

**Rumsey Green Committee(RGC) –
12/14/12 Summary Minutes and 12/21/12 Action Items (Final)**
(Action items in **Bold**)

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

- I. Timeline. **RGC to prepare for presentation to Planning Commission’s (PC)12/17/12 meeting and 1/2 or 3/13 meetings.** PM may try to resubmit an interim submittal before next Friday’s RGC meeting.

- II. Provide minimum residential component for mixed use buildings. **PM to add in next version.**

- III. % open space – **PM needs to calc this.** There is no provision in Version 2 that provides for required open space for future layouts. e.g. if the grocery store and associated parking lot are deleted and replaced with other development.**RDG to consider adding cemetery property (although this would also increase the overall project size) and/or adding additional floors (although this may result in building cost triggers for taller buildings) to eliminate a building as possibilities for additional open space.PM/RDG to look at the possibility of providing additional open space near the Apartments.**

H. Heyser to discuss open space variance process with Amy Boyd and possibly the Town attorney.

- IV. Review of Figure 3: Regulatory Plan. **PM to reissue with “Flex Frontage” (previously called “Open Frontage”) clarified.**

- V. Review of Street Types

PM to indicate the background for how these street types were proposed for Ranson.RDG to review fire truck and garbage truck required clearances and respond. Public Works Director to respond to initial submittal.

- VI. Review of Rumsey Green District document (**PM: can you provide a title for this section?** E.g. Rumsey Green District Development Rules)

A.Missing items

- 1. Signage – **PM to provide suggestions for Route 45 signage. Version 2 does not appear to include provisions for large signs on the grocery store, etc. RGC to discuss with full PC whether the proposed signage sections that duplicate the sections of Title 9 should be included.**
- 2. Building appearance requirements. **PM to add in next version.**

B. Permitted uses

1. Usage of RC zone for the Rumsey Green Project.
 - a. Permitted Uses Section – PM duplicated Title 9 RC uses in Version 2 but did not understand that the RC zone allows uses included in less restrictive zones. (i.e. R2/R1). **PM to add multifamily, condominiums, townhomes, etc. but not single family or duplex.** The 3,000 sf limitation needs further discussion.
 - b. Use of the RC zone as a fallback – **PM to add.**

- C. Parcel widths/Building Dispositions
 1. **PM to provide minimum width 16' necessary for affordable townhomes.**
 2. 80% Building coverage of parcel – **PM to clarify why this was deleted from Version 1.** Parcel boundaries will be as shown on Figure 3.
 3. Table 1 – In general there will be no side property lines as shown on this table for this project. i.e. the buildings on a parcel will be built at the same time. Parking in the rear of a parcel is allowed anywhere that space is available.
 4. The possibility of converting a building (e.g. bank) to a condominium needs to be provided. **PM to include.**

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

- E. Frontage Standards
 1. **Sheetz parcel - PM, RDG, RGC to think about better uses of this space other than lawn.**
 2. Vinyl siding. Trim details are important when vinyl siding is used. **E. Lewis believes that quality vinyl siding installations are possible and will draft suggestions.** The opinion of the full PC is needed for this issue. **K. Bragg-Stella to draft the description of the issue for PC consideration after receiving information from E. Lewis. PM to review this overall issue and advise.**
 3. 60% shopfront glazing, 25% residential. **PM to provide photo examples.**
 4. Landscape Screens. **PM to provide photo examples of these screens.** Initial reaction to these screens is that we have questions about their purpose.

- F. Parking
 1. **E. Lewis will submit a spreadsheet showing the number of parking spaces assigned for each use at each building.**
 2. Residential parking. **PM to clarify 0.5 street count and consider college student tenants in the next version.**
 3. Shopfront parking minimums were raised from those in Version 1 based on the perception that they were too low. **These minimums are to be discussed with the PC.**

- G. Why include parking formulas and secondary building discussions if these are already shown or not shown on the plan? The plan only guarantees that the roads (including the Green) are constructed. The building configuration may change in the future and the code will guide other building layouts. E.g. the grocery store and

associated parking lot may not be built. Additionally this code could be used for other locations in the Shepherdstown area in the future.

VII. Other Design Issues

- A. Secondary emergency access to the site. H. Heyser reports that the Church owns the property that connects to Route 45 in front of the condominiums/Remax buildings. **RDG to clarify secondary emergency access roads to be provided.**
- B. Stormwater management
RDG to clarify stormwater management on submitted plans.
- C. Bottleneck at diagonal parking. **PM to review.**
- D. Bank drive-thru
The Bank drive-thru road connection to Highway 45 is intended to be entrance only. **PM/RDG to revise the drive-thru lane queue space to accommodate this traffic flow direction.**

VIII. Process Issues

- A. Clarify the status of the current project parameters. # of residential units, amount of retail/office space proposed? # parking spaces? Typical elevations. **RDG to submit.**
- B. Annexation and PUD submittal requirements and status of submittal.
RDG to submit documents as available.
 - 1. Site environmental issues – A topographic survey was submitted 12/3/12. However it doesn't show water courses, sinkholes, trees 6" or larger in diameter, etc. **RDG to clarify if this is the extent of this submittal.**
 - 2. Adequate Public Facilities Study – schools, roads/traffic study, wastewater, water. Section 9-1416 clarifies these requirements. The traffic study is not allowed to be circulated until WVDOH completes its review (currently underway). **RDG to submit available documents.**
- C. **RGC to review the language in the Title 9 PUD section that addresses maintenance of open space. RDG to make suggestions.**
- D. It is agreed that the project approval process needs to be substantially complete before RDG would agree to annexation. This approval process will follow the PUD section of the Title 9 including submittal of an Outline Plan, etc.
- E. 3/24/11 letter from Mark Dyck concerning traffic study and 3/15/11 Annexation Petition from Rumsey Development Group LLC. It was agreed that the project information in these documents is largely out of date and doesn't require a formal response. E. Lewis believes that a Traffic Study is not helpful in this situation.

IX. Next meeting. The next RGC meeting will be December 21, 2012 10:00 AM at Town Hall. It is expected that a conference call to Nathan Norris at approx. 10:30 AM will be part of this meeting.

X. New Items

- A. Review draft Proffer list
- B. Review of Version 2 of the Rumsey Green Regulatory Code (scheduled for submission 12/10/12)
- C. Add transit center to the plan

Submitted by,
Steve Ayraud - Chair