

**Rumsey Green Committee(RGC) –
11/20/12 Summary Minutes and 11/27/12 Action Items (final)**
(Action items in **Bold**)

Attendees: Kathryn Briggs-Stella, Harvey Heyser, Steve Ayraud, Nathan Norris (via telephone)

- I. Figure 1: Location Plan – This will show adjacent properties. **Placemakers (PM) to provide.**
- II. Timeline. Version 1 comments to be finalized November 28, 2012. PM is willing to accept the RGC Summary meeting minutes as the Town’s formal response. PM could have a Version 2 submittal by 12/10/12 which would allow review by the Planning Commission (PC) at its 12/17/12 meeting. Comments to Version 2 will be provided by 12/21/12. PM Version 3 submittal are due approx. 1/10/13. 1/21/13 PC meeting would allow final acceptance. Tentative Public Hearing 2/18/13. Also see Annexation discussion below.
- III. Single story mixed use buildings.11/19/12 PC meeting result: 1 story buildings to be prohibited except for Sheetz and grocery store. Need to insure front access to all units and separate entrances needed for upper story units. **PM to add in next version.**
- IV. Mixed use buildings.11/19/12 PC meeting result: For buildings indicated on the concept plan as mixed use (except for Sheetz and grocery store): 50% minimum of the overall site mixed-use floor area above the 1st story shall be used for residential. 1st floor of mixed-use buildings shall be non-residential. **PM to add in next version.**
- V. % open space – **PM needs to calc this.** The concept plan as shown was developed without consideration of the 10% PUD open space requirement. Economics wasn’t a driving factor in the concept layout. It is noted that the PUD also requires proximity of the open space to the users. This appears to be a problem for the apartments shown on the plan. If 10% can’t be achieved, it could be argued that the quality of the open space (improved open space per the PUD) provided justifies a variance. To some extent a variance makes it more difficult to justify to the public the increased densities (compared to conventional Title 9) in the project. **PM to look at the possibility of providing additional open space near the Apartments and discuss this issue with RDG.**
- VI. Review of Figure 3: Regulatory Plan

Open frontage designation is confusing on this plan.**PM to reissue with “Open Frontage” clarified.PM to provide information on Ranson locations of these streets for Rumsey Green Committee (RGC) to visit.**
- VII. Review of Street Types

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. (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.) Are these dimensions (including turning radius) okay with the Fire Department which has large (non-urban) vehicles?**RDG to review and respond.**

VII. Review of Chapter XXX: Rumsey Green Mixed Use Center District

A. Missing items

1. Signage – **PM to provide suggestions for building and Route 45 signage.**
2. Building appearance . 11/12/12 PC meeting result: This is not a major concern to the PC, but would like PM to provide suggestions. **PM to add in next version.**
3. Missing Table 1. **PM to add.**

B. Permitted uses

1. Adopt RC zone with added grocery/gas station? Should the RC zone be only used for Permitted Uses identification or are there other areas of Title 9 where it would be useful to use when an issue is not covered by Chapter XXX? **RGC and PM to review Title 9 and respond by next meeting.**
2. Add restrictions to the Rumsey Green development to prevent competition with Downtown stores? e.g. No toy store, bookstore, handmade crafts, wine/beer specialty, etc.

11/19/12 PC meeting result: Do not pursue this.
The RGC expressed surprise at this decision.

C. Parcel widths

1. RDG concern about minimum width – **PM to contact RDG to clarify.**
2. Grocery store as shown doesn't comply. **PM will provide a "pre-approved exception" for the grocery store in the next version.**
3. 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.**

D. Principal Building?**PM to clarify – applies to this project?**

E. Building Height - 25 feet from ground level needed?**PM to review.**

F. Frontage Standards

1. Sheetz doesn't comply with frontage standard. **PM will provide a "pre-approved exception" for Sheetz in the next version.** The exception should

not transfer to future owners of this parcel. The Zoning Officer again stated his concern that the area between the convenience store and Route 45 is not well used in the current design. This design is based on Sheetz' requirements.

PM and RGC to think about better use of this space other than lawn.

2. Residential stoop reasoning. Provide raised living space above street level to encourage residents to leave drapes open. Note that handicapped access will be provided from the rear of the residential buildings. What is the reason that this section appears to disallow stoop space for chairs/BBQ grilles/etc. ? **PM to review.**
3. Sliding windows not allowed. Is this intended to apply only to horizontal sliders? **PM to review.**
4. Vinyl siding allowed. Historic District Guidelines don't allow? The consensus is that vinyl siding, rails, fences, etc. should not be allowed. **PM to review.**
5. 70% shopfront glazing, 25% residential. These are typical percentages. **PM to review and provide photo examples.**
6. Shopfront awnings. Contrary to the current version, the intent is to encourage but not require awnings. **PM to revise.**
7. Street Screens. Opaque screens/fences 3 to 10 foot tall are required to fill any unused frontage space. **PM to provide photo examples of these screens. PM to review.**

G. Parking

1. Non-residential: min. 1space/2000 sf. This is a big change from Title 9 1/300 sf. 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. PM's goal was to set reasonable, but low, requirements. RDG willing to consider parking maximums. 11/19/12 PC meeting result: Yes – provide maximums. **PM to advise on maximums.**
 - a. Grocery Parking – The 150 spaces shown on the concept plan represent the amount likely to be required by a grocery store. This amount far exceeds the minimum which requires 22 spaces. The amount of parking could be negotiated to a lower level when a tenant is finalized.
 - b. Sheetz parking – This area is likely overparked.
 - c. Diagonal parking at the Green – This area is overparked to allow for the possibility that the gas station will not be included in the project.
2. Residential parking requirement satisfied without street parking? Street parking is intended for guests. The reference to 0.5 street count toward unit requirements may be a mistake. College student tenants may require more parking than designated. **PM to review.**

VIII. 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.** Nathan had the impression that some of the future streets (Back Alley extension and south road?) would be built to some extent with this project. **RDG to clarify secondary emergency access roads to be provided.**
- B. Stormwater management
Stormwater management space was not taken into account in the concept plan. RDG said in a previous meeting that stormwater would be accommodated by underground and offsite methods. Offsite methods present review/enforcement challenges to the project. **PM to review with RDG.**
- C. Bottleneck at diagonal parking
There is a possibility that drivers backing out of spaces along the Green could backup traffic onto Route 45. **PM to review.**
- D. Service vehicle access
Loading dock access road shown at the grocery store has been designed to allow semi-tractor trailers to back in (albeit with difficulty). Sheetz will not allow an alternate service vehicle access route to bypass the Green.
- E. Bank drive-thru
The Bank drive-thru road connection to Highway 45 is intended to be entrance only. It is confirmed that even though this project is intended to be a walkable community, drive-thru access is still required. **PM/RDG to revise the drive-thru lane queue space to accommodate this traffic flow.**

IX. Non-Regulatory Code Issues

- A. Clarify the status of the current project parameters. # of residential units, amount of retail/office space proposed? # parking spaces? Typical elevations.

The PC at its 11/19/12 meeting expressed frustration at the lack of specific details presented to date. Are a range of potential sizes acceptable (see Annexation/PUD discussion below)? **PM to discuss with RDG.**

- B. Review Annexation and PUD submittal requirements and status of submittal. What is critical path?

In the 11/14/12 RGC meeting we agreed that the Annexation and PUD process would proceed concurrently. This means that the submittal requirements in Title 9 for Annexation and PUD should be proceeding in order to meet the schedule above. The noted requirements include: impact statements, proffers, detailed plans, schedule, # of units, utility plans, subdivision plats, maintenance agreements, etc. **PM to discuss with RDG.**

C. There is a need to know what entities will own, manage, and maintain the common open space. There could be problems with HOA type associations maintaining the Green area. Possibly a Merchant Association? **RGC to review the language in the Title 9 PUD section that addresses maintenance of open space. RDG to make suggestions.**

X. Next meeting - November 27, 2012 9:30 am Town Hall, 10:00 am EST call to Nathan's cell phone (in Utah).

XI. New Items

A. Town Guidelines applicable for this area? Not in Historic District.

B. Chapter XXX- review PC comments from 11/6/12 meeting. The PC comments specific to Chapter XXX are reproduced below:

Article I – Purpose: The PC had questions and felt the entries were sketchy. They noted that tables referred to [in other parts of the document] were not included. “Market” in (e): The PC had questions about the meaning of the term. RDG indicated that “market” refers to the real estate market, not a food market. RDG pointed out that one of the goals of the process has been to create something that can adapt to changing needs – that has flexibility and is not set in stone like the typical shopping center. D. Rosen requested that this concept be clarified and more detailed in the document (especially how this project will be tied into the surrounding area and what flexibility will be allowed).

The President summarized what he had heard: the items enumerated under purpose make sense but should be more detailed.

RDG indicated that this article allows for the six (6) things listed and that the uses allowed are detailed in the rest of the document. They pointed out that the document does spell out a process for converting from one use to another. J. Stella stated that the purpose of a form-based code is to create rule to guide a flexible, dynamic process over time – to make things come out in a good way as opposed to citing every little rule. K. Bragg-Stella pointed out the need for sustainability. (If the market changes, we do not want to have buildings that cannot be another use but must be bulldozed for something new.)

Architecture, Look, and Feel: T. Trainor asked if there should be something about this in the purposes. The PC seemed to feel that was covered under (d). K. Motivans expressed her hope that (d) would cover issues such as grid, materials, lighting, look, and feel.

The President asked if there were any broad purposes not listed. T. Trainor asked about connections to the rest of Town. The PC seemed to feel that was under (b). J. Stella observed it might be beyond the scope of this document and pointed out that the Town cannot dictate to owners of neighboring properties.

Article II – Definitions: The PC decided to skip discussion of this article because definitions are customarily dealt with after a document is essentially finished.

Article III – General Provisions: The President summarized this article as having two parts: the Regulatory Plan and the Authority of Standards. The Z.O. requested clarification of the later. The President responded that anything that was not addressed by the regulatory plan would fall under Title 9.

Article IV – Uses Permitted in the MUC District: The PC indicated that the term “MUC” (mixed use center) was not well explained.

Entry (a): The PC was not certain if this referred to whatever Title 9 allows. RDG expressed their understanding that entries in parentheses are PlaceMakers’ comments. (The list of uses may not be inclusive, but it needs to align [with what Title 9 allows].)

B. Schill and the Z.O. observed that Title 9 takes a cumulative approach: all permitted uses for one district [residential, for instance] are allowed in the next district [residential/commercial] with additional uses specified/listed. (Rumsey Green might meet the permitted uses of the R/C district with the addition of gas stations and supermarkets.)

K. Motivans pointed out the lack of clarity about mixed uses in a single building. The PC questioned “institutional” and “accommodations.” RDG responded that institutional might include an adult learning center for Shepherd and that accommodations [B & Bs, inns, motels, etc.] are not something they have in their concept plan. RDG did point out the possibility that these documents would not be just for Rumsey Green but adjacent property owners might consider something similar. J. Stella reminded the PC that they had discussed using this process as a way to start working on a form-based code to use in other circumstances in the future.

RDG indicated they had added a “service commercial” use to allow for an urgent care facility because they were not certain that use fit the “office” designation.

The PC noted that the uses proposed are intended to be interchangeable [in this mixed use district] much in the same way uses are interchangeable in Title 9. They also noted that Title 9 does not distinguish between uses in setting parking needs. (Commercial parking requirements are based on square footage.)

C. Review of RDG suggested changes to Chapter XXX (dated 10/16/12)

D. Big Box prohibition 9-1422

E. Obstruction at corners 9-209

F. Other Annexation/PUD Submittal Issues

1. Site environmental issues – is a topographic survey available? Can a tour of the site be arranged for the RGC?

2. Proffer status

3. Status of Adequate Public Facilities Study – schools, roads/traffic study, wastewater, water. Town committee approvals.

Submitted by,
Steve Ayraud Chair