

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 12, 2013**

1. ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 4:08 p.m. Committee members present were Vice-Chair Gus Khavanin, Bob Breslau, and Harry Venis. Also present were Planning and Zoning Manager David Quigley, Deputy Planning and Zoning Manager David Abramson, Planner Lise Bazinet, and Secretary Janet Gale recording the meeting. Chair Michael Crowley and Casey Lee were absent.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: December 11, 2012 (under separate cover)
January 8, 2013 (under separate cover)

Ms. Gale advised that only the December 11, 2012, minutes were completed. Mr. Breslau made a motion, seconded by Mr. Venis, to approve the December 11, 2012, minutes. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Crowley – absent; Vice-Chair Khavanin – yes; Mr. Breslau – yes; Ms. Lee – absent; Mr. Venis - yes. **(Motion carried 3-0)**

3. SITE PLANS

Design Variation

3.1 DV 12-204 Tower Shops, 1904 South University Drive (BP) **(tabled from January 8, 2013)**

Richard Lochead, representing the petitioner, was present. He waived the quasi-judicial procedure.

Ms. Bazinet reminded Committee members that per their recommendation, the applicant was back with a sample pallet and tenant design criteria for signage variation.

Mr. Breslau complimented the applicant on their design package; however, he questioned the sample elevations on pages 16 and 17, noting that it appeared to allow two sign locations for one tenant. Mr. Lochead clarified that the illustration meant one of two possibilities – not both.

Mr. Breslau made a motion, seconded by Mr. Venis, to approve the application subject to the clarification that on pages 16 and 17 of the Tenant Design Criteria, the applicant agreed that the signage shown above and below were alternatives and that they cannot both be used by the same tenant. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Crowley – absent; Vice-Chair Khavanin – yes; Mr. Breslau – yes; Ms. Lee – absent; Mr. Venis - yes. **(Motion carried 3-0)**

Site Plan

3.2 SP 12-216 Davie ALF Associates, LLC, 8201 Stirling Road (A-1)

Marcie Nolan, Jim Thompson and Ralph Tait, representing the petitioner, were present. Ms. Nolan waived the quasi-judicial procedure. Mr. Abramson summarized the planning report.

Ms. Nolan concurred with the planning report. She introduced her “team” of experts who were present to answer specific questions. Using PowerPoint, Ms. Nolan better explained the project and was able to show several layers and viewpoints of the site.

Ms. Gale read a statement from Ms. Lee regarding the excellent landscape plans. Ms. Lee recommended that the applicant follow the plans with no deviation in materials or the size of the materials. She suggested that the applicant “contract grow” the plant material now so it would be available when needed. Ms. Nolan confirmed that the applicant had arranged a “contract grow” upon completion of the design.

Mr. Breslau commented that it was an overall great project which was needed in the Town. He requested that any additional parking above Code be designated as handicapped parking. The parking count was correct; however, the labeling on page C-7 was incorrect and, therefore, needed to match the actual parking. Ms. Nolan agreed to make the correction.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 12, 2013**

Mr. Breslau explained his safety concerns regarding the traffic flow at the front entrance. After some discussion and specifying the problems and possible solution on the plans, the applicant agreed that it could be reconfigured by changing the placement of the guard house.

Also discussed were van and/or bus parking and it was determined that permanent bus parking would be located by the loading zone indicated on the plans and agreed to by Ms. Nolan.

Mr. Breslau inquired about a two-foot space indicated on the plans between the sidewalk and front end vehicle parking spaces. Mr. Tait responded that instead of wheel bumpers, there was curbing and the two-foot space could have landscaping or the sidewalk could be extended to meet the curb. Mr. Breslau expressed that extending the sidewalk would be the better option. Mr. Tait agreed to extend the sidewalk. It was discovered that section CC and DD provided the correct sidewalk detail so Mr. Breslau stated he would incorporate it into his motion.

Vice-Chair Khavanin had mentioned some details to add to the plat in order to achieve a wider entrance opening and to place the guard house in the median. He offered his drawings to Ms. Nolan who indicated that she would pass it on to Jane Storm who was doing the plat.

Vice-Chair Khavanin made several technical engineering points regarding drainage which were noted by and discussed with Mr. Thompson.

Mr. Breslau made a motion, seconded by Mr. Venis, to approve subject to the following changes and modifications: 1) the applicant would revise the lake and drainage plan and would resubmit to staff to come back before the Site Plan Committee prior to sending to Town Council for final approval; 2) page C-7, adjust the labeling to match the parking; 3) any excess parking spaces beyond Code shall be converted to handicapped spaces; 4) adjust SP-1 curbing and sidewalk in front of the southern building to match page C-4 regarding details DD and CC; 5) adjust access openings on Stirling Road to accommodate a potential redesign which shall include a single straight island, and by moving the gatehouse closer to the south to create as close to a four-way straight intersection that can be accommodated at the main entrance; 6) page C-4, sidewalks will be modified from their existing five-feet to either seven-feet or they can remain at five-feet with wheel stops added; 7) locate a parking space for a 14-passanger van somewhere on the site; and 8) that Casey Lee's comments would be incorporated into the plans (that the quantity and quality of the landscape plant materials would be consistent with what was submitted on the plans with no deviation in height). In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Crowley – absent; Vice-Chair Khavanin – yes; Mr. Breslau – yes; Ms. Lee – absent; Mr. Venis - yes. **(Motion carried 3-0)**

4. OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business discussed.

5. NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business discussed.

6. COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

There were no comments and/or suggestions made.

7. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business and no objections, the meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Date Approved: _____

Chair/Committee Member