

LAND USE, PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Meeting of September 9, 2021

Members Present

- | | |
|----------------------------|--|
| ✓ Jean McCoubrey, Co-chair | ✓ Larry McEwen |
| ✓ Steve Gendler, Co-chair | Ned Mitinger |
| ✓ Jason Friedland | Andrew Moroz |
| ✓ John Landis | |
| ✓ Joyce Lenhardt | Kathi Clayton, President CHCA (ex-officio) |
| Chris Linn | ✓ Larry McEwen, VP Physical |

Others Attending:

Scott Mayer, developer 8201 Shawnee
Jon Mayer, developer 8201 Shawnee
Matt Spector, attorney
Richard Snowden
Stan Runyan, architect
Jean McCoubrey
Mark Malfara,
Camille Peluso,
Randy Williams
John Beckman
Shirley Hansen
Mary Henry
Diane Fiske, CH *Local* and *Inquirer*
Walter McGuire, CH *Local*
Celeste Hardester, Development Review Facilitator
Anne Mc Niff, Executive Director CHCA
Melissa Nash, recorder

The meeting was opened at 8:06 pm by Steve Gendler, co-chair. Jean McCoubrey was recused due to her participation in the project. This meeting was conducted remotely using Zoom. The meeting was dedicated to the review of the townhouses for 8201 Shawnee.

8201 Shawnee

- Introduction: Richard Snowden introduced the project, which was originally part of the One West project. The townhome portion was sold in 2019 to developers Scott and Jon Mayer. The project is subject to the original agreements with the community with further restrictions to the Stan Runyan/Jean McCoubrey design. There has been some redesign. S Runyan was retained as a consultant to ensure adherence to the agreement. Bowman Properties will oversee the project during construction.
- Adherence to the Agreement: Jean McCoubrey reviewed the relevant portions of the agreement, which is a lengthy document as it covers the front portion of the project as well as the townhouses. Parcel B, the townhouses, much of the subject of exhibit B is dimensional massing. The maximum height allowed is 38'. The present design agrees. The maximum of 4 stories also is in agreement with exhibit B. The setback of the actual building from Shawnee property line is 16' and the setback from Hartwell is 5'. These are compliant. The existing foundation also complies with the Shawnee setback. Bay

windows terraces, landscaping may be in front of the setback. The maximum number of units is 8 in two buildings. This is compliant. Enclosed trash and trash plan is provided as required. R Snowden asked about the size of the footprint of the buildings. It is smaller than the original with the rear walls being setback farther from the rear property line. R Snowden introduced Matt Spector as part of the team. The new architecture team is not present. No near neighbors were in attendance. S Gender asked about the inclusion of a landscape buffer between parcel A and B. R Snowden stated that there was an evergreen buffer that has been partially removed to aide in construction. It will be restored. S Gendler asked if there were any near neighbors present. There were not. J Lenhardt noted that John Beckman was in attendance. J Beckman was an original negotiator of the agreement.

•Current Project Status: Scott and Jon Mayer introduced the project including changes that have been made to the original design. J Mayer stated that he and his father are the developer/builders of the project and that they are trying to fit into the community. He presented slides for the project, beginning with the surveyed foundation for the building under construction, then the site plan and the garage level plan. One change is that the distance from the rear property line has been increased. The retaining wall steps up along the grade and there is a wall of hedges. There will be street trees along Shawnee that side will have green areas and a low wall and low fence with plantings. J Landis asked is units 1-4 will be the same as units 5-8 (under construction). They will be. There is a storm water vault, which is 200' long by 10' wide and 4' deep. It will release accumulated storm water slowly. J Lenhardt asked about changes from zoning to as-built. There is a change in the wall on the upper property line. The wall will have a stone facing It will be real schist not cultured stone. J Mayer noted the renderings are not 100% accurate. There are stairs on the lower portions so the buildings are level. Courtyards have landscaping. J Landis suggested that the parking circulation is tight. It is adequate; cars will exit the property nose first. There will be an HOA. It was asked if the HOA will enforce consistency in fencing. It will. R Snowden noted that he would prefer stone walls rather than estate fencing between the unit yards. The color/materials palette was discussed. There is a darker palette with white and wicker and more variety. Bays will have shakes. There will be some board and batten on the rear. The shakes will be Hardie Plank. Jason Friedland asked about the structure of the condo association. Cross easements for the property will be included. The open spaces between buildings will belong to the adjacent units. Celeste Hardester asked about the owners' responsibility for exterior upkeep. S Gendler asked about the colors and materials being included in the HOA. The goal is consistency. J Landis asked if the units would be rentals. They will probably not be rentals. Individuals will purchase them, and at 1.8 to 1.9 million, they are too expensive to rent. S Gendler commented positively on the design adding that he is reminded of Charles Rennie Macintosh hill houses. He also asked if the materials and other restrictions would be in the deeds. J Mayer noted that the restrictions would be part of the HOA, which does follow the deed. It was asked where the AC units will be located. They will be on the roof in a shielded are carved out. J Landis asked if the middle units have a second means of egress. They have the front door and the garage as egress. There is also the rear deck but that is above ground level.

•Committee Action: S Gendler asked if a motion would be in order. L McEwen asked what the original committee had for expectations at this point. J Lenhardt stated that LUPZC should confirm that the project satisfies the agreement. Although J McCoubrey has verbally stated that it does, a written confirmation of that should also be made. The committee has the permit drawings, but there have been changes made for construction. The committee should have those newer documents as well. J Mayer noted that the permit drawings and the construction drawings are substantially the same. There were older permit drawings that came with the project. It was asked what the differences between the build and the original. R Snowden noted that the difference are slight, mainly changes to the skin. He suggested contingent approval with receipt of the updated construction drawings and the compliance with the agreement. Documents need to catch up with today. S Runyan noted that the buildings are smaller and that the revised permit is for the smaller building is needed. The new permit would have

Runyan reviewed and would include the new team. An attorney is working on the revised permit. John is satisfied with conditional approval pending receipt of revised construction drawings, a revised operation of construction exhibit for the site, which has changed. J Landis noted that although time has passed the project has remained substantially true to the original approved project. Approval can be made conditional on receipt of final versions of documentation. L McEwen noted that the CHCA needs final documents for its records. These documents should exist. Building envelop documents must exist if a building permit exists. R Snowden stated that accurate construction documents are needed. J Mayer noted that building permit does not focus on exterior cladding. It focusses on construction, health and safety, etc. L McEwen restated what the community association needs construction drawings including an accurate representation of the skin of building. J Lenhardt noted that the existing docs state that cultured stone will be used. It has been said that natural stone will be used. The documents should say this. J Mayer stated that changes will be sent to the LUPZC by Monday.

S Gendler repeated the motion. The LUPZC approves the current plan conditional on the final drawings and compliance with the agreement. He added that façade maintenance be added to the transaction deeds. A document will include the state the exact materials and colors. Discussion followed about the actual appearance versus the city's needs/requirements. J Mayer noted that the city does not require that precise detail. R Snowden suggested that conditional approval be dependent on receipt of accurate documentation. J Mayer will have his architect put the exact façade drawings put together for the committee. Material is coming soon. Clean drawings are needed. J Lenhardt suggested a written assurance that he will build what is submitted. The motion should mention clean drawings, agreement adherence and cover letter. J Lenhardt asked for stone walls between units. She would also like to see stone walls along Shawnee. J Mayer stated that there will be a wall with a fence on top. The question of snow removal was discussed. L McEwen noted that these types of issues should be in the HOA. J Landis asked about the construction timeline. J Mayer stated the first building will be framed and skinned. Units will be completed as they are sold. After two units are under contract, the second building will be started. Time will be 12 -15 months.

Motion is to approve conditionally with clean final drawings, adherence to the community agreement, operational provisions, and façade and maintenance included in deed when sold.

The motion passed. J Mayer asked if work could continue while the committee waits for the drawing. It may continue for a reasonable length of time. The drawing should be produced by September 17.

Adjournment

- The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 PM.