

**CITY OF ANDOVER
SITE PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE
May 2, 2017
MINUTES**

The Site Plan Review Committee met for a regular meeting on Tuesday, May 2, 2017 at Andover City Hall located at 1609 E. Central Ave., Andover, Kansas. Chairman Allison called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m. Members present were Chairman Doug Allison, Dennis Bush, Todd Woolsoncroft, Clark Nelson, Brandon Wilson. Members Nate Hinson and Don Kimble were not in attendance.

Staff in attendance: Les Mangus, Director of Public Works and Community Development; Mark Detter, City Administrator, Steve Anderson, City Engineer and Daynna DuFriend, Administrative Assistant.

Review the minutes of the April 4, 2017 meeting.

Clark Nelson made a motion, seconded by Don Kimble, to approve the minutes of the April 4, 2017 meeting as presented. Motion carried 5/0.

SP-2012-05- Review for approval of the site plan for Revelation Ministries Christian Church, located at 414 S. Onewood Dr., Andover, Kansas.

Chairman Allison recused himself from the committee due to business relations.

Bill Johnson, Evans Building Co., Inc. and Doug Allison, TEAM Architecture, agents for the applicant, were both present to represent the application.

Mr. Allison explained that the layout is basically the same as what the committee reviewed last time and basic materials are much the same. Dormers and arches were added to help break up the roof line soften the eave line. Changes at the front entrance include bringing out the main entry element in the upper elevation with additional EIFS that will be scored to break up the appearance for added visual interest. Building material samples were presented. The metal roof panel will be rust red in color.

Clark Nelson asked if this was different from what was originally presented.

Mr. Johnson stated that this is the same material.

Mr. Allison then presented the metal panel that would be used on the upper portion of the exterior walls in a vertical application and will set out eight inches from the lower metal panel. The lower horizontal panel will be at the base of the building

Dennis Bush asked if the EIFS was around the columns and if both phases, 1 and 2, were being presented for approval.

Mr. Allison answered that EIFS with a stone accent at the base of the columns would be used. Grading will remain the same concept but will be scaled back for this smaller application.

Les Mangus replied that phase 2 would have to come back for approval.

Mr. Johnson noted that the roof of the original approved project was all on one plane. The steps in the roof levels were added after the committee expressed concern over the size of the roof.

Todd Woolsoncroft asked if the slope of the roof was changed since the last meeting and if the stone would be a man-made stone.

Mr. Johnson said that it would remain the same. The last drawing may have been incorrect.

Mr. Allison replied that the stone is man-made.

J.R. Jessen, 915 W. Putter Circle, is opposed to a metal barn concept. He is not opposed to the metal roof but would like to see a different material used on the walls.

Dennis Howard, 331 Chippers, asked how many entrances would be at this site and would the traffic be funneled into the subdivision.

Mr. Allison stated that there would be two entrances off of Onewood Drive.

Clark Nelson asked the agents if they met with the neighborhood about the design. He then asked staff if the regulations for the residential neighborhood subdivision would be applicable to the church property.

Mr. Johnson said that a neighborhood meeting was held with the first approval and added that this was downsized from a large commercial development. There would be traffic no matter what is there.

Les Mangus answered that the neighborhood is a separate plat and those regulations would not apply to the church. He added that the zoning and platting were approved in 2012 along with the site plan that was slightly larger than what is proposed tonight.

Dennis Bush also added that what is being discussed tonight are the corrections made, the reduction in building size and the additional improvements suggested by the committee at the previous meeting.

Mr. Johnson noted that with the additional comments that were made once they resubmitted again, there has been some updated information submitted to cover everything discussed in the previous meeting.

Brian Lindebak, 225 S Onewood Dr., is strongly opposed to an all metal building placed at the entry of his development as well as the entry of the community. He asked how this plan conforms to the US 54 Corridor Plan.

Les Mangus explained that this site plan was being developed at the same time as the Corridor Plan. Right of way was dedicated to accommodate US 54. Land use reflects the church owning the 20 acres. Access has been worked out with the Corridor Plan. All of these issues were discussed 5 years ago.

Mr. Johnson pointed out that the church basically donated the right of way for the frontage road at no cost to the State or the City of Andover.

Clark Nelson said that this is similar to a recent case that was viewed as not very appealing for a building seen when entering the City of Andover. He asked Mr. Allison if there was any way to change the front of the building to accommodate these concerns from the neighborhood.

Mr. Johnson stated that this project was previously approved with a larger roof. Changes were made to downsize the project and that is why the project is being brought back.

Mr. Allison stated that the committee never said a metal building could not be built. There have been some poor examples of metal buildings built in the early days and that is what drove the start of this committee. This is a metal building but things have been done to soften lines and ground plane and EIFS is used in strategic locations. Additions to the project include more EIFS around the front entrance, dormers were added back on, arches were added to help soften lines.

Todd Woolsoncroft asked if at the south elevation, where the two sides flank the entrance, would it be possible to replace the bottom metal panel with EIFS material and stone.

Mr. Allison replied that this increases the cost of the project.

Brandon Wilson expressed concern with the amount of different materials being used. Stone, EIFS, and three different types of metal panels. The wall appears top heavy with the top portion protruding out. He agrees with the suggestion of adding stone along the bottom. The columns being stone and EIFS protruding out from the metal building line looks like an after-thought. A stone wainscot on the building to tie-in with the stone columns would architecturally make more sense. This would be an added cost, but as a city we need to think about the gateway into the community and set the precedence for this development.

Mr. Johnson explained that the use of different materials was done to match what was previously approved. This is a very tall building and the off-set in the wall is to visually break it up.

Dennis Bush asked what it would take for the committee to approve this plan.

Brandon Wilson suggested improvements to the landscape plan. The whole perimeter would have to be more densely landscaped to soften the appearance of the metal building.

Les Mangus noted that in the submitted plan there is landscaping between the columns bays, and is very heavily landscaped at both the north and south ends and ornamental trees in between.

Brandon Wilson stated that there were no trees or shrubs directly in front of the building and even along the sides.

Mr. Allison noted that phase 2 is the front addition and anything placed in front of the building would have to be removed when the addition was constructed.

Brandon Wilson replied that a future addition could be 40 years from now. The front of the building is bare and the landscaping should be denser to soften the building.

Mr. Johnson asked to confirm with staff that the landscape design was already above the standard requirements.

Les Mangus answered that this design does far exceed Site Plan Review guidelines.

Discussion continued concerning the validity of the previously approved building design if the submitted revised design were to be approved.

Mr. Allison stated that this is a better looking building (than the original).

Clark Nelson said that he didn't think there was any question that it's much better than the last. Whether or not that constitutes something he would like to drive by every day is why the neighbors are here tonight.

Dennis Bush asked if the materials on the front of the building were to be changed and increase the landscaping in accordance with what is shown on the sides would the committee support it.

Clark Nelson asked if that would include the stone, additional landscaping, EIFS that was talked about.

Dennis Bush replied yes. The applicant has the ability to go back to 2012 or he takes the recommendations of changing the plan to include the stone along the front, south side, and the EIFS as discussed along with additional landscaping to break that up fully knowing that the landscaping would be removed when he goes to phase 2.

Brandon Wilson said that he is also concerned with the west side as it is the main drive into the neighborhood. He doesn't feel that there are enough trees.

Mr. Allison stated that there are three layers of trees along the west side of the building. When the trees on the south side mature, the top of the building will be seen but not that much of the lower part.

Brandon Wilson asked if the road north of the building was part of the project.

Mr. Allison said that road is not being proposed to be put in initially.

Brian Lindebak said he would be surprised that the fire department wouldn't want an additional access point and would agree with the committee suggestion of increased landscaping along the west façade and addition stone to the base. This would be a gesture of at least hearing what the neighbors have said.

Les Mangus said that with the two access points off of Onewood Drive the Fire Marshall does not have a problem with circulation.

J.R. Jessen add that he is ok with changing the south and west sides of the building as you enter the neighborhood and even taking away the pillars and half arches and put stone along the bottom with siding above the stone perhaps this would save some money. He would like to see the building look like the neighborhood.

Mr. Allison stated that this is not a residence and residential materials should not be used. They have tried to be sympathetic in the use of some different lines and different planes.

Brandon Wilson inquired about the height of the north elevation of the building and landscaping along the north side. The trees will not be mature for a long time. The neighboring properties will be looking at a huge end wall of a massive metal building.

Mr. Allison noted that there is a good distance and layers of landscaping between the two sites.

Clark Nelson said that he would go along with what he believes are Brandon's positions and in keeping with what Mr. Lindebak is saying, this isn't the greatest but he thinks it is in conformity with what is trying to be accomplished. It is a fairly decent compromise knowing that this is a very visible building to Andover for years to come and they need to be aware of that.

Todd Woolsoncroft asked the committee for thoughts on replacing the upper metal panel with and EIFS material above the proposed stone wainscot on the south side only.

Mr. Allison said he didn't feel it was reasonable to ask for a stone wainscot and additional landscaping. If you want the stone wainscot why are you wanting to cover it up with landscaping. They would be happy to add only the landscaping if that helps the situation.

Brandon Wilson said his pick would be to select the stone and give up the landscaping.

Brandon Wilson made a motion, seconded by Clark Nelson, to approve SP-2012-05 Revelation Ministries Christian Church as presented with the following conditions: 1. On south elevation, install an 8-foot stone wainscot using same stone material as planned for the columns, replace the upper metal siding with EIFS that would match the EIFS planned for other areas of building, recommend additional landscaping along building line., 2. On west elevation, install an 8-foot stone wainscot along the entire wall. Motion carried 4/0.

Mr. Allison asked if desired could they come back with another proposal to include the ideas and compromises discussed for a different approval.

Clark Nelson encouraged them to have persons from the neighboring properties participate with them.

Dennis Bush and Clark Nelson asked if this new plan would replace the original approved plan or could they go back to the old plan if they didn't like this one.

Les Mangus answered yes they could as it is an approved plan.

Chairman Allison rejoined the committee.

SP-2017-07- Review for approval of the site plan for Trax Car Wash, located at 565 S. Andover Rd., Andover, Kansas.

Phil Meyer, Baughman Co., agent to the applicant was present.

Stan Cox and Steve Cox, applicants, were also both present.

Mr. Meyer explained that Stan and Steve Cox are the owners and developers of Trax Car Wash. They have a facility currently in Derby that was built four years ago. Trax Car Wash is a tunnel car wash facility with an attendant on site during business hours. The attendant checks incoming cars and supervises the traffic flow into the tunnel car wash. He presented copies of building material information to the committee members. There will be one entry into the facility that will align with the driveway to Dillon's on the east side of Andover Road. Vacuum bays are located in the center with parking. A parking area is also available for customers to detail their cars. The central vacuum system is located in the trash dumpster enclosure near the back (west end) of the parking lot. Cars entering the facility will queue up in two lines. Washes are purchased at the kiosk where the attendant will check the vehicle before entering the car wash and controls how quickly cars are sent through. Vehicles exiting the car wash can either leave or pull into the detailing area with the vacuum bays. This project recently went through a zone change so they now have the proper zoning for this type of facility. This is will be a concrete split-face block and glass facility with some stucco on the top of building and on the south side panel.

Les Mangus added that his memo regarding this project was brief as he did not receive the latest plan in time to make comments. Phil has the comments and he can give the update on what was submitted Friday morning. The latest plan was included in the meeting packets.

Mr. Meyer said that the plans submitted Friday because they wanted to pick up comments received from Les on his initial review and bring them to the committee revised. The driveway across the street on Andover Road for Dillon's is now shown and a sidewalk connection along Andover Road is shown. The trash enclosure will be a cedar fence material with a steel frame. A mechanical unit will be on the south side of the building and when placement is determined it will be screened with the same cedar fence material. The lighting plan does not meet the SPRC

standards on the one footcandle. The reason for that is due to the business hours being 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. This business is not operated during the evening hours. Lighting is more for security of the building than it is for function and everyday operations.

Clark Nelson confirmed that the business will be open more during the daylight than evening.

Mr. Meyer replied yes, and asked that the committee approve the plan with the lighting as submitted.

Les Mangus added that his comment is on the less than one footcandle of lighting in the access driveway. At that point the customer is in their vehicle, queued up to enter the car wash. There will not be pedestrians or parking in this area, vehicles are in line to enter the facility.

Brandon Wilson commented that in winter at 5:00 or 5:30 p.m. it will be dark.

Les Mangus agreed that it will be dark, however they will be in a running car with the headlights on.

Clark Nelson asked if staff approved of this as it is.

Les Mangus said that after a discussion with Phil today and given the hours of operation and fact that vehicles in that line are running, moving ahead, making their progression into the car wash, it is appropriate.

Dennis Bush asked if it was written in the PUD that business hours were 7:00 to 7:00 or should it be stated in the motion as a condition that the hours don't change.

Les Mangus replied no, it does not make a difference. That area is for circulation in getting into the car wash. It is not a pedestrian or parking area.

Brandon Wilson noted that when exiting the building it is very dark, but this is the same situation with no parking.

Todd Woolsoncroft asked about the lighting fixture located at the southwest corner that appears to have some bleed over onto the south adjacent property.

Mr. Meyer said that they felt the existing hedgerow along the south property line prevented any bleed over issues.

Les Mangus added that lighting is allowed to bleed over one half footcandle and the highest at that point is .3 footcandle.

Mr. Meyer continued explaining the trash enclosure landscaping on the revised plan shows some evergreen vertical shrubs around the enclosure. There is a future connection for the property to the north for cross circulation. This was not done to the south property because of exiting vehicles from the car wash. The monument sign is shown just west of the north access driveway

and will be a 10 feet tall pole sign with 70 square feet of signage. They are wanting a larger sign for visibility from Highway 54 and they will be taking this request to the Board of Zoning Appeals. The building sign will be 79 square feet in size.

Todd Woolsoncroft asked if the lighted signage would only be on during 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. business hours and if the pole mounted sign would also be a lit sign.

Mr. Stan Cox answered that the wall sign would turn off at 7:00 p.m. the digital part would turn off at 7:00 p.m. In Derby the main sign is lit up at night after 7:00 p.m., dusk to dawn.

Mr. Meyer stated that they placed a site triangle on the driveway and there is not an issue with the site triangle at this location to Andover Road. Based on the response from the Fire Department a fire lane is not required. The building dimension is 108 ½ feet east to west and 37 feet north to south. If the size of the wall sign is a little over regulation they will meet the regulations. They are not asking for a larger size sign on the building. They will only be asking for a larger pole sign.

Dennis Bush asked to confirm placement of the central vacuum system to be in the trash enclosure and if they had any information on the decibels of the vacuum. The opening of the trash enclosure appears to be in direct line with the house on the adjacent property to the south.

Mr. Stan Cox said that the vacuum is one big, lower rpm unit and is very quiet.

Brandon Wilson inquired as to the access of the trash truck to the trash enclosure and recommended that the radius at the south side of the driveway entry be changed to be the same as the north side of the driveway entry. For larger vehicles it would be a tighter turn and could result in landscape and curbing damage.

Mr. Meyer explained that the truck would back out and turn around to leave. The reason for moving the enclosure was to allow the attendant to clearly see the kiosk.

Chairman Allison asked if the fiber cement stucco panel is a siding product and if the exposed steel framing is painted. He then asked if the blue panels on the building were similar to the brown panels in the glazing system, if the gray areas on the north side would be glass and if the polycarbonate transoms would be transparent.

Mr. Stan Cox replied that it is a stucco material and the steel framing is powdered coated. The colored panels are a hard, thick plastic material. The polycarbonate material is frosted to let light in but it is not clear.

Mr. Meyer said the gray areas would be all glass.

Chairman Allison questioned why the fascia was being stepped down and if the concrete block would be brown colored as in the renderings.

Mr. Stan Cox explained that this was the design agreed upon for their building in Derby so that is what they are using to keep consistent. The block is colored with a rough texture.

Dennis Bush asked if a fence was planned along the south property line and if there were any drawings for the shed.

Les Mangus said that it is noted from zoning to construct an 8-foot cedar fence along the south and west property lines.

Mr. Meyer replied that they do not have any drawing for the 12ft. x 12ft. shed but did present photos of the shed at the Derby site.

Mr. Stan Cox added that the one at the Derby site is a wood shed with siding on it to match the colors of the building.

Brandon Wilson asked if there would also be a canopy over the kiosk.

Mr. Steve Cox said that there would.

Todd Woolsoncroft asked if the proposed knee wall panel would be installed on this project.

Mr. Stan Cox stated that this eliminates some of the glass.

Chairman Allison asked what material was for the canopy.

Mr. Stan Cox answered that it is a heavy duty fabric. The material used in Derby is now four years old and has not faded or torn.

Clark Nelson made a motion, seconded by Todd Woolsoncroft to approve SP-2017-07 Trax Car Wash as presented. Motion carried 5/0.

SP-2017-08- Review for approval of the site plan for Firestone Complete Auto Care Store, locate at 212 E. Cloud Ave., Andover, Kansas.

Jeff Smith and Chip Ashley, CEI Engineering, agents to the applicant were present to represent the application.

Eric Miller, architect, SGA Design Group, was also present.

Mr. Smith explained that this Firestone store is an 8-bay, minor automobile service facility. Six service bays are to be on the west side of the building and two additional bays on the south side of the building. The customer show room and main entrance is on the northwest corner of the building. There is one point of access to Cloud Avenue to the south. These will also be connecting to the existing driveway south of the existing Arby's and also to the existing parking

lot connection on the northeast corner of the Arby's site. The original large lot has been split into a 1.25-acre tract with the remaining parcel reserved for future development. There is an existing stormwater detention pond to the east that they will be directing all of the Arby's stormwater and their additional stormwater through their site to be conveyed out to the lot on the east. All of the vehicle repairs take place entirely inside of the building. There is a separate trash enclosure for trash only. There will be no exterior storage of used tires or any materials. That is kept inside the building in a dedicated area for storage.

Brandon Wilson questioned staff that according to the Corridor Plan building entrances should be facing south. Arby's faces north as this project is proposed to do. What is correct? He thinks they should be conscience as more buildings are built entrances aren't flip flopped in different directions.

Les Mangus said that they are using finish materials all around the building and those properties along the highway will never have direct access to the highway.

Mr. Miller added that the south elevation of their building is very similar to the north elevation. They are not really turning their back to either access. The entrance is identified architecturally by raising the wall above the entrance. This also screens the only roof top unit AC unit on the building for the showroom and front offices. The building is 128 feet long and 60 feet wide with the storefront in the showroom area with a canvas awning over the front to soften the entry. Signage is lit by antique looking gooseneck light fixtures. The stone block is a split-face CMU and is the branded image that Firestone is going for. They want people to identify the building with Firestone.

Clark Nelson asked if there would be a pole sign.

Mr. Miller replied that there will be a monument sign very similar to other business signs in that shopping center.

Chairman Allison confirmed that all exterior materials are split-faced block just painted in different colors. He asked if there would be any variation in the coursing.

Dennis Bush then asked what material would be at the top.

Mr. Miller said the block would be painted with a metal cap across the top.

Brandon Wilson asked for details on the concrete flume and what their plans were for drainage until the lot on the east is developed.

Mr. Ashley explained that they wanted to pick up all of the stormwater coming from the downspouts on the back side of the building to be channeled down and funneled into the drive with the parking lot run off before it moves to the lot at the east. They will provide temporary rip-rap pads at the discharge point to the north and also to the discharge point of run off from the loading zone. That will prevent erosion until the neighboring lot is developed. When developed

they can connect to those flumes and drives to convey run off to the detention basin. This continues the same method currently being used by the other properties.

Clark Nelson asked if staff agreed with this type of drainage.

Steve Anderson stated that this is covered with a cross lot drainage agreement and was addressed at the time it was platted.

Todd Woolsoncroft asked if there would be an onsite trash enclosure.

Mr. Miller answered that there would be a trash enclosure constructed with the same materials as the building.

Dennis Bush asked staff if there was anything to prevent exterior tire storage.

Les Mangus said that there was nothing written in the ordinance. Used tires can be handled under the environmental code and if they want to display a rack of new tires they could do so.

Mr. Miller noted that all tires would be stored inside including the used tires.

Brandon Wilson inquired about the purpose of the parking area at the southwest corner of the lot.

Mr. Miller replied that this area was needed to meet the parking requirements and will probably be used for employee parking and potential overflow.

Dennis Bush made a motion, seconded by Clark Nelson to approve Firestone Complete Auto Care Store as presented. Motion carried 5/0.

SP-2017-09- Review for approval of the site plan for AT&T Retail Store Development, located at 115 E. US Highway 54, Andover, Kansas.

Mike Mellinger, KSCR16, LLC, property owner and agent to the applicant was present to represent the application.

Mr. Mellinger explained that this property was purchased 4-5 months ago. A requirement of the seller was to take the tanks out, that has been done. They are an AT&T authorized dealer. The tenant is an AT&T Retailer, not AT&T Corporate, but they are the largest AT&T Retailer in the country with 1500 locations. Andover was selected as there was no store in the community or within 5 miles. They have proven that free standing buildings work better than being in a strip center location. When they purchased the property they were not told of the highway expansion but he understands that it would be taken away when construction begins. They would like to get rid of the highway access point and have an internal access point. He has not been able to make contact with Arby's to discuss with them. With only one access point AT&T probably will not approve this site. They would like to be able to keep the highway access point short term until they can work out a deal with the neighboring property owners. They have enough parking to be

able to give up a few spaces for a driveway to connect with Arby's parking lot allowing customers to exit the lot. This store is estimated to do about \$80,000-100,000 a month in gross sales. The building will be 38 feet by 70 feet, 2,660 square feet. They always try to have about 25 percent more parking than required by code. They also make the parking spaces bigger with a minimum 10 feet wide space. The building materials will be a combination of stone, Dryvit, and an aluminum/steel siding product.

Brandon Wilson asked what color the canopy would be.

Mr. Mellinger said that it would be the blue that AT&T uses and added that the trash enclosure will be a split-faced masonry block with a concrete precast cap and doors on the front.

Les Mangus explained that this site plan is a little out of phase. They have the zoning in place and one of the conditions of the zoning was platting. There are some issues with the access. Both he and the applicant have been trying to contact KDOT for an opinion on the existing Kellogg access. He cannot get an answer from anyone with authority yet but feels they will have this information by the time it gets to platting.

Mr. Mellinger explained that when he contacted KDOT for an estimate of when they were talking about doing this project and would he be able to keep or not keep the driveway. They said that if the driveway was not being moved there was nothing they could do about it, it would be up to the city. They did say the project would not begin before 2025 but could not be more specific.

Dennis Bush noted that this is a well-designed building and is the type of building you would not mind having on the corridor of your city.

Brandon Wilson asked if there would be roof top units.

Mr. Mellinger said that there would be and if needed they can raise the parapet wall to screen the units. He added that their agreement with AT&T is to have this building done and open before the end of the calendar year.

Clark Nelson made a motion, seconded by Todd Woolsoncroft to approve AT&T Retail Store Development as presented with the following conditions: 1. Complete platting., 2. Raise parapet for mechanical screening. Motion carried 5/0.

Andover Unified Development Manual update from Foster Design Associates, LLC.

David Foster and Debra Foster, Foster Design Associates, LLC were present to update the Site Plan Review Committee of the progress for the Andover Unified Development Manual.

David Foster explained that the information in the committee packets is the diligent efforts of their office and city staff. The first element, 105 Site Plan Approval, will be in the Zoning Regulations and sets up the authority and jurisdiction for the Site Plan Review Committee.

The committee discussed creating a set time period for project approval and the affirmative vote process for the committee.

David Foster pointed out that in Part 3 – Site Plan Review Procedures and Standards there will be links set up so that by clicking on the link the user will be directed to definitions or a website. They did go through the first part of it trying to get the steps listed in order of what needs to be done.

Debra Foster noted that this has been consolidated from Site Plan Standards plus three sets of guidelines. Redundancies have been removed and translated into plain English.

David Foster explained that a new project approval certificate will now be used. It will be signed and state that it was approved by the committee and should be maintained as such and will be an enforceable document. He asked the committee if this should be set up so that city staff be able to enforce maintenance of the approved project.

Les Mangus noted that he reviews site plans annually to ensure compliance. There is specific language in the existing regulations about maintenance of landscaping. What they are asking is if similar language is needed in all of the other conditions. This would state in plain English that once the project is built it must be maintained in the approved form. Any lack of maintenance of the approved plan would be a zoning violation.

David Foster remarked that there is a large amount of documentation that needs to be submitted and feels that it may be too much from the developer's side of it. He asked the committee if they felt burdened with too much to review for the cases.

Clark Nelson said that as a layman it is amazing to him how the committee members review every piece of paper. These members are very dedicated and really study this stuff.

Brandon Wilson agreed that there is a lot on information.

Dennis Bush said that the information is needed.

Debra Foster added that a change Les has requested in the type of information you will get is a comprehensive site plan from the applicant that includes all possible conflicts such as utility lines, trees, sidewalks, access, signage, etc. And we are requiring electronic or digital files of all submitted material. The pdf files could be projected for viewing during the meetings.

David Foster explained that an owners certificate will be on the front page and will stay with the property for any successors or assigns. And added that access management and the vehicle access vision triangle are clarified. He mentioned that the separation and clearances for trees has been carefully looked at. Now a shade tree is anything over 25 feet in mature height, ornamental trees are 25 feet and under. That does not coincide with the preferred tree species list, however it is appropriate from a site planning standard. When the user looks at the site plan listing they will see small, medium, large and very large and will have to make an extra step to meet the

requirements. Some flexibility has been added for irrigation not being needed on established, natural areas. Xeriscape or drought tolerant plantings will not need to be irrigated once plants are established.

The committee discussed requirements and turf grass selections for large lots.

Debra Foster described the requirements for a sidewalk route in parking lots that extends along the length of parking to the entrance of the building. They are also looking at a landscaped island, length-wise, that with a sidewalk could be up to 17 feet wide island.

Les Mangus stated that the existing guidelines require an island to be a minimum of 20 feet wide. That type of access way would only be required on parking lots with more than 500 spaces.

David Foster discussed the requirement of 5 feet as minimum bed width. With a 2-foot vehicle bumper overhang allowance the plantings must be maintained within 3 feet of the curb and provide screening. This is basically the standard used.

Brandon Wilson asked about parallel parking stalls adjacent to an island, especially on the driver's side. He suggested having a hard surface behind the curb. He added that colored mulch should not be allowed and metal edging needs to be recessed into the ground.

Debra Foster noted that mulch will wash away leaving a mud surface.

David Foster stated that all parking lot lighting must be within an island or at the perimeter except in industrial.

Brandon Wilson suggested trash enclosures be required to match the building. Cedar fence material is not always maintained. He also proposed using some type of barricade that could be placed at cross lot access driveways that are installed on developed sites leading to an adjacent undeveloped site.

David Foster summarized discussion of trash enclosures that are in view from a public way of streets being compatible with building materials and zoning district requirements. He suggested a concrete curb or parking bumper be used at the unused cross lot access driveway.

Dennis Bush asked if curbing should be required on new construction parking lots. Subway does not have curbs and the parking bumpers used are now broken and look terrible.

Member items-

There were no member items.

Adjourn

Chairman Allison adjourned the meeting at 9:44 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted by

Dayna DuFriend
Administrative Assistant

Approved this 6th day of June, 2017 by the Site Plan Review Committee, City of Andover.