

**Rumsey Green Committee –
11/14/12 Summary Minutes/Action Items and 11/20/12 Informal Agenda (rev.final)
(Action items in **Bold**)**

Attendees: Kathryn Briggs-Stella, Jim Auxer (partial), Harvey Heyser, Steve Ayraud, Eric Lewis (partial), Chris Colbert (partial), Nathan Norris (via telephone - partial)

1. Purpose of the Regulatory Code
 - A. Figure 1: Location Plan – This will show adjacent properties. **Placemakers (PM) to provide.**
 - B. Figure 2:Code Intent – This is a concept plan, but buildings are not locked in place.
 - C. Figure 3:Regulatory Plan – Street types and block configuration shown.
 - D. Street Types – These are based on street configurations provided for Ranson.
 - E. Chapter XXX: Rumsey Green Mixed Use Center District –These will be the rules for development. This will be ultimately attached as an Exhibit to the Annexation/PUD agreement.
2. How will these documents be used? What is the process for adopting them?
Annexation/PUD issues.

Using the existing Title 9 Planned Unit Development (PUD) process for moving the project forward is recommended over developing a completely new zoning district and associated regulations. However, a variance to the 10% open space requirement in the Title 9 PUD section may be needed.

RDG made it clear they need to know what the rules governing future development of the site will be in order to proceed with their annexation request. The process for moving the project forward will involve concurrent annexation and PUD approval to assure RDG that the project is acceptable to the Town. The Committee noted that any parcel of the required size in Town may apply under the PUD requirements.

In the long term will Chapter XXX be incorporated into Title 9? Maybe some aspects of it could apply to other projects.

3. Timeline for finalizing these documents. 3 iterations, 1 week Shepherdstown review/comments, 2 weeks PM revisions. Likely early next year for final.
4. Review of 11/6/12 Planning Commission meeting comments
 - A. Single story office designations in June 2012 Illustrative Concept. The Illustrative concept is not the guiding document. PM stated that during development of the Concept Plan, RDG requested detailed calculations so they could compare them with their original concept plan. Many pleasant single story downtowns have been built. RDG repeated their intention that all buildings except the supermarket and convenience store will be 2 or

more stories. PM indicated they can add that requirement to the code. The Committee noted that if market conditions change in the future, the developer of a specific building can apply for a variance. The Zoning Officer noted his preference that the convenience store be 2 stories. The expectation based on the July presentation is (similar to existing downtown Shepherdstown) 2 story buildings. **Need to discuss with full Planning Commission (PC).**

- B. Very few/none mixed use designations (only Alternate G and J) are being proposed in the detailed breakdown of uses shown in the Illustrative Concept Unit Counts presented at the July 2012 public hearing. However, the overall color coded legend on this figure shows additional potential mixed use. RDG indicates that most buildings will be mixed use. Residential use to be allowed on second story over retail/office, but not required. **Need to discuss with PC.**
- C. % open space – **PM needs to calc this. Mayor to discuss additional open space with RDG.**
- D. How is the change from Title 9 requirements justified to the public? The PUD section has been part of Title 9 since 2007. The PUD section allows densities in excess of those allowed in conventional zoning districts in exchange for more walkable communities with consolidated open spaces.

5. Specific Review of Draft Documents

A. Figure 3: Regulatory Plan

- 1. Open frontage? **PM to reissue with “Open Frontage” clarified. PM to provide information on Ranson locations of these streets for Rumsey Green Committee (RGC) to visit.**

B. Street Types

- 1. Typos
- 2. Yield lane concept explained

PM to reissue simplified versions of these documents. PM to indicate where these street types are located in Ranson so that RGC can visit.

Yield lane is not necessarily a correct description of the Types E&F. **Steve recommends review of these documents by the Public Works Department.** *[The Z.O. conveyed a copy of PM’s draft documents to Public Works Director Welch on 11-15-12. He will review PM’s street designs, but he did bring up the difficulty of getting garbage trucks down very narrow streets.]*

C. Chapter XXX

- 1. Missing items
 - a. Signage – **PM to provide suggestions for building and Route 45 signage.**

- b. Building appearance – Should all buildings look alike? Different?

PM advised against detailed requirements. PM can provide design guidance language if requested. Note that Title 9 and Guidelines include Architectural Review standards. **Need to discuss with full PC.**

- 2. Missing Table 1
- 3. Permitted uses
 - a. Adopt RC zone with added grocery/gas station?
 - b. Add restrictions to prevent competition with Downtown stores?
 - 1. e.g. No toy store, bookstore, handmade crafts, wine/beer specialty, etc.

Need to discuss with PC. Mayor to discuss with RDG.

- 4. Parcel widths
 - a. RDG concern about minimum width – **PM to contact RDG to clarify.**
 - b. Grocery store as shown doesn't comply
 - c. 80% Building coverage of parcel –how calculated?**RDG needs to provide clarification on parcel boundaries to PM. PM to clarify. PM to issue diagrams to illustrate building setback standards.**
- 5. Principal Building?**PM to clarify – applies to this project?**
- 6. Building Height - 25 feet from ground level needed?
- 7. Frontage Standards
 - a. Sheetz doesn't comply with frontage
 - b. Residential stoop reasoning
 - c. Sliding windows not allowed
 - d. Vinyl siding allowed?
 - e. 70% shopfront glazing, 25% residential
 - f. Shopfront awnings
 - g. Street Screens
- 8. Parking
 - a. 1space/2000 sf? Grocery store= 22 spaces, small store=1/2 space?

These are minimums. It is noted that the current site plan shows approximately 150 parking spaces at the grocery store. At the public meeting the SBA expressed concerns about unfair competition at RG with too much parking. RDG pointed out that downtown businesses have made it clear that they do not want Rumsey Green to have too much parking. They did indicate that their main concern in the code was setting reasonable, but low, requirements. RDG willing to consider parking maximums. **PM to advise on maximums. Need to discuss with PC.**

b. Residential parking requirement satisfied without street parking

6. Other Design Issues

- A. Secondary emergency access to the site
Possibly extend Back Alley for emergency vehicle, pedestrians and bicycles?
Route thru Remax parking lot? Does the Church have an easement for access
in this area? **Harvey to check on easement.**
- B. Stormwater management
- C. Bottleneck at diagonal parking
- D. Service vehicle access
- E. Bank drive-thru

7. Next meeting - November 20, 2012 10AM Town Hall

8. New items

- A. Clarify the status of the current project parameters. # of residential units, amount of retail/office space proposed? # parking spaces? What is shown on the concept plan?
- B. Review Annexation and PUD submittal requirements and status of submittal. What is critical path?
- C. There is a need to know what entities will own, manage, and maintain the common open space.

Submitted by,
Steve Ayraud, Chair