

Planning Commission Hearing

Minutes

June 14, 2010

PC MEMBERS	PC MEMBERS ABSENT	STAFF PRESENT
Meta Nash	Gary Brooks	Joe Adkins, Deputy Director for Planning
Alderman Russell		Gabrielle Dunn, Division Manager of Current Planning
Billy Shreve		Nick Colonna, Comprehensive Planner
Josh Bokee		Pam Reppert, City Planner
Steve Stoyke		Jeff Love, City Planner
		Brandon Mark, City Planner
		Devon Hahn, City Traffic Engineer
		Scott Waxter, Assistant City Attorney
		Carreanne Eyler, Administrative Assistant

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Commissioner Bokee presented Commissioner Nash with a reappointment award for the Planning Commission.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Approval of the April 12, 2010 Planning Commission Minutes as amended:

MOTION: Commissioner Bokee.

SECOND: Commissioner Shreve.

VOTE: 5-0.

Approval of the April 19, 2010 Workshop Minutes as amended:

MOTION: Commissioner Bokee.

SECOND: Alderman Russell.

VOTE: 4-0. (Commissioner Shreve and Commissioner Stoyke abstained.)

Approval of the May 10, 2010 Planning Commission Minutes as amended:

MOTION: Commissioner Bokee.

SECOND: Commissioner Shreve.

VOTE: 5-0.

Approval of the May 17, 2010 Workshop Minutes as amended:

MOTION: Commissioner Shreve.

SECOND: Alderman Russell.

VOTE: 4-0. (Commissioner Bokee abstained.)

Approval of the June 11, 2010 Pre-Planning Commission Minutes as amended:

MOTION: Commissioner Shreve.

SECOND: Commissioner Stoyke.

VOTE: 3-0. (Commissioner Nash and Commissioner Bokee abstained.)

III. PUBLIC HEARING-SWEARING IN:

"Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the responses given and statements made in this hearing before the Planning Commission will be the whole truth and nothing but the truth." If so, answer "I do".

•**IV. PUBLIC HEARING-CONSENT ITEMS:**

(All matters included under the Consent Agenda are considered to be routine by the Planning Commission. They will be enacted by one motion in the form listed below, without separate discussion of each item, unless any person present - Planning Commissioner, Planning Staff or citizen -- requests an item or items to be removed from the Consent Agenda. Any item removed from the Consent Agenda will be considered separately at the end of the Consent Agenda. If you would like any of the items below considered separately, please say so when the Planning Commission Chairman announces the Consent Agenda.)

•**A. PC10-24FSI, Final Site Plan, FCC Parking Lot Expansion**

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

MOTION: Commissioner Bokee.

SECOND: Commissioner Stoyke.

VOTE: 5-0.

V. MISCELLANEOUS:

B. 2010 Comprehensive Plan Revisions

INTRODUCTION OF CASE BY THE PLANNING STAFF:

Mr. Colonna entered the entire staff report into the record. He stated that after discussion with Mayor McClement, staff is proposing to remove Tier 3 and the North-South Road from the Land use Map and provide text regarding the Heart of the Civil War Heritage Area. Mr. Colonna asked the Planning Commission if they could have a discussion on the Civil War Heritage Area and then take a vote and the Planning Commission agreed.

MOTION: Commissioner Bokee moved to recommend reinserting the text regarding the Heart of Civil War Heritage Area into the Comprehensive Plan as outlined by staff.

SECOND: Alderman Russell.

VOTE: 5-0.

INITIAL PLANNING STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends incorporating the suggested changes to the document.

PLANNING COMMISSION QUESTIONING OF STAFF:

There was on questioning of staff from the Planning Commission.

PRESENTATION OF THE CASE BY THE PETITIONER/APPLICANT OR HIS AGENT OR ATTORNEY:

City was applicant; presentation was given along with the staff report being entered into the record.

PLANNING COMMISSION QUESTIONING OF PETITIONER/APPLICANT:

Commissioner Bokee asked that in the County's Tier 3 from what is provided this evening, it talks about land banking and guess it does apply to land banking either through agricultural land preservation but also potential growth opportunities that might be there beyond the 20 year horizon, is that correct?

Mr. Colonna replied yes and that is the intent of the future growth area, if needed.

Commissioner Bokee stated that in the text on page 53 talks about Transfer of Development Rights that is being inserted into the Comprehensive Plan is that correct?

Mr. Colonna stated yes, that is correct.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Mr. George Rathlev resides at 1912 Whitehair Road, Annapolis, MD stated that this Commission voted unanimously to recommend the plan for adoption by the Mayor & Board of Aldermen. He added that he would like to request that the current plan, the adopted plan, not be changed.

Mr. Bruce Dean, McEvoy & Dean stated that he feels that the text of the Comprehensive Plan and the map should remain as is.

Mayor McClement stated that Tier 1 and Tier 2 have the capability of being achieved and looks at this being a 20 year growth plan. He added that Tier 3 will not happen in 20 years, it may not happen in 30 years but understands the basic principal of showing an area that some day we will have interest in expanding our City. Mayor McClement added that he doesn't want to take it away and his thought process was to take it off of the Comprehensive Plan Map, retaining the text to show that we want to retain interest in that area. He explained that they have determined how this would be funded but we seem to keep continually want to leave it out there. He doesn't disagree with wanting to leave it out there so he is hoping they can come up with some type of hybrid of where we have an insert showing it, have the text showing we are interested and 10 years from now when we do our upgrade now its there and we have the feasibility to do it.

PETITIONER REBUTTAL:

There was no petitioner rebuttal.

PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION AND QUESTIONS FOR STAFF:

Alderman Russell emphasized that it should not be changed. She added that she doesn't see what the benefit is in taking it off the map.

Commissioner Shreve concurred with Alderman Russell.

Commissioner Nash stated that she concurred with Alderman Russell and Commissioner Shreve, that from a planning perspective this is what we arrived at with lots of participation and that does not preclude the Mayor & Boards decision to take other things into consideration. She concluded by saying that she wants to stick with the Planning Commission's original decision.

Commissioner Bokee stated he is less concerned with some of the text changes but in terms of the map from a planning, technical stand point, he doesn't see why they shouldn't include Tier 3 if he supports the Tier 3 text.

Commissioner Stoyke agreed with Commissioner Nash that Tier 3 was an area of interest that they are hoping to be developed as the need develops. He feels there is no reason to eliminate it.

Mr. Colonna asked the Planning Commission if they were comfortable with the text but not the map.

The Planning Commission feels it should remain the way it is.

RESTATEMENT/REVISION OF PLANNING STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

There were no restatements/revisions from the planning staff.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

MOTION: Commissioner Shreve made a motion to keep the Comprehensive Plan and Map as-is excluding item H and as adopted from the Planning Commission and the Mayor & Board on November 19, 2009.

SECOND: Commissioner Stoyke.

VOTE: 5-0.

•C. Golden Mile Small Area Plan Update

Mr. Adkins briefed the Board on the Golden Mile Small Area Plan. He added that there will be a meeting regarding this on June 23, 2010 at 6 p.m. at the Boscov's court in the Fredericktowne Mall.

•D. 2010 Municipal Growth Element Appendix

Mr. Adkins stated that with the passage of House Bill 1141, the 2006 General Assembly added new requirements for municipal comprehensive plans. HB 1141 added two additional elements that need to be considered when adopting a comprehensive plan. The Water Resource Element (WRE) and the Municipal Growth Element (MGE) were added to evaluate the effects of the proposed land use on services and facilities. He briefed the Commission on the report given out on the MGE.

•VI. OLD BUSINESS:

E. PC10-100ZTA, Zoning Text Amendment, Downtown Parking Area

INTRODUCTION OF CASE BY THE PLANNING STAFF:

Mrs. Dunn entered the entire staff report into the record. She stated that the Land Management Code (LMC) Workgroup is proposing amendments to Section 607, "Parking and Loading Standards," of the LMC in order to eliminate the minimum parking requirements for a designated area of the downtown.

INITIAL PLANNING STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff is presenting this item for information only and is seeking the input from the Commission on the topics covered in the staff report.

PLANNING COMMISSION QUESTIONING OF STAFF:

There was no question of staff from the Planning Commission.

PRESENTATION OF THE CASE BY THE PETITIONER/APPLICANT OR HIS AGENT OR ATTORNEY:

City was applicant; so no presentation was given.

PLANNING COMMISSION QUESTIONING OF PETITIONER/APPLICANT:

There was not questioning of the petitioner/applicant from the Planning Commission.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Truby LaGarde, resides at 15 E. 3rd Street, stated that she feels that residents should be included in the process for a major change. She added that this will impact the residents significantly and feels the workgroup made a mistake by not including people from that area. She asked that those issues be reconsidered.

Irene Kirilloff, resides at 204 E. Church Street, stated this has been an ongoing problem and residents can not park in front of their houses. She also added that the residents are under pressure due to this and they don't know where the quality of life is going. She concluded by stating that she hopes that the Planning Commission will consider the residents concerns.

Mary Rokos, resides in the 200 Block of E. Church Street, stated that there are so many activities in Frederick that there is no parking for residents. She added that she don't want Frederick to be a congested place where tourist park and don't want to come anymore. She urged that the Planning Commission not consider the minimum parking places.

Michael Williams stated that he would like the Planning Commission to not support this parking amendment.

Ashley Mancinelli, resides at 35 E. All Saints Street, stated that there should be more options for downtown parking that the Planning Commission should look at such as more metered parking. There are a lot of areas that don't provide meter parking and if

there were meters she feels it would prevent a lot of the non-residents from parking in those places. She gave a few other thoughts for the Planning Commission to consider helping the residents of downtown Frederick.

Krista McGowan, LMC Workgroup, stated that she appreciates everything the residents have said and she did attend the NAC meetings. She feels that the more residential, commercial, employment businesses we can bring to the downtown as long as they are properly provided for is a good thing for everyone. Ms. McGowan would encourage the City to move forward with this text amendment.

Bob McCutcheon, McCutcheon Apple Products, stated that he thinks there is a way to work with the residents to provide them with a privilege of parking where they live. He added that he feels a plan could be made that will suit everyone's needs and still provide the relief and the ability to develop the property. Mr. McCutcheon thinks the proposal the LMC Workgroup has is a positive one and urges the Commission to move this forward.

Rocky Mackintosh, developer of Site F, One Commerce Plaza, stated that he agrees with a lot of the suggestions that were brought forth this evening. He said we have got to find a way to look at this comprehensively about how we can start incentivizing people to move into the parking decks.

PETITIONER REBUTTAL:

There was no petitioner rebuttal.

PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION AND QUESTIONS FOR STAFF:

There was no discussion or questions for staff from the Planning Commission.

RESTATEMENT/REVISION OF PLANNING STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

There were no restatements/revisions from planning staff.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

No vote was taken, this case will be continued.

F. PC10-101ZTA, Zoning Text Amendment, Text Amendment Process

INTRODUCTION OF CASE BY THE PLANNING STAFF:

Mrs. Dunn entered the entire staff report into the record. She stated that the Planning Department is proposing revisions to Section 306 of the Land Management Code (LMC) entitled, "Land Management Code Amendment and Rezoning," in order to eliminate the requirement that text amendments be heard at two public hearings by the Planning Commission prior to moving forward to the Mayor and Board for final action.

In addition, the proposed amendment also aims to more clearly distinguish the difference between the various types of zoning map amendments and clarify the processes for each.

INITIAL PLANNING STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff supports a positive recommendation by the Planning Commission to the Mayor and Board of Aldermen for the proposed text amendments as presented.

PLANNING COMMISSION QUESTIONING OF STAFF:

Commissioner Nash questioned staff as to the impacts of this amendment on the Institutional floating zone.

Mrs. Dunn replied that what they were trying to do was to make it easier for a property owner to transfer a property that may be institutional so if they wanted to sell it to someone else for a different use then they, as the property owner, can come forward at that time and then say they would like to remove the institutional zone to revert it back to the base zone.

PRESENTATION OF THE CASE BY THE PETITIONER/APPLICANT OR HIS AGENT OR ATTORNEY:

City was applicant; so no presentation was given.

PLANNING COMMISSION QUESTIONING OF PETITIONER/APPLICANT:

There was no questioning of petitioner/applicant from the Planning Commission.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

There was no public comment.

PETITIONER REBUTTAL:

There was no petitioner rebuttal.

PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION AND QUESTIONS FOR STAFF:

There was no discussion or questions for staff from the Planning Commission.

RESTATEMENT/REVISION OF PLANNING STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

There was no restatements/revisions from planning staff.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

MOTION: Commissioner Shreve moved to recommend case PC10-101ZTA for a positive recommendation to the Mayor & Board of Aldermen.

SECOND: Commissioner Bokee.

VOTE: 5-0.

•VII. NEW BUSINESS:

•G. PC08-523FSI, Final Site Plan, Shops at Monocacy

INTRODUCTION OF CASE BY THE PLANNING STAFF:

Mr. Love entered the entire staff report into the record. He stated that the applicant seeks approval of a five (5) pump fueling station on a pad site at the previously approved Shops at Monocacy shopping center.

INITIAL PLANNING STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the architectural elevations as depicted on Sheet C-6 of the final site plan based on the consistency with the existing shopping center façade and with the following conditions:

To be met in less than 60 days:

Remove the Option #1, Standard Roof from Sheet C-6.

Staff recommends conditional approval of the final site plan subject to the following conditions:

To be met in less than 60 days:

Remove all commercial references from the freestanding signage and reflect the changes on Sheet C-6.

1. The location of the freestanding sign must be shown on the landscaping plan and landscaping surrounding the base of the sign must be depicted.
2. Provide a note stating "The Developer is responsible for fully funding, permitting, constructing, and installing all signal equipment and software necessary to 1) provide a northbound right-turn overlap phase on Monocacy Blvd. at MD 26 and 2) upgrade the equipment/software at Monocacy Blvd. and Riverbend way to facilitate interconnection and enhance coordination with the signal at MD 26 and Monocacy Blvd.
3. Applicant must label materials in black and white elevations

PLANNING COMMISSION QUESTIONING OF STAFF:

There was no questioning of staff from the Planning Commission.

PRESENTATION OF THE CASE BY THE PETITIONER/APPLICANT OR HIS AGENT OR ATTORNEY:

Mr. Bruce Dean, McEvoy & Dean stated that this station is not just a 5 pump fueling station it is an affiliated 5 pump fueling station with Giant Food. He added that the Shops at Monocacy were approved several years ago and this area was approved as a pad site. Mr. Dean commented that they have no issues with the staff conditions.

PLANNING COMMISSION QUESTIONING OF PETITIONER/APPLICANT:

Commissioner Bokee asked how big are the trees that are going to be planted.

Mr. Dean Smith, VHB stated that the trees are listed as 2 to 2 ½ inch caliber and generally would be 6 to 8 feet in height.

Alderman Russell asked if the traffic lights would be LED lights.

Mr. Daniel Lovus, VHB stated that the lights would be installed to SHA standards and would be LED if that signal is included in LED standards for SHA.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Harris Johnson resides at 1809 Derrs Court thinks it isn't the best location for a gas station and feels it is an after-thought to meet the market conditions. He feels that this site will be impacted with more traffic.

PETITIONER REBUTTAL:

Mr. Bruce Dean stated that he understands the concern regarding traffic but because this is an affiliated gas station it will not be generating as much new traffic as a Sheetz. Citizens will already be there shopping at Giant and then will go to the gas station. Of course it is open to the public but most likely it will be people shopping at Giant and there will not be much new generated traffic.

Devon Hahn, City Traffic Engineer, stated that they have worked long and hard at the traffic issues here and feels that additional capacity is needed in this area to better alleviate all the concerns. She added that as Mr. Dean mentioned there was some reduction in trips because of the shared use between the grocery store and the gas station as well as the past approvals for the site. Mrs. Hahn also stated that these signal improvements do meet the code of the LMC.

PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION AND QUESTIONS FOR STAFF:

Commissioner Bokee stated that he was in favor of the sign as it was drawn. He thinks architecturally it looks better.

Mrs. Dunn commented that was also staff's concern where the shopping center has reached its free standing sign maximum for advertising. They already have 2 free standing signs and the section of the state regulations requires that they have pricing signage and does trump the local ordinance with regard to the number and size of signage.

Alderman Russell stated that we need to try to keep signs to a minimum because they are not the most attractive feature of the City but still achieve our purposes.

RESTATEMENT/REVISION OF PLANNING STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

There were no restatements/revisions from planning staff.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION ARCHITECTURAL ELEVATIONS:

MOTION: Commissioner Bokee moved to approve staff's recommendation of the architectural elevations as depicted on Sheet C-6 of the final site plan PC08-523FSI as read into the record by staff as well as the staff report and with the 1 condition to be met in less than 60 days which is to remove the Option # 1, Standard Roof from Sheet C-6.

SECOND: Commissioner Stoyke.

VOTE: 5-0.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION PC08-523FSI:

MOTION: Commissioner Bokee moved to approve staff's recommendation of conditional approval of final site plan PC08-523FSI with the 4 conditions that are to be met in less than 60 days as read into the record by staff.

SECOND: Commissioner Stoyke.

VOTE: 5-0.

H. PC10-60FSI, Final Site Plan, Walnut Ridge-Section 6

INTRODUCTION OF CASE BY THE PLANNING STAFF:

Ms. Reppert entered the entire staff report into the record. She stated that the Applicant requests approval of a revised final site plan for Section 6 of the Walnut Ridge PND to construct seven (7) multi-family buildings containing 204 dwelling units off of Tuscanny Drive.

The Applicant also requests a modification from the 1986 Zoning Ordinance under Section 16.09.1 for maximum building heights of 55 ft. and 45 ft. that exceeds the maximum height permitted for the zoning district of 40 ft.

INITIAL PLANNING STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of modification from Section 16.09.1 to allow for the maximum 55-foot and 45-foot building heights as proposed based on the flexibility granted to the Planning Commission under the PND provisions and the distance between the nearest structure and areas outside of the PND exceeding twice the height of the proposed structure.

Staff recommends approval of **Final Site Plan PC10-60FSI** for Walnut Ridge Section 6 with the following condition to be met within:

Less than 60 days:

- 1. The plan and note #7 must be revised to indicate the number of bike racks being provided adjacent to the pool.

PLANNING COMMISSION QUESTIONING OF STAFF:

Commissioner Nash asked where the shared use path ended.

Ms. Reppert stated that it has been built in around that parking spaces and runs down to the sidewalk on the street.

Ms. Reppert stated that she received an email from a Robin Hanvey regarding this application and wanted to put on the record that they feel these proposed entrances fall on a curved part of the road and would create a safety hazard with the minimum separation standards for roads. She added that they feel it is clearly unacceptable to move forward with plans to add 204 multi-family units to the neighborhood without first addressing the traffic and school concerns that will inevitably be worsened or created. Ms. Reppert stated that their number one concern is the maximum height of 40' falls outside acceptable standards and should not be allowed.

PRESENTATION OF THE CASE BY THE PETITIONER/APPLICANT OR HIS AGENT OR ATTORNEY:

Alice Miller, Benchmark Engineering concurred with the staff report conditions.

PLANNING COMMISSION QUESTIONING OF PETITIONER/APPLICANT:

There was no questioning of petitioner/applicant from the Planning Commission.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Dallas Kinkade resides 1826 Free Terrace, and also serve on HOA Board of Directors for Walnut Ridge stated that serious consideration needs to be made as the impact of 204 multi-family units are going to have the schools, utility, traffic and public services. He feels that it is not appropriate for the community. He added that this will affect the appearance of the entire area and severely impact home market values. Mr. Kinkade expressed that this will create unsafe conditions and will significantly add to the traffic congestion. He respectfully requests that the Planning Commission deny these new plans.

Rebecca Perednis, resides at 2104 Chestnut Lane, concurred with everything Mr. Kinkade said and there are so many things that need to be reconsidered with this project.

Commissioner Bokee wanted to point out that the decision of whether 204 units move forward or not is in some ways off the table because without Planning Commission action, this project in its current form of 17 buildings and 3 stories could move forward tomorrow because that decision was made prior to this hearing. He questioned if there was a preference based on 17 buildings that are 3 stories or 7 buildings verses 4 stories?

Rebecca Perednis replied that she has not seen the plans for the 17 buildings to be able to see the impact of the area. She knows that the height will be a very big concern.

Gordon Nero, resides at 1810 Granby Way, also concurred with Mr. Kinkade. He requested that the Planning Commission deny the height increase and deny the modification from the 1986 Ordinance.

Ken Gold, resides at 2141 Chestnut Lane, agreed with Mr. Kinkaid's assessment on transportation and traffic but there will be 204 units no matter what. Mr. Gold also expressed concern that the proposed changes were to accommodate the developer to make the units rentals just to make more money.

Michael Perednis, also resides at 2104 Chestnut Lane, stated that he would prefer to see more units with a lower height and a study done for left turns because he feels that with increased traffic there will be a long progression line.

Lenworth Black, resides at 2101 Chestnut Lane, commented that he would like to know what the arrangements are for the school situation because it is going to grow.

Commissioner Nash asked Mrs. Hahn to explain APFO in regards to traffic, specifically when it was adopted and the date of this project and how the project precede the application of that ordinance.

Mrs. Hahn stated that the City has several codes and ordinances that developers follow including the LMC and the APFO ordinance, both of which work to address all of the issues the public has touched on including traffic, schools, water; however, there are also minimums if you are under a certain number of trips you don't have to do a traffic study. This new project is not supposed to add any units beyond what as previously approved and therefore, there was no additional study required at this time.

PETITIONER REBUTTAL:

Jim Shulty, Security Development, commented that it was always planned that Section 6 would be apartments and it was never contemplated to be condominiums.

He added they thought perhaps they could improve the plan and revisit the design of the building.

Commissioner Bokee asked Mr. Shulty if he could talk about the landscaping on the current plan.

Mr. Shulty stated the berm will remain to the extent that we can keep it and will be heavily landscaped just like the road where the townhouses are.

Ms. Miller wanted to clarify that the berm will come down a little bit and the landscaping she feels will be denser than across the street. Commissioner Bokee asked about the landscaping on Tuscanny Drive and noticed that some of the trees were 4' minimum in height but then there are some with a minimum of 6' with a 2 inch caliber and would like to know what the actual maturity will be.

Ms. Miller replied that she doesn't know that answer off the top of her head but knows that the evergreens are significantly tall trees.

PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION AND QUESTIONS FOR STAFF:

Commissioner Bokee commented that one thing he would like staff to do is take another look at the landscaping at the tree canopy because he notices that there is a lack of tree canopy throughout that area.

Ms. Reppert stated staff has discussed landscaping with the applicant in great detail because of trying to get the right tree in the right place and also with our arborist. She added that she thinks the applicant recognizes the importance of this and has proposed some very large trees even in the parking areas for shading

Commissioner Bokee expressed concerns about the close the proximity of the buildings to the existing units at Walnut Ridge as well as Old Farm. It seems that with the 7 buildings and the way they are angled that it doesn't create a wall along Walnut Ridge.

Alderman Russell stated that she understands the concerns of the public because she had some concerns with tall buildings in this kind of neighborhood and she also understands there is a need for all levels of housing in our community, not just housing for people who can afford single family homes, and that we have to meet the needs of the rental community as well. She concluded that with some reservations, she will support this project.

Commissioner Nash had concerns with the height as well but thinks with the landscaping and the berming and the way the buildings are turned it will have less of an impact than the plan that was approved. She added that she feels there will be a great demand for these apartments and she will support it because this plan is more carefully laid out and landscaped.

Commissioner Stoyke concurred and feels the developer has gone to great extent here.

RESTATEMENT/REVISION OF PLANNING STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

There were no restatements/revisions from the planning staff.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION MODIFICATION SECTION 16.09.1:

MOTION: Commissioner Shreve agreed with staff recommendations of modification from Section 16.09.1 for PC10-60FSI.

SECOND: Commissioner Stoyke.

DISCUSSION: Commission Nash indicated that her support was based on the reduction of the number of buildings creating more open space and less impervious surface and because the height of the buildings in this configuration would allow for a higher-end product to be built other than what was previously approved.

VOTE: 5-0.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION PC10-60FSI:

MOTION: Commissioner Shreve recommended approval of final site plan PC10-60FSI for Walnut Ridge Section 6 with the following condition to be met in less than 60 days 1) The plan and note # 7 must be revised to indicate the number of bike racks being provided adjacent to the pool.

SECOND: Commissioner Stoyke.

VOTE: 5-0.

Meeting adjourned at 9:10

Respectfully Submitted,

Carreanne Eyler

Administrative Assistant