

Brunswick City Planning Commission

November 5, 2020 – Caucus

6:30 p.m. – Video teleconference

Joe Shirilla, Chairman
Jeff Arona, Vice Chairman
John Rocha, Recording Secretary
Abbas Hasan, Member
Brad Saeger, Member
Nick Hanek, Council Representative
Matt Jones, Consulting City Engineer
Pamela Plavecski, Planning & Zoning Coordinator
Santo Incorvaia, Assistant Law Director
Grant Aungst, Community & Economic Development Director
Kim Harrington, Brownstone Building & Redevelopment, 3660
Center Road, Suite #117, Brunswick
Travis Crane, Davey Resource Group, 1310 Sharon Copley Road,
P O Box 37, Sharon Center
Thom Sutcliffe, Drees Homes, 6860 W. Snowville Road, Suite
105, Brecksville
Gillian Hall, Triban Investment, 7555 Fredle Drive, Suite 210,
Painesville
Anthony Bianco, 803 Timberlake Trail, Brunswick
Joel Trent, 4156 Patricia Drive, Brunswick
Cynthia Wargo, 4195 Arlington Drive, Brunswick
Doug Harsany, Harsany & Associates, 5415 St. Andrews Drive,
Westerville

Chairman Joe Shirilla called the meeting to order at 6:33 p.m.

The first item was the review of the public hearing for the Oak Ridge Preserve SPD-7 rezoning, conceptual plan, development guidelines, home elevations, and variances for wetland removal and sidewalk location. Mr. Saeger suggested that Section E(d) of the Development Guidelines should be amended so that a surface design is not allowed on the exposed foundation walls. He also suggested that Section D(5)(c) should be revised so that only floor levels above grade should count towards the minimum square footage of the home. Mr. Hasan inquired about the street width being only 22', instead of 24'; Mr. Jones replied there are more delivery vehicles these days and 22' is just adequate. Regarding the private shared driveways, Mr. Hasan stated there should be enough houses constructed to maintain them before it is turned over from the homeowners' association.

The second item was the discussion of the revised detailed site plan for the Ridgeline Chase single family cluster development revised emergency access drive location, west and south

of 1918 Pearl Road, south of Laurel Glens Subdivision. As the new emergency access drive will exit into the Rito's Bakery parking lot, Mr. Saeger questioned if there is enough distance between the drives; Mr. Jones responded there is a one block distance. He said he would have preferred the Aylesworth Drive exit, but there are significant wetlands to consider.

Mr. Shirilla adjourned the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

Respectfully,

Pamela Plavecski

Brunswick City Planning Commission

November 5, 2020

7:00 p.m. – Video teleconference

Joe Shirilla, Chairman
Jeff Arona, Vice Chairman
John Rocha, Recording Secretary
Abbas Hasan, Member
Brad Saeger, Member
Nick Hanek, Council Representative
Matt Jones, Consulting City Engineer
Pamela Plavecski, Planning & Zoning Coordinator
Santo Incorvaia, Assistant Law Director
Grant Aungst, Community & Economic Development Director
Kim Harrington, Brownstone Building & Redevelopment, 3660
Center Road, Suite 117, Brunswick
Travis Crane, Davey Resource Group, 1310 Sharon Copley Road,
P O Box 37, Sharon Center
Gillian Hall, Triban Investment, 7555 Fredle Drive, Suite 210,
Painesville
Thom Sutcliffe, Drees Homes, 6860 W. Snowville Road, Suite
105, Brecksville
Anthony Bianco, 803 Timberlake Trail, Brunswick
Joel Trent, 4156 Patricia Drive, Brunswick
Cynthia Wargo, 4195 Arlington Drive, Brunswick
Doug Harsany, Harsany & Associates, 5415 St. Andrews Drive,
Westerville

Item 1

Chairman Joe Shirilla called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

Ms. Plavecski called the roll: 5 Present 0 Absent.

Item 2

There were no announcements or correspondence.

MR. SHIRILLA MOTIONED TO MOVE ITEM 5(a) REGARDING OLD BUSINESS OF THE RIDGELINE CHASE SUBDIVISION REVISED DETAILED SITE PLAN UP ON THE AGENDA, AS IT WILL ONLY TAKE A SHORT AMOUNT OF TIME TO REVIEW.

Mr. Saeger seconded the motion. The vote was 5 Ayes 0 Nays.

Item 3

MR. ARONA MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 15, 2020.

Mr. Rocha seconded the motion. The vote was 4 Ayes 0 Nays 1 Abstain (Mr. Hasan).

Item 5(a) – moved up on the agenda

Regarding the revised detailed site plan for the Ridgeline Chase single family cluster development revised emergency access drive location, west and south of 1918 Pearl Road, south of the Laurel Glens Subdivision, Ms. Gillian Hall, from Triban Investments, and Mr. Thom Sutcliffe, from Drees Homes, were present.

Ms. Hall explained that existing wetlands and topography make it difficult to have the emergency access exit into the Laurel Glens Subdivision to the north. Mr. Jones commented the new drive has full access to the Rito's Bakery southern parking lot.

Mr. Shirilla inquired if the emergency access drive will be gated; Ms. Hall responded yes. He asked if it will be evident that this is an emergency access drive only; Mr. Jones replied it will be evident from both sides.

MR. ARONA MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE REVISED DETAILED SITE PLAN FOR THE RIDGELINE CHASE SINGLE FAMILY CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT REVISED EMERGENCY ACCESS DRIVE LOCATION, WHICH WILL TERMINATE IN THE SOUTHERN PARKING LOT OF RITO'S BAKERY, 1930 PEARL ROAD. A RESTRICTED ACCESS GATE WILL BE INSTALLED CLOSER TO THE RITO'S BAKERY SOUTHERN PARKING LOT.

Mr. Saeger seconded the motion. The vote was 5 Ayes 0 Nays.

Item 4(a)

Regarding the public hearing for the Oak Ridge Preserve SPD-7 rezoning, conceptual plan, development guidelines, home elevations, and variances for wetland removal and sidewalk location, Mrs. Kim Harrington, from Brownstone Building & Redevelopment; and Mr. Travis Crane, from Davey Resource Group, were present.

The Staff Review Comments were addressed at follows:

1. Pursuant to Section 1268.05(c), in order for City Council to create a SPD, it must first make written findings that the proposed SPD will meet the objectives of Section 1268.01, and that one or more of the following conditions exist within the proposed SPD:
 1. A concentration of existing or proposed retail, service or industrial establishments serving as a business activity center for the community.

2. Land that is occupied by substantial natural characteristics worthy of preservation or which are historic aids to the identification of residential communities.
3. Lands which call for ingenuity and imagination by site designers and developers in keeping with overall land use and open space objectives of the Comprehensive Plan, while departing from the strict application of use, setback, height, lot size and related requirements of the Zoning Code.

Mr. Arona commented that he walked the property and agrees that a Special Planning District is merited by the topography. The Commission agreed that conditions 2 and 3 would be applicable.

2. The applicant has requested variances for four wetland removal areas as follows:
 - a) area west of Sublot 28;
 - b) stormwater management area and parking spaces north of Sublot 28;
 - c) street crossing between Sublots 5 and 29; and
 - d) rear of Sublot 5, which appears to slightly touch Sublot 4.

Pursuant to Section 1222.07 of the Subdivision Regulations, the Planning Commission may grant variances to these Subdivision Regulations where unusual or exceptional factors or conditions require such modification, provided that the Commission:

- a) Finds that unusual topographical or exceptional physical conditions exist;
- b) Finds that strict compliance with these Regulations would create an extraordinary hardship as a result of exceptional conditions;
- c) Permits any modification of these Regulations only to the extent necessary to remove the extraordinary hardship;
- d) Finds that any modification granted will not be detrimental to the public interest nor in conflict with the intent and purpose of these Regulations;
- e) Requires such other conditions to be met by the proposed plan or plat as the Commission finds necessary to accomplish the purposes of these Regulations when modified; and
- f) Records such modification on the plat to be submitted to Council.

Mr. Jones explained the variances required and the Planning Commission agreed that subsections a) through f) have been met.

3. In accordance with Section 1278.09(d), a 4' wide sidewalk is shown on the south side of Street "A", but a sidewalk will not be installed on the north side. Section 1230.01(b)(3) – Appendix H of the Subdivision Regulations requires sidewalks on both sides of the street. A variance to the Subdivision Regulations will be required, pursuant to Section 1222.07, as stated above in Comment 2. The Planning Commission agreed the conditions in subsections a) through f) have been met. As there will only be a sidewalk on one side of the street, Mr. Harsany noted he would like to see this augmented with improved access and use of other portions of the property, such as providing a walk and/or some useable public spaces, that could be added to the area along the private drive on the west end of the property and to other common

areas. He also suggested additional paths, a small picnic shelter, a sitting area with several benches, or similar amenities that would emphasize the common space is accessible and available to all residents, which should be indicated on the conceptual plan and in the development guidelines. Mrs. Harrington agreed to install picnic benches and tables near Sublots 13 and 14, and some benches by Sublot 5 and 6 to overlook both stormwater management ponds.

Mr. Harsany gave an overview of his report. He stated the proposed site is beautiful with the existing topography and vegetation and said there is a need in the city for this type of development. He noted the topography is a challenge, as there are steep slopes and changes in elevation.

4. In keeping with the standards for single family cluster lots, in accordance with Section 1284.06(j), verify that the garage door for the home models submitted shall be a maximum of 2' forward (towards the primary access street) of either the front wall of the main living area, if there is no covered porch; or the front porch line, provided the porch is both covered with a roof and has a concrete frost depth foundation. In no instance shall the garage door be more than 6' in front of the main living area. The consultant recommended the above should be added to the development guidelines, to which the Planning Commission and developer agreed.
5. Section D(5)(c) of the Development Guidelines states that lower level finished space area for buildings constructed with daylight windows of 36" height or greater or walk-out doors shall be considered living area for square footage calculation of total living area. The consultant recommended this section should be removed, or that only floor levels that are more than 50% above grade and that have doors exiting directly above grade, are included in the calculation of minimum square footage. Staff recommends Section D(5)(c) should be removed in its entirety, to which the Planning Commission agreed and stated this section should be revised to state only floor levels that are entirely above grade are included in the calculation of minimum square footage, as suggested by the consultant.
6. Section E(4) of the Development Guidelines have been revised to comply with Table 1276-1(a), which requires single family dwelling units to provide four parking spaces per dwelling unit, including two spaces in a garage. Staff recommends that longer driveways should be considered to accommodate the current trend of larger vehicles. The Planning Commission agreed the driveway length for all units should be increased two feet, resulting in a driveway length of 22', to which Mrs. Harrington agreed.
7. Fire hydrants for the subdivision shall be placed 300' apart, as required by the Fire Department. The consultant also agreed with this comment, to which the developer concurred.
8. No parking shall be permitted on the shared drives by Sublots 14 through 17 and Sublots 32, 33, and 34 to allow for emergency vehicle access; the consultant agreed with this requirement. This could be achieved with no parking signs; signage reflecting

this is a designated fire lane; or signage that this is a tow-away zone, which would be enforced by the Oak Ridge Preserve Homeowners Association. Mr. Hasan commented the private street is only 20' wide, but it serves only five houses. Mr. Jones noted since the private street is at the end of the line, it will not deal with the density of driveways and delivery vehicles. He explained there are no curbs on a private drive, which also allows for slightly more width. Mr. Harsany commented vehicles will be going slower since they are coming to the end of the street. Mr. Jones explained the narrower the street, the lower the speed limit, to which Mr. Harsany concurred.

Mr. Hasan commented that a certain percentage of homes on the private drive should be sold before maintenance is turned over to them from the developer; the Commission agreed that 60% of the homes should be sold.

9. Pursuant to Section 1268.04, City Council approval of SPD-7 is required.

In addition to the above Staff Review Comments, the consultant recommended the following additions or revisions to the Development Guidelines:

1. The consultant stated a primary concern for this site is the change in elevation on the lots, noting some changes are higher than 15' across a portion of the building envelopes. He commented these elevation changes raise questions about the feasibility of these high-slope lots from a development cost standpoint and questioned what types of foundations are proposed to be used. He also noted the slopes raise concerns as to how stormwater management will occur between buildings; how erosion will be prevented; and how sediment will be kept out of the stream, both during construction, and throughout the life of the development, which will need to be addressed with the City Engineer on the detailed site plan. The City Engineer has noted the above comments are based on existing conditions; a proposed grading plan shall be submitted.

Due to the above changes in elevation, the consultant suggested adding the following to the Development Guidelines:

- a. Define what portions of the site are anticipated to be mowed (or how that will be determined), and what portions are anticipated to be left in natural vegetation (or how that will be determined).
- b. Explain who will be responsible for maintaining natural vegetation to prevent damage to homes, i.e. dead tree removal.

The Commission agreed these items should be added to the development guidelines.

2. Lighting fixture details should be provided to ensure adequate lighting, while reducing glare and light trespass. The Commission agreed the following language should be added to the development guidelines "Lighting fixtures shall be provided to ensure adequate lighting, while reducing glare and light trespass."

3. List minimum building envelope widths and depths. The consultant noted in most cases, the houses will need to be deeper than they are wide. He also recommended a minimum of 200 sq. ft. of private outdoor open space with a minimum dimension of 10', to which the Planning Commission and Mrs. Harrington agreed. Due to the small size of the lots, staff recommends prohibiting pools and accessory buildings in this subdivision. Also, staff suggests that a maximum 5' high "low-sight impact preservation fence" (similar to the fence allowed in Brunswick Town Center SPD-2) should be the only type of fence permitted. The Planning Commission requested this to be added to the development guidelines; Mrs. Harrington concurred.
4. The consultant expressed a safety concern about residents backing out of the short drives into the street, as the radius pulling into one of these drives next to another parked car is tight, though workable, and recommended the following:
 - a. Parking and stopping shall only be permitted on the sidewalk side of the street and not in the cul-de-sac.
 - b. The street should be widened to 24'; however, if this is not feasible, staff recommends that on-street parking should be prohibited. Mrs. Harrington commented since she agreed to lengthen all the driveways to 22', she would like the street width to remain at 22', instead of 24', as there is beautiful topography at the rear of the proposed homes that she would like to remain intact. Mr. Crane noted if the street is widened to 24', it would result in a 2' width of additional impervious surface. Mr. Harsany stated there are a lot of deliveries that take place, which could be challenging to maneuver around if vehicles are parked in the street. The Commission agreed that on-street parking would be prohibited on both sides of the street and is not permitted anywhere in the subdivision. Mr. Arona and Mr. Shirilla suggested that additional off-street parking spaces could be added by Sublot 18 and Sublot 19.
 - c. The distance between the street and the front of the building envelope on the non-sidewalk side should be increased from 20' to 22', to which Mrs. Harrington concurred.
5. Add façade information such as colors, material choices, roof pitches, overhang widths, and trim type and widths. The Commission stated this was addressed with the review of the proposed home models as follows:
 - The Devonshire – Elevations "A", "B", "C", "D", "E", "F", and "G" with a minimum size of 1,590 sq. ft.
 - The Hamilton - Elevations "A", "B", "C", "D", "E", "F", and "G" with a minimum size of 1,735 sq. ft.
 - The Heritage (only one elevation proposed) with a minimum size of 1,650 sq. ft.

Mr. Shirilla declared the public hearing open:

Mr. Anthony Bianco, 803 Timberlake Trail, stated he supports the new development; however, there is silt run-off in the stormwater retention basin in their subdivision (The Timbers), resulting in less capacity for the basin. He commented he thinks it is caused by

roadwork across the street and inquired if Oak Ridge Preserve will have any stormwater impact on their subdivision.

Ms. Cynthia Wargo, 4195 Arlington Drive, suggested having one to three less units so the roads could be widened and provide more green space. She stated they are exceeding the maximum number of homes; having less homes would be better.

Mr. Joel Trent, 4156 Patricia Drive, said he was concerned about drainage into the ravine and stormwater management.

There was no further public comment; therefore, Mr. Shirilla declared the public hearing closed.

Mr. Jones explained the city code is sensitive to the needs of residents located downhill from the development. He said the denser the development, the more stringent are stormwater management requirements. He commented the developer is only allowed to discharge a certain amount of drainage into the ravine, and less water will be released into the stream after the property is developed. He further noted the entire ravine is being preserved and the Oak Ridge Preserve development will not have an impact on Timberlake Trail. He said he is aware of the silt problem in the Timberlake Trail stormwater basin. Mr. Jones explained the culvert will be sized to handle 25-year storms and flood routing calculations will be provided.

Regarding the home elevations, Mr. Shirilla asked what the price point is; Mrs. Harrington responded there is a wide price range depending on the lot and size of the home. She stated the starting price will be in the high \$200,000's. Mr. Shirilla asked if Mrs. Harrington will regulate having three of the same elevations in a row; she answered they are not in favor of "cookie cutter" homes. She noted there may be two homes in a row of the same model, but they will have different elevations. She also stated the size of the lot and topography will determine which houses will fit on certain lots.

In summation, the Planning Commission asked for the following additions to be made to the conceptual plan and development guidelines:

1. Revise Section D(3)(a) so that 2' shall be added to the driveway length on all homes, resulting in a 22' length.
2. Add additional guest parking spaces by Sublot 18.
3. Section E(4) has been revised to state each dwelling unit shall have four parking spaces, including a minimum of two spaces in the garage and two spaces in the driveway. Additionally, the following subsections shall be added:
 - (a) No on-street parking shall be permitted within the subdivision.
 - (b) Guest parking shall be provided with off-street parking spaces within the development.
4. A minimum building envelope size shall be established (minimum width and depth).

5. Section G(c) shall be revised to state each building envelope shall provide private open space at a minimum ratio of 200 sq. ft. per unit.
6. Section D(5)(c) shall be deleted and replaced with the following: "Only floor levels that are entirely above grade are included in the calculation of minimum square footage."
7. Define in Section F the following:
 - (a) what portions of the site are anticipated to be mowed (or how that will be determined), and what portions are anticipated to be left in natural vegetation (or how that will be determined).
 - (b) Explain who will be responsible for maintaining natural vegetation to prevent damage to homes, i.e. dead tree removal.
8. Add the following to Section E(3)(d) to read as follows: "There shall be a maximum of 16 inches between exterior wall finishes and the final grade. Exposed foundation walls shall be covered with brick, stone or masonry. Exposed formed-in-place concrete is acceptable no more than 4" above grade on the front elevation and no more than 16" above grade on the side and rear elevations."
9. Section E(1)(d) will include the following: "The developer will maintain private driveways until 60% of the units are sold."
10. Add a section that lighting fixtures shall be provided to ensure adequate lighting, while reducing glare and light trespass.
11. Section D(4)(c) shall be added as follows: "Only a maximum 5' high low-sight impact preservation fence shall be permitted."

Due to the requested revisions above, the Planning Commission suggested tabling the application until the November 19, 2020 meeting, to which Mrs. Harrington agreed.

MR. SAEGER MOTIONED TO TABLE, AT THE APPLICANT'S REQUEST, THE OAK RIDGE PRESERVE SPD-7 REZONING, CONCEPTUAL PLAN, REVISED DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES, HOME ELEVATIONS, AND VARIANCES FOR WETLAND REMOVAL AND SIDEWALK LOCATION, EASTERN PORTION OF 834 PEARL ROAD.

Mr. Hasan seconded the motion. The vote was 5 Ayes 0 Nays.

Item 6

There was no new business.

Item 7

No one appeared at the public comment period.

Item 8

Mr. Hanek gave the Council Representative's Report. He stated there will be a joint Economic Development and Planning & Zoning Council Committee meeting on November 17, 2020 to discuss the suggestions made by the Comprehensive Plan Update.

MR. ROCHA MOTIONED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING.

Mr. Saeger seconded the motion. The vote was 5 Ayes 0 Nays.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:46 p.m.

Respectfully,

Pamela Plavecski

PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

November 5, 2020

Oak Ridge Preserve SPD-7

(Public hearing – rezoning, conceptual plan, development guidelines, home elevations, and variances for wetland removal and sidewalk location)

Location: 834 Pearl Road
SPD-7 (currently R-R District)

Proposed Use & Background:

At their meeting on September 3, 2020, the Planning Commission moved the rezoning, conceptual plan, development guidelines, home elevations, and variances for wetland removal and sidewalk location to a public hearing for the proposed Oak Ridge Preserve (Ritchie property) Special Planning District No. 7. This subdivision will consist of 34 single family homes on the eastern 12.9258 acres of the 25-acre parcel located at 834 Pearl Road (Permanent Parcel No. 003-18A-04-193) that was annexed into the city from Brunswick Hills Township on January 14, 2019 (Ordinance No. 1-19). This property is currently in the R-R Rural Residential District, which acts as a holding zone for property newly annexed into the city, pursuant to Section 1248.08 of the Zoning Code, until the property is requested to be rezoned (proposed SPD-7).

Staff Review Comments:

1. Pursuant to Section 1268.05(c), in order for City Council to create a SPD, it must first make written findings that the proposed SPD will meet the objectives of Section 1268.01, and that one or more of the following conditions exist within the proposed SPD:
 1. A concentration of existing or proposed retail, service or industrial establishments serving as a business activity center for the community.
 2. Land that is occupied by substantial natural characteristics worthy of preservation or which are historic aids to the identification of residential communities.
 3. Lands which call for ingenuity and imagination by site designers and developers in keeping with overall land use and open space objectives of the Comprehensive Plan, while departing from the strict application of use, setback, height, lot size and related requirements of the Zoning Code.

At the July 2, 2020 meeting, the Planning Commission discussed that conditions 2 and 3 are potentially applicable. The independent consultant stated under Section 1268.01 entitled "Purpose", that subsections "a", "b", "d", and "e" would be applicable. He noted in his report that the purpose and intent of a Special Planning District has been met.

2. The applicant has requested variances for four wetland removal areas as follows:
 - e) area west of Sublot 28;
 - f) stormwater management area and parking spaces north of Sublot 28;
 - g) street crossing between Sublots 5 and 29; and
 - h) rear of Sublot 5, which appears to slightly touch Sublot 4.

Pursuant to Section 1222.07 of the Subdivision Regulations, the Planning Commission may grant variances to these Subdivision Regulations where unusual or exceptional factors or conditions require such modification, provided that the Commission:

- a) Finds that unusual topographical or exceptional physical conditions exist;
 - b) Finds that strict compliance with these Regulations would create an extraordinary hardship as a result of exceptional conditions;
 - c) Permits any modification of these Regulations only to the extent necessary to remove the extraordinary hardship;
 - d) Finds that any modification granted will not be detrimental to the public interest nor in conflict with the intent and purpose of these Regulations;
 - e) Requires such other conditions to be met by the proposed plan or plat as the Commission finds necessary to accomplish the purposes of these Regulations when modified; and
 - f) Records such modification on the plat to be submitted to Council.
3. In accordance with Section 1278.09(d), a 4' wide sidewalk is shown on the south side of Street "A", but a sidewalk will not be installed on the north side. Section 1230.01(b)(3) – Appendix H of the Subdivision Regulations requires sidewalks on both sides of the street. A variance to the Subdivision Regulations will be required, pursuant to Section 1222.07, as stated above in Comment 2. The consultant commented given the terrain of this site, that a 4' wide sidewalk on only one side of the street is feasible. However, he noted he would like to see this augmented with improved access and use of other portions of the property, such as providing a walk and/or some useable public spaces, that could be added to the area along the private drive on the west end of the property and to other common areas. He also suggested additional paths, a small picnic shelter, a sitting area with several benches, or similar amenities that would emphasize the common space is accessible and available to all residents. The consultant stated this should be indicated on the conceptual plan and in the development guidelines.
4. In keeping with the standards for single family cluster lots, in accordance with Section 1284.06(j), verify that the garage door for the home models submitted shall be a maximum of 2' forward (towards the primary access street) of either the front wall of the main living area, if there is no covered porch; or the front porch line, provided the porch is both covered with a roof and has a concrete frost depth foundation. In no instance shall the garage door be more than 6' in front of the main living area. The consultant recommended the above should be added to the development guidelines.
5. Section D(5)(c) of the Development Guidelines states that lower level finished space area for buildings constructed with daylight windows of 36" height or greater or walk-

out doors shall be considered living area for square footage calculation of total living area. The consultant recommended this section should be removed, or that only floor levels that are more than 50% above grade and that have doors exiting directly above grade, are included in the calculation of minimum square footage. Staff recommends Section D(5)(c) should be removed in its entirety.

6. Section E(4) of the Development Guidelines states that each dwelling unit shall have two parking spaces, including a minimum of one space per unit in a garage which is physically attached to and directly accessible from the dwelling unit. Table 1276-1(a) requires single family dwelling units to provide four parking spaces per dwelling unit, including two spaces in a garage. The Development Guidelines shall correspond to the home model elevations submitted, which indicates two-car garages. Staff recommends that longer driveways should be considered to accommodate the current trend of larger vehicles.
7. Fire hydrants for the subdivision shall be placed 300' apart, as required by the Fire Department. The consultant also agreed with this comment.
8. No parking shall be permitted on the shared drives by Sublots 14 through 17 and Sublots 32, 33, and 34 to allow for emergency vehicle access; the consultant agreed with this requirement. This could be achieved with no parking signs; signage reflecting this is a designated fire lane; or signage that this is a tow-away zone, which would be enforced by the Oak Ridge Preserve Homeowners Association.
9. Pursuant to Section 1268.04, City Council approval of SPD-7 is required.

In addition to the above Staff Review Comments, the consultant recommended the following additions or revisions to the Development Guidelines:

1. The consultant stated a primary concern for this site is the change in elevation on the lots, noting some changes are higher than 15' across a portion of the building envelopes. He commented these elevation changes raise questions about the feasibility of these high-slope lots from a development cost standpoint and questioned what types of foundations are proposed to be used. He also noted the slopes raise concerns as to how stormwater management will occur between buildings; how erosion will be prevented; and how sediment will be kept out of the stream, both during construction, and throughout the life of the development, which will need to be addressed with the City Engineer on the detailed site plan. The City Engineer has noted the above comments are based on existing conditions; a proposed grading plan shall be submitted.

Due to the above changes in elevation, the consultant suggested adding the following to the Development Guidelines:

- a. Define what portions of the site are anticipated to be mowed (or how that will be determined), and what portions are anticipated to be left in natural vegetation (or how that will be determined).

- b. Explain who will be responsible for maintaining natural vegetation to prevent damage to homes, i.e. dead tree removal.
- 2. Lighting fixture details should be provided to ensure adequate lighting, while reducing glare.
- 3. List minimum building envelope widths and depths. The consultant noted in most cases, the houses will need to be deeper than they are wide. He also recommended a minimum of 200 sq. ft. of private outdoor open space with a minimum dimension of 10'. Due to the small size of the lots, staff recommends prohibiting pools and accessory buildings in this subdivision. Also, staff suggests that a maximum 5' high "low-sight impact preservation fence" (similar to the fence allowed in Brunswick Town Center SPD-2) should be the only type of fence permitted.
- 4. The consultant expressed a safety concern about residents backing out of the short drives into the street, as the radius pulling into one of these drives next to another parked car is tight, though workable, and recommended the following:
 - a. Parking and stopping shall only be permitted on the sidewalk side of the street and not in the cul-de-sac.
 - b. The street should be widened to 24'; however, if this is not feasible, staff recommends that on-street parking should be prohibited.
 - c. The distance between the street and the front of the building envelope on the non-sidewalk side should be increased from 20' to 22'.
- 5. Add façade information such as colors, material choices, roof pitches, overhang widths, and trim type and widths.

Staff Recommendations:

Staff withholds recommendation to City Council of the rezoning, conceptual plan, revised development guidelines incorporating the above suggestions by the independent consultant, home elevations, and variances for wetland removal and sidewalk location until the above items are addressed.

Ridgeline Chase single family cluster development
(Revised detailed site plan)

Location: west and south of 1918 Pearl Road, south of Laurel Glens Subdivision
R-L District

Proposed Use & Background:

At their meeting on July 16, 2020, the Planning Commission approved the detailed site plan for the Ridgeline Chase Subdivision consisting of a 77-home single family cluster development (50 conventional single family homes and 27 single family cluster lots). However, as environmental concerns arose regarding the location of the gated emergency access drive on the north side of the site between 4418 Aylesworth Drive and the parking

area east of 4442 Aylesworth Drive in the Laurel Glens Subdivision, an alternate location has been provided. The emergency access drive will now extend from Street "C" and run eastward to Street "B", and will terminate in the southern parking lot of Rito's Bakery (1930 Pearl Road).

Staff Review Comments:

1. Final site plan approval is subject to engineering approval.
2. Pursuant to Section 1278.02(a)(1), City Council approval of the revised detailed site plan is required.

Staff Recommendations:

Staff recommends approval of the revised detailed site plan and new emergency access drive location.