achieve this density and variety of housing types, smaller lot sizes are necessary. This allows for greater use of infrastructure such as streets, sidewalks, water and sewer lines and drainage facilities and is consistent with the type of urban design that the City of Fruita hopes to achieve through the new Comprehensive Plan. Smaller lot sizes are also necessary and typical of attached housing types such as townhomes, which will be included in the Dwell PUD.

The minimum lot sizes proposed for the Dwell PUD are 2900 square feet for single-family detached homes and 2100 square feet for single-family attached homes. The minimum lot size for a townhouse in the Downtown Mixed Use (DMU) zone is 2500 square feet. The Dwell PUD is comprised largely of single-family attached dwelling units (with zero side setbacks with common walls) and with nearly 20% open space; as a result, the minimum lot sizes have been designed for modern row houses that are consistent with urban design.

Mr. Jones said that one of the key goals of the Dwell PUD is to create a community with that variety of housing types that meets the new R4-8 land use classification from the Comprehensive Plan. He said that in order to achieve that, this density and variety of housing types, smaller lot sizes are necessary. He continued that this allows for greater use of infrastructure such as streets, sidewalks, water and sewer lines, and drainage facilities and is consistent with the type of urban design that they believe the City of Fruita hopes to achieve through the new Comprehensive Plan. He said that he smaller lot sizes were also necessary and typical of attached housing types such as townhomes which are included within the Dwell PUD. He said that those minimum lot sizes proposed Dwell PUD is 2900 square foot for single family, 2100 for single family attached and minimum lot sizes closely representing the DMU zone of 2500 square feet.

Slide 13 - Analysis of Proposed Deviations

Setbacks:

Front yard setback (single-family detached and attached) – Front yard setbacks in the Dwell PUD have been set at 15 feet in order to bring the homes closer to the street and to create a greater sense of community which is typically found in traditional neighborhoods. The Community Residential (CR) and the DMU zones allow a 15-foot front yard setback for homes that are alley loaded. Almost one third of the homes in the Dwell PUD are alley loaded, therefore the proposed front yard setback is consistent with the underlying zones. The applicant would like to create a consistent streetscape with homes which is another reason for the proposed 15-foot front yard setback.

Mr. Jones said that one of the items that was proposed with this was an alternative street. He continued that the alternative street does incorporate a detached sidewalk for the loop road and that was important to the developer, the detached sidewalk, the requirements for the mandatory front porches, that type of thing.

Side yard setback (single-family detached and attached) – There is no deviation proposed for the side yard setbacks for single-family detached and attached dwelling units. The DMU zone is actually more restrictive for side yard setbacks by allowing a 15-foot side yard setback. The DMU zone also allows a zero-side yard setback for common walls which is consistent with the proposed Dwell PUD side yard setback for attached dwelling units that are not an end unit.

Rear yard setback (single-family detached and attached) – There is no deviation proposed for the rear yard setbacks for single-family detached and attached dwelling units.

Slide 14 – Analysis of Proposed Deviations

Maximum Lot Coverage:

The Dwell PUD is proposing 40% maximum lot coverage (defined as that area of the lot or parcel which may be occupied by principal and accessory structures) for single-family detached dwelling units and 60% maximum lot coverage for single-family attached dwelling units. The reason for this is once again related to the smaller lot size and desire to make more efficient use of the lot area, especially with attached dwelling units. The 40% is more restrictive than the allowed lot coverage of 50% with the underlying CR zone district. The 60% lot coverage proposed for attached dwelling units is similar to the 60% lot coverage allowed in the DMU zone for alley loaded homes. There is very little difference between the proposed lot coverage of the Dwell PUD and the underlying DMU zone.

Maximum Height:

The maximum height of 40 feet proposed for the Dwell PUD (for both single-family detached and attached homes) is specifically requested to accommodate the architectural style of modern row homes that utilize steep roofs with a pitch of 6/12 or 8/12. The current trend in modern home construction also utilizes nine-foot ceilings which contributes to the need for additional building height.

The maximum height for accessory structures is proposed to be 16 feet.

Slide 15 – Approval Criteria

The review and approval criteria for the following Land Use Code sections have been addressed. The Dwell PUD meets, or can meet, all of the individual criterion for the relevant Code sections:

Sec. 17.11.020(B), Adjustments

Sec. 17.15.060(C 1-5), Sketch Plan Review

Sec. 17.13.060(B), Rezone

Sec. 17.17.010, General Purpose

Sec. 17.17.030 (1-4), Planned Unit Development and compliance with Titles 8, 9, 12, 13 and 15

Slide 16 – Review Agency Comments and Public Comments

- All review agency comments have been addressed or will be addressed through the subdivision review process.
- To date there have been no public comments received.

Slide 17 – Conclusion

After demonstrating how the Dwell PUD meets the goals and policies of the recently adopted Comprehensive Plan, and how the Concept Plan meets, or can meet, the Fruita Land Use Code for a Planned Unit Development, the applicant respectfully requests approval of the Concept Plan.

Slide 18 – Questions?

Mr. Jones concluded his presentation and turned it back over to the Planning Commission for Public Hearing.

Commissioner Karisny thanked him and opened up the hearing to the public. He wanted to clarify that this was heavily reliant on the Comprehensive Plan which is called Fruita in Motion and was worked on this past year and just recently completed. He said that it would be helpful to who the audience the link or to show them where they can see it on the website. He asked Mr. Caris to comment on what part they might be looking at to get a better sense of what this is all about.

Mr. Caris responded that if he would like, after the conclusion of the public hearing, to go on our website to show everyone where they could find it so they can review it or would you like me to do that?

Commissioner Karisny thought it would be helpful now and then they would go into the public participation part of the meeting. He reiterated that the concepts and ideas of the Concept Plan rely heavily upon the Fruita in Motion Comprehensive Plan. He continued that in the past year the city went through many public meetings, outreach, stake holder meetings, citizen meetings, park gatherings, board displays talking about the Comprehensive Plan, and a professional consultant that helped with it and it was just recently completed.

Mr. Caris showed the audience how to access the Fruita in Motion Comprehensive Plan on the City of Fruita website. He said that the chapter that they are paying particularly close attention to is the Land Use and Growth chapter. He continued, this chapter sets the stage for a Future Land Use map and the context for some of the variety of housing types that they have already had when residential and commercial was built over the last few decades. It also talks about the process and then he talks about the currently adopted Land Use map that the applicant's representative shared. Mr. Caris brought up the Future Land Use map to show them. He said that it serves as a guiding document to govern growth on the City's edges and the streets that you see that are currently residing within the dark black line is areas that have already been annexed into the City and placed in zone districts. Areas outside of that line are areas that are currently in the county that the City is planning to grow into in the future and a growth management area beyond that. He pointed to an area on the map that the requested development would be going into and explained that it was within the city limits and has a Future Land Use with associated densities as a result of which is 4 units per acre to 8 units per acre.

Commissioner Karisny thanked him. He wanted to suggest that it be put on the homepage and a quicker link to find it. Commissioner Karisny summarized that the Concept that they were hearing falls under the recommendations of this land use plan. The idea was that Fruita has become a very expensive place for new people to live and the intent of the 4-8 is to create other opportunities for people, such as cops, teachers, etc. to be able to live in our community.

Commissioner Purser said that every 10 years the City of Fruita goes to the public that will participate and requests their vision of the next 10 years. The Comprehensive Plan is built on that feedback. He continued that this is the 10 year mark and they are saying that there are some

ideas that are perhaps reflected by this applicant. This applicant has looked at what a public process has said is important for the next 10 years in Fruita.

Commissioner Karisny opened the hearing to public comment. He gave a brief overview on the procedure for this portion of the hearing.

Ms. Kathy VanDoozer who lives at 513 Sabil Drive went up to speak. She said that she is in Wildwood Estates which is directly south of the new proposed subdivision. She thanked everyone for their time. She said that she had a couple of concerns. She was concerned about the street width. She understood it to be 25'. She said that Sabil Drive is considered an urban collector street and the speed limit on that road is 25 mph. She said that Wildwood Drive is basically putting people in the subdivision down around the roundabouts. She felt that the traffic would continue to flow down south onto Sabil Drive which is directly south of the subdivision. She continued that the density of the whole plan seemed outrageous to her. She asked if anything in Fruita that is 8 units per acre and if so, where is it at? She asked if anyone knew and if there was anything with this high of density in Fruita?

Commissioner Karisny said that other than the apartment complexes, no.

Ms. Van Doozer asked if that was on 18 Road and Harrison? And then said perhaps. She also said that her son lived over there on 18 and Harrison in a 2 story 4 unit building over there. She said that most of those units were rentals. She said that concerns her living in this neighborhood with all of the density of the rental properties. She talked about the 15-foot setbacks from the front yard. She said that she thought her cousin's truck was longer than 15 feet and it just a single car garage and she said that most people have 2 vehicles and a lot of people drive trucks in their neighborhood and in the City of Fruita itself. She thought that visually it is going to look like a parking lot with the tiny front areas and no additional parking. She talked about single story versus two story. She said that Wildwood Estates that is south of the subdivision are all single-story homes. She continued that directly across the street on Maple the first homes are all single story. Everything to the east of Wildwood is single story until you get to Wildwood Drive, excluding one home next to hers, is a two story. She said it was a funky, small lot. She would like to see some harmony in closing into the neighborhood, to keep the single stories if possible. She said the two-story next to her house stands out like a sore thumb. She said that north of Ottley are all single-story homes with very few exceptions over in Wildwood Acres. She said that she didn't know that they were encouraged to submit community comments before, or she would have. She continued, corners and parking, she asked in the corners that they have, how wide are the streets? Are they 25 feet, 28 feet?

Commissioner Karisny said that this will be answered after she is done.

Ms. Van Doozer talked about Hazel Circle which is directly south of the subdivision is a very tiny street with the same configuration. She said that when people park on both sides of the road it is really tight. She said that she could guarantee that the fire department, any kind of emergency vehicles coming through there, even the school bus to pick up a handicapped child has difficulty going around those corners.

Commissioner Karisny thanked her for her testimony.

Commissioner Gollob asked if he could ask a question.

Mr. Caris said that there will be additional questions from the Public hearing and that they would write them down and either the Staff or applicant can answer them. He felt that this would be a most effective way to answer the questions.

Commissioner Karisny encouraged Commissioner Gollob to go ahead and ask the question.

Commissioner Gollob asked Ms. VanDoozer if she could explain to him her concern about traffic flowing down onto Sabil Drive?

Ms. Van Doozer said that Wildwood Acres is directly south of this. She said that single family homes are on the side that the retention pond is at. She pointed out Hazel Circle that she has the concern about the driveways. She said that Sabil Drive is a main street that connects Maple to Wildwood Acres which is where Wildwood Drive is which is the new connector to the new subdivision. Sabil Drive is considered an urban collector street and she thinks that is 40 feet wide, but she didn't know. She said that she is concerned about people utilizing Sabil Drive more for traffic and there are only 7 houses along Sabil Drive, and they go fast.

Commissioner Gollob said that it will increase the capacity along Sabil Drive. He thanked Ms. VanDoozer.

Commissioner Nisley asked for clarification, he said that it looked like on the map, it looked like the roads are 40 foot right of way and just the alleyway is the 25 foot? He continued, 40 foot right of way around the edges and the only 25 foot is the alley.

Mr. Sam Atkins responded said that the entrance into the subdivision would be the standard local street which is 44' of right of way, 28' of asphalt. He said that the other roads that loop are 25 or 25 ½ feet of asphalt. He continued that the proposal is to limit parking to one side, they have 28 feet standard road section, they are going with 25 but they would eliminate parking on one side.

Commissioner Karisny asked if there were others that wanted to give testimony.

Mr. Dave Burgess who lives at 508 Hazel Circle went up to give testimony. He said that he opposes the project, it isn't a good plan for Fruita, even the people that are going to live there are going to have 2 cars, they are going to have guests, and the traffic is going to be congested. He said that the homes that are going along the south road the single homes are all two stories. He said that all of the homes on that side are ranch homes. He said it would be a better thing if they made the ones on the outside perimeter single story homes to blend in with the rest of the single-story homes that are in the neighborhood. He said that this looks like something that is really going to be a big congestion, twice as big and twice as many homes that should be in there. He said that Fruita shouldn't plan something like this. He said that this is going to be a crime scene. He said 70 homes. He continued that he bought his house and they told him that this was going to stay open space, a rural park, which it isn't now. He said that seeing this here, if they made it

half as many homes people would have a place to park in front of their house. He went on to say that it looked like the back yard are 15 feet from the fence. He felt that this was poor planning. He felt that the developer wasn't thinking about anybody that lived around there.

Commissioner Karisny thanked him.

Ms. Helen Robinson who lived at 512 Hazel Circle went up to speak. She said that she understood that she was not supposed to repeat what others have said. She wanted to make a point that her house does face filing 2 where the field is. Her back yard is 100 feet long. She said that this means that she will have at least 2 ½ homes in her back yard, all two stories and all 40 feet high. She said that this was very invasive, and it will completely take away her views of the Bookcliffs and she didn't think that she will be able to see anything again. She said that she is not against growth but to have ranches on the perimeter would be great. She continued, to have a common area up against the fence maybe a sidewalk and then start a side street and then the homes. It would probably take away from the 70 homes, it might have to be 50. She said it seemed like a lot. She said that her husband and she came here from Denver to get away from all of the construction and the cities and areas that they are building. She came to a nice small town and to live out the rest of their years and now the reason that they moved here to this small town, she felt that Denver was right in her back yard again and that is what they moved away from. She said her quiet neighborhood isn't going to be quiet anymore. She said it is quiet and peaceful and everything as a two story is not going to blend in. She talked about the funky vibe that Fruita is trying to bring in these days. She understands that they want more modern. She doesn't think this area for modern is really going to fit in. Her biggest concern is her back yard and her privacy which she will have none of.

Commissioner Karisny thanked her and asked if there were others in the audience that wanted to speak.

Mr. Jerry Mack who lives at 1837 L Road went up to speak. He said that he didn't see a lot right about this development, the PUD and trying to increase the density. He saw a lot wrong with it. He said that it seemed to him that one of the glaring problems would be traffic and parking and the narrow streets. He said that he just travelled to Texas for a while and visited a few developments of this nature. He said he didn't see any parking, really designated parking for visitors around here. He said that was one of the biggest problems he saw down in Texas was these style developments. He continued that with something like this they were sacrificing livability for density which doesn't seem right to him. He said that he didn't know if it is up to the City to make money for the developer. He thinks that making the density a little lower and making it fit into the surrounding community is more of the City's job than trying to up the density, the 4-8 currently seems better suited than the 10-20 or whatever they are going for in the PUD. He said that this is a cute development and some of the developments he saw in Texas were really cute, but they weren't really practical. They were not that livable. He continued that he would like to reiterate what was said previously that not all growth is good growth. He anticipates parking problems; he wasn't sure how to address those with a high density like this. He said it is a disturbing trend that he is seeing going around right now.

Commissioner Karisny thanked him. He asked if anyone else would like to speak.

There was no one else.

Someone in the audience asked if they could still send in comments online?

Commissioner Karisny said yes. He then closed the public comment portion of the hearing. He said that they would like to answer some of the questions that they had heard before the Planning Commissioners would give their comments.

This was agreed upon by the Planning Commissioners.

Commissioner Karisny asked Mr. Caris to talk about the questions he had jotted down and that they would start there.

Mr. Caris started with saying that a member of the public asked about not necessarily what the pavement width was but what the right of way width was. He went onto the GIS map and go through Sabil and Hazel Court to answer the questions. He asked Mr. Atkins to explain to the audience the process for an alternative street section and conventional road classifications are for residentially zoned areas.

Mr. Atkins referred to the map saying that this shows Sabil Drive south of the project. He said that Sabil Drive from Maple to Hall Street is a residential collector that is 52 feet of right of way, 36 feet of asphalt. Sabil Drive east of there is a standard local road. He said that traffic has the ability to disburse within the subdivision once one gets to Hall Street. He continued that once this subdivision comes in the Wildwood is going to circle up and around either direction and have another connection over. The only other connection to the east is Wildwood because of the wash. He said that there shouldn't be any traffic from this subdivision that would want to come south to Sabil and up if they were headed east. Otherwise they would just head across Wildwood. He said that there is traffic from the west that uses Sabil and K 6/10 to get over to Pine Street.

Mr. Caris added that the typical local street is 44 feet of right of way and 28 feet of asphalt, which is curb, gutter and sidewalk on both sides of the street.

Mr. Atkins said that this allow parking on both sides.

Commissioner Gollob said that the concern about emergency services accessing that off of 17 ½, is that a concern?

Mr. Atkins said that they would have just as much width to maneuver as they do on a local street with parking on both sides.

Commissioner Gollob then added with parking on one side.

Mr. Atkins said slightly more actually.

Commissioner Karisny made the point that Lower Valley Fire does have the opportunity to comment on any plan that is made, and they will. He continued that this is a concept plan and if it doesn't work for them, they will say so and it would need to be changed.

Someone from the audience asked about the school district having a say.

Commissioner Karisny told them that the school district has the ability to comment on this. He continued to ask questions about the road width. He said that they are talking about standard which is 28 feet.

Mr. Atkins said that standard is 28. He said that the internal roads with the exception of Wildwood to the west is 25 feet of asphalt. Wildwood to the west would be the standard 44 feet with the 28 feet of asphalt.

Commissioner Karisny asked if there were additional questions about the roads.

There were none.

Mr. Caris said that one of the other questions was in relation to parking. He continued that as Mr. Atkins and the applicant had articulated that the plan is to limit parking to one side of the street that would be enforced and would have signs that would indicate that there would be no parking on one side of the road.

Commissioner Purser asked who would enforce that?

Mr. Caris said the Code Enforcement Officer.

Commissioner Purser asked if it would be the Homeowner's Association?

Mr. Atkins said that there would be no parking signs on one side of the street, it wouldn't be just a code, they would have MUTDC signage that says no parking on one side of the road.

Commissioner Karisny asked about the setback for parking in front of the home that has a driveway, they are talking about 15, 25-foot setbacks. He said that when we have a garage that is front facing, is that a 25-foot setback?

Mr. Caris asked if he was speaking to what was in their dimensional standards?

Commissioner Karisny said that he was speaking to the concept plan.

Mr. Caris said that 15 feet was what was being proposed, if there is front facing garages it is 25 feet. He said that was in the proposed PUD plan guide.

Commissioner Karisny asked if there were other questions.

Mr. Caris said that the public asked about the 40-foot building height. He said that in the neighborhoods that surround this proposed development are community residential where the building height is 35 feet. He added that even though there are some ranch homes that are no where near that, they could have been two story houses and up to 35 feet. That is the way the zoning code reads for community residential. That is why a number of new houses being built and a number of houses that were built from 2002 to 2007 had that entitlement as a part of that community residential zone district. They are asking for 40 feet. He wanted to explain that 35 feet is what is allowed.

Commissioner Karisny added that this was under community residential which is what the surrounding neighborhoods are. He asked if the commission wanted to start asking questions?

Commissioner Nisley asked if Lower Valley had looked at it?

Mr. Caris said that they were sent the application but until there is a more formal development to give them the details, the applicant because this is a concept plan, went around to Ute Water, the irrigation company, and to Lower Valley. He said that Mr. Jones will explain that to them.

Commissioner Nisley then asked about public safety for lots 54 – 62 where the access is the alley. He said he thinks there is no offsite parking for any of those units, they have the driveway and the 15-foot driveway space.

Mr. Jones said that this was correct. He said that this section follows what is allowed under current and standard codes. He said that it exceeds it presently with a 20-foot-wide alley access is required. He said that the developer of this project wanted a wider access so he went with a 25 foot alley. He added that this plan was submitted to Lower Valley Fire and discussions ensued with them and their emergency services looked at it and did not have any issues with the transportation network road widths as it had been presented to them. He also said that he wanted to touch upon something some of the neighbor's concerns, there are almost 40 off street parking spaces that are designed as elements on the north, south and west of those areas as a joint use for those wanting to go to the park as well as guest parking spaces and he felt that this was important to note.

Commissioner Nisley asked if most of the units would be 3 bed, 2 bath? He was just trying to figure out parking spaces per family occupied.

Mr. Jones said that the development was looking at a range of sizes and with some smaller homes potentially 1000 - 1100 square foot. They could see some 2-bedroom, 2 bath homes as well.

Mr. Caris said that to explain this more thoroughly, the burden of proof is on the applicant to provide the amenities that drive the request. He said that a part of the PUD guide would have floor plans where those attached units and for the single-family detached units. This is an opportunity to get feedback to see if pursuing in more detail, getting an architect, designing the project is feasible. He said that there will be a lot more detail what each of those units will look like for a floor plan standpoint and they will have an opportunity to evaluate the ability for the

interaction to take place as the project moves forward in greater detail. They will have to provide that because they are creating their own standards that they will have to adhere to each time that they request a planning clearance and each time they request a building permit.

Commissioner Nisley asked if in the Comprehensive Plan they are calling this an R4-8, four units to eight per acre, once the Code is updated to reflect that change, if they came after that process was done they wouldn't need a PUD to conform with the zone area with the density, they would meet that density?

Mr. Caris said yes, the only thing that would change is that they would have dimensional standards. They are proposing those restrictions on themselves that the setbacks, for each one of those zoning designations R4, R5, R6, R7, and R8, they would have their own dimensional standards. He added that those are gross densities, if it were an R8 they typically see these built out at R6 and if it were R6 you typically see it built out at R4. He said that this was another reason why they are petitioning for a PUD because their gross densities are higher than that.

Commissioner Purser said he was seeing at average in the home square footage to be 2100-2900 and that is just a concept at this point. He said that the small house is no longer an option for a young family. He said that the minute these are up for sale they are purchased for above market value and made into a vacation rental. He said that he saw a need for affordable, desirable small homes. He also sees a desire for a smaller home to have a smaller footprint. He said he is excited about the innovative presentation that he is seeing here. His biggest concern is that it actually will be affordable. If it is not then it is not affordable and makes the neighbors unhappy. He said that for this to benefit Fruita, it truly needs to offer options to the young family, single professional, etc. He asked if there will likely to be an 1100 square foot option that is not an luxury 1100 square feet, but an affordable one?

Mr. Jones asked if this was something that the Commission desires to see?

Commissioner said he did, and it would be a reflection of their discussions about the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Nisley said that affordable housing was brought up in the Comprehensive Plan and that this was a big issue that they were having. He continued that having 1100 square feet that is still \$300,000-\$350,000 for the house doesn't meet that affordable definition.

Commissioner Purser said that he is concerned how it affects the neighbors and what he was hearing is what anyone of them would feel when there is an open field next to them and then they no longer do. He said that what he hears is that the transition was uncomfortable. He felt that this could be creatively responded to. His biggest concern is that this will have affordable housing.

Commissioner Gollob said on one hand this is a Concept Plan that checks many of the boxes in the Comprehensive Plan that they spent time going through. He said that seeing that in action here was a good first step. On the other hand, he saw a lot of community concern, especially the neighbors surrounding this that have similar problems. He said that there is something there, but

he is unsure if it is just this. He asked, what accommodations could be made for blocking views especially on the outside versus the inside of the development? He brought up the concerns about parking. He then spoke about the density and traffic concerns. He reiterated Commissioner Pursers question about what creative ways could these be addressed? He said that he applauded the effort to match what they had talked about in the Comprehensive Plan, but there are some issues that he is hearing, and he would like to see those issues addressed to be fully supportive of this.

Commissioner Karisny went back to the general concept of this. He said that it was talked about in the Comprehensive Plan, this was the process that was done over the last 9 months and many of these ideas came from that. He said that this was a Planned Unit Development and it was uniquely different, in the Community Residential that they are living in and these ideas are based upon that. He continued, that some of these ideas are based upon that it has become very expensive to live in Fruita and these are opportunities for young professionals, for us it is the medical people who live here, teachers, cops, those kinds of folks who are starting their careers to come and be able to live in Fruita. He said that the idea of the large open space the developer had a concept that this whole neighborhood and this green space would be the community connecting that green space together. They aren't giving these people back yards, but they are giving them a large space to play in. He said that there is some good research that says that kids that grow up who have access to things like green space, access to neighbors who are their teachers or cops, that they create neighborhoods that are good for kids and this makes a difference in their lives. He said that there are a lot of good ideas in this. He mentioned that when something like this goes into an existing neighborhood 30 years later it is shocking. He said some of the ways this has been mitigated in other subdivisions that they have done; fencing is one of those things. He said that there is a perimeter that goes around the whole thing, a transition of housing types that go from the perimeter and then get denser in the center and denser towards the major street, which would be 17 ½ Road. He said that there is a sensitivity to transitioning from a Community Residential to a higher density multifamily subdivision plan. He said that these are some of the ways to help mitigate that. He said that this is called infill. He said that the entrance and exit is primarily off of 17 ½ Road. He said he wasn't sure that traffic would be the issue. He said that the review authority may require conditions of approval to promote compatibility between uses. He said that the type of uses called out in the PUD guide should align with the surrounding neighborhoods that are zoned Community Residential. He said that he understood that the Community Residential can be 35 feet tall, most of it is not. He also understood for the roof pitch that they need to go to 40 feet. He added that when the Community Plan was looking at the downtown area, they divided it into 6 quadrants, there was a single quadrant that was looking at allowing that based on the input from the community. He said that a 35-foot height limit is a reasonable thing to ask or to expect. He said that there are a number of subdivisions that front collector streets like 17 ½ Road that have 6 foot wooden or plastic fences. He said that they become difficult to see out of. He said they could have an open fence or a lower fenced area. He said that one thing he sees missing is that there is a community of older adults who are moving from their larger single-family homes and moving into smaller homes. He mentioned universal design house, single level, flat threshold, wide doors, so that these older adults can age in place. This may be a great product to put next to the existing subdivisions, Vintner's Farm, Wildwood Estates, that would be single stories, older adults. He thought that there is a need for this and that there is a place for th

at within this. He continued that the concept is what the Community Plan has been talking about but there are a number of tweaks that need to happen. He wanted to know why they are jumping right to 8 and maybe have some single-family homes that are more universal design would eliminate some of the density but would also bring additional generations of people into that neighborhood. He said that the viewshed is something that will be talked about a lot and he is unsure how to preserve that. He talked about row homes that are in the Community Plan that looked like townhomes. He talked more about the quadrants downtown and only one of those had townhomes in it.

Mr. Caris brought up cottage wee homes that were in there also.

Commissioner Karisny said that duplexes were in that area and mixed use. His point was pushing back on the 40-foot-tall row houses or townhomes. He said a better place to do that would be pushing them out to 17 ½ Road and keeping them further away from the existing homes. He said this would help in the transition.

Commissioner Gollob said that he felt this was something that had some promise but with tweaks. He said that with given the ideas that were talked about that it his hope was that he could go back, take those into account, think about what they heard there and see if they could address those comments and concerns as it moves forward.

Mr. Caris said that he bulleted out the comments. He said it was important to not just land on the topics that were discussed but if they are going to formulate a motion in whatever direction he thought it would be prudent for them to put all of that on record even if it is a lengthy motion and so that they were sending a clear message about the areas that have potential concerns from the Planning Commission and from the public. He wanted to be sure that it was articulated correctly and get feedback from the Planning Commission.

Mr. Caris continued that one of the main questions was that they would potentially have under 1200 square foot housing units with no guarantee that they will be affordable units. The Comprehensive plan wasn't tangential or bifurcated, they wanted a mix of housing alternatives but they also wanted them to be affordable. He continued that there is little support for the 40 foot tall, 35 foot is already a by right in the CR zone was talked about, more detail on the parking is going to work within the development and requesting that the applicant come up with a parking plan and enforcement plan, alternative street design questions and how that is going to work and interface as far as the different housing alternatives. With regard to fencing, potentially see into the development rather than having vinyl 6-foot fences. He also mentioned the universal building design and transitioning of density.

Commissioner Gollob asked if traffic was encompassing the street design?

Mr. Caris confirmed this.

Commissioner Gollob asked if that would be added with that?

Mr. Caris said that this should be added.

Commissioner Gollob added especially spill over traffic to neighboring communities.

Commissioner Karisny said in clarifying on the fencing that his comments had to do with 17 ½ Road. He isn't saying to take down the fences and put up smaller ones, but do not put a 6 foot fence along 17 ½ Road to barricade the subdivision. But attention to fencing, as part of the transition.

Mr. Atkins said that there is a 14-foot landscape strip along Maple, so they wouldn't have a fence immediately on the right of way.

Commissioner Karisny that it said the homeowners being responsible for that area between the sidewalk and that strip. He said that what they have learned in the past is that this doesn't work. He said it would need to be an HOA responsible for that area and it works more efficiently that way. He said he would include the fencing as part of the transition. He made an additional point that the addition of housing types reduces the density.

COMMISSIONER PURSER MOVED THAT THEY APPROVE TO RECOMMEND DWELL PUD IF IT MEETS THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS; TO TAKE A LOOK AT MAKING SURE THE UNITS DRASTICALLY AND OBVIOUSLY PROVIDE SOME AFFORDABLE HOUSING TO THE MARKET, THAT THE HOUSES ARE NO HIGHER THAN 35 FEET TO REMAIN SIMILAR TO THE SURROUNDING ZONING, THAT THE DEVELOPER SHOWS A PARKING PLAN, THAT THEY WOULD AVOID A FENCE CANYON MEANING PUTTING A FENCE ON 17 ½ ROAD LEAVING THAT OPEN AND USING LANDSCAPING AS A BUFFER TO THE STREET BUT THAT THEY WOULD USE FENCING AS A BUFFER BETWEEN THE EXISTING NEIGHBORHOODS AND THAT THEY WOULD PUSH THE HIGHER STRUCTURES IN DESIGN CLOSER TO 17 ½ ROAD AND THE INTERIOR OF THE DEVELOPMENT AND THAT ON THE HOUSING THAT IS CLOSE TO THE EXISTING NEIGHBORS THAT THEY WOULD CONSIDER UNIVERSAL DESIGN SINGLE STORY HOMES TO MEET THE NEEDS OF OLDER INDIVIDUALS AND TO USE THESE HOMES AS TRANSITIONAL STRUCTURES FROM THE EXISTING NEIGHBORHOOD AND MOVING ON INTO THE INTERIOR.

COMMISSIONER NISLEY SECONDED THE MOTION

MOTION PASSED 4-0 IN FAVOR TO APPROVE THE MOTION WITH THE CONDITIONS

I. OTHER BUSINESS

Commissioner Karisny asked if there were any community development activities.

Mr. Caris said that the Land Use Code Kick Off date would be sent to them. He invited them to participate in certain segments or all of it, whatever worked for their schedules. He talked about the consultant, how often and times they could be meeting, what was included in it and how they would be adopting it.

Adjournment 9:07 pm

Respectfully submitted,