

**Rumsey Green Committee(RGC) –
12/21/12 Summary Minutes and 12/28/12 Action Items (Final)**
(Action items in **Bold**)

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

- I. **Timeline. RGC to prepare a report for presentation to Planning Commission’s 1/16/13 meeting.** This will allow PM to make additional revisions to Version 2. N. Norris has been traveling the last few weeks and hasn’t been able to consider some aspects of the Development Rules.

- II. Provide minimum residential component for mixed use buildings (abbreviated as: 50% residential for the upper floors of the mixed used buildings). Placemakers (PM) has concerns about setting a project-wide goal as opposed to a per building goal because a project may be unable to meet the goal at the end of the project. **PM to consider this and respond.**

- III. % open space – A calculation and a design for a pocket park were received just prior to the meeting. Preliminarily the calculation of open space shows 5.2% open space (Entry Green and pocket park). 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. N. Norris noted that Smart Code typically only considers projects sizes between 20 and 80 acres. (Rumsey Green project is 15.4 acres). When open space is considered, it can range between 5% and 20%. (Note that Shepherdstown PUD requirement is 10% open space and 25% for subdivisions). K. Bragg-Stella suggests that high-end landscaping could be considered as mitigation for insufficient open space. **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.**

H. Heyser to discuss open space variance process with the Town attorney.

- IV. Review of Figure 3: Regulatory Plan. **PM to clarify “Flex Frontage” (previously called “Open Frontage”). PM to conform the color coding in Figure 2 to the frontage designation in Figure 3.**

- 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 to add a section heading to this document: Rumsey Green District Development Rules and integrate it with Figures 1,2,3 and Tables 1-4 which have been issued separately.**

A. Signage – **PM to provide suggestions for Route 45 shopping center and grocery store signage.** Shopping Center: not too high and stone/brick base. Possible to integrate the proposed Welcome to Shepherdstown sign? Grocery store sign should be handled thru Site Specification Exception section. **RGC to discuss with full PC whether the proposed signage sections that duplicate the sections of Title 9 should be included.** E. Lewis and J. Auxer believe that Rumsey Green is sufficiently different from the historic areas of Shepherdstown that a separate sign ordinance is needed. S. Ayraud notes that a quick calculation of the allowed signage for a 20' frontage "Band Sign" yields 60 SF of signage. This is 2.4 times the entire amount allowable under Title 9.

B. Building appearance requirements. S. Ayraud initially intended this request to simply require diversity in building appearance to approximate the situation in downtown Shepherdstown. E. Lewis states that this is their intent. N. Norris has some ideas to pick up "low hanging fruit". H. Heyser would like suggestions. The role of the HLC in reviewing designs was briefly discussed. **PM to add in next version.**

C. 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 morerestrictive zones. (i.e. R2/R1). **PM to add multifamily, condominiums, townhomes, etc. but not single family or duplex.** The 3,000 sf limitation needs removal.
- b. Use of the RC zone as a fallback. It is noted that the language for this contingency is already included in the PUD section for the "underlying district". The underlying district (i.e. RC) should be specified in the application.

D. Parcel widths/Building Dispositions

1. Provide minimum width 16' necessary for affordable townhomes. 16' is inadequate for parking behind a unit. 18' is proposed.
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. The possibility of converting a building (e.g. bank) to a condominium needs to be provided. **PM to include.**

E. Building Height - 25 feet from ground level needed? E. Lewis notes that there is a need to allow tenants (e.g. some chain restaurants) with no usage on the second floor. i.e. 25' tall ceilings. **PM to review.**

F. Frontage Standards

1. **Sheetz and Entry parcels - 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 before 1/2/13.** Tentatively VS would be allowed for 3 sides of the residential buildings. S. Ayraud notes that VS is not prohibited in Title 9 – only in Historic District Guidelines which don't apply to RG. 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.

G. Parking

1. E. Lewis submitted a spreadsheet showing the number of parking spaces assigned for each use at each building. Preliminary review indicates: 1) Far more parking (277) for grocery store than is shown on the plan. 2) Inadequate space on the plan to meet the parking needs of Building G and possibly P.
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.**

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 confirm agreement has been achieved to allow this access.**
- 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. **See discussion below.**
- 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. Project approval process. The RGC recommends that RDG utilize the services of an architect to move the project details forward including considerations of unit layouts/access etc. to confirm that the concept plan is feasible. Contrary to previous meeting minutes, RDG has changed their mind and may not want to submit additional project details at this time. **RGC to decide if it is worthwhile to continue to meet to discuss process issues with so little detail forthcoming.**

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