

The regular meeting of the **Design Review Commission** was held on August 13, 2020, at 5:00 Pm in the Board Chambers of Town Hall, 500 Poplar View Parkway.

The following staff members were present: Development Director, Jay Cravens; Town Planner, Mr. Jaime Groce; Assistant Town Planner, Nancy Boatwright; Planner, Scott Henninger, and Administrative Specialist Sr., Ms. Amy Jensen.

ROLL CALL:

Stamps	Donhardt	Lawhon	Hepner	Lester	Peeler	Doss
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Quorum present.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chairman Doss asked if there were any corrections or additions to the minutes from the July 09, 2020, meeting.

Hearing none, Chairman Doss called for a motion to approve the minutes from the July 09, 2020, meeting as presented.

Motion by Commissioner Donhardt, and seconded, to approve the minutes from the July 09, 2020, meeting as presented.

Hearing no further discussion, Chairman Doss asked for a roll call.

ROLL CALL:

Peeler	Donhardt	Lawhon	Hepner	Lester	Stamps	Doss
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Motion Approved.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

Chairman Doss asked if there were any changes or additions to the agenda.

Mrs. Groce explained that there were no modifications or additions to the agenda.

Chairman Doss asked for a motion to approve the agenda.

Motion by Commissioner Peeler, and seconded to approve the agenda.

Hearing no further discussion, Chairman Doss asked for a roll call.

ROLL CALL:

Hepner	Donhardt	Lawhon	Peeler	Lester	Stamps	Doss
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Motion Approved.

APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA

There were no items on the Consent Agenda.

FORMAL AGENDA

6.a DD19-066 & DD20-0001 – Georgetown PD (formerly known as Mt. Pleasant Trace PD) – Request approval of common open space landscaping, lighting, fencing and entry features including a recommendation to the BMA on the Town Planner’s review of minor PD Amendment related to a streetscape plate for a 64-lot single-family residential subdivision on 26.57 acres located on Mt. Pleasant Road near its intersection with Progress Road.

Mr. Scott Henninger gave the Staff presentation. He said this development was formerly known as the Mt Pleasant Trace PD, and there are two separate requests. The first request is approval of the common open space landscaping, lighting, fencing and entry features. The second request is a recommendation to the BMA on the Town planner’s review of the minor PD Amendment related to a streetscape plate for a 64-lot single-family residential subdivision. The project is located on Mt. Pleasant Road near its intersection with Progress Road. The Mt. Pleasant Trace PD was originally approved in 2008 and a Final Plat was approved, but a Development Agreement was never executed and the Final Plat was never recorded. On December 9, 2019 the BMA approved Resolution 2019-41, which created an Outline Plan that addressed unresolved procedural requirements from 2008, allowed the Alternative Tree Mitigation ratio of 14 trees per acre, and clarified the process to decide what improvements are needed. The Minor PD Amendment will modify the landscape plate along Mt. Pleasant Road to relocate the masonry wall adjacent to the property line to eliminate unmaintainable common open space behind the wall and include a mix of street trees and upright evergreen shrubs. The Planning Commission added a condition requiring an additional 11 feet of right-of-way for the widening of Mt Pleasant Road at the meeting last week. Mr. Henninger said that would not affect the landscaping.

- | |
|---|
| EXHIBITS |
| 1.DRC Conditions of Approval (08/07/20) |
| 2.Applicant’s Cover Letter (07/13/20) |
| 3.February 28, 2008 DRC Conditions |
| 4.Revised Mt. Pleasant Rd. Landscape Plate per Minor PD Amendment (2020) |
| 5.Tree Protection, Mitigation, & Open Space Landscape Exhibits (07/13/20) |
| 6.Material & Color Sample Exhibit |
| 7.Outline Plan (dated July 2020) |

The Open Space Plans indicate there are 4 amenity areas proposed. They are currently labeled as A, B, C and D. A trail will run through preserved trees in Common Open Space A. The frontage of Mt. Pleasant Road will primarily fall within Common Open Space B and will consist of entrance features, a 6-foot masonry wall, street trees, and upright evergreen shrubs. Common Open Space C contains a ditch and a retaining wall behind Lots 58 thru 61 to help preserve two large Oak trees. The primary amenities will be located within Common Open Space D (wet detention pond, mail kiosk, trail with benches, & landscaping).

Mr. Henninger said only minor issues remain following extensive review by Staff dating back to the 2019 submittal. Approval Conditions have been added to meet the intent of the Guidelines. The PD has a requirement for a masonry wall along the entire frontage of Mt. Pleasant Road to match the landscape plate, and a segmented block retaining wall (pewter) is proposed behind Lots 58 thru 61 to transition grades along the east property line.

A 2008 DRC condition required a cedar fence along the entire eastern property line. Also Condition 5 would require a 6-foot masonry or cedar fence extending from the entrance feature to the northeast corner of Lot 64.

Mr. Henninger said the applicant has agreed to all of the Conditions.

Subdivision fencing is not proposed behind the lots along the west property line. If lighting of the mail kiosk or trails is proposed, it shall be indicated on the plans and meet the requirements of the Lighting Ordinance. The sign panels meet the 2008 DRC Condition not to exceed 25 sq. ft. All disturbed areas will be sodded and all un-naturalized areas irrigated.

Review of the Construction Drawings will address the storm water requirements for the subdivision. The site drains to a wet detention basin within Common Open Space D. The applicant should consider adding a fountain in the basin to prevent stagnant water. During the Development Agreement Process, the Engineering Division will review the plans to ensure adequate capacity for storm water.

Mr. Henninger said the major questions for the Design Review Commission include:

Are the proposed open space improvements adequate?

Should the applicant extend the masonry wall to the corner of Lot 57 to match the landscape plate?

Should the applicant include a masonry or cedar fence along the entire east property line?

Does the segmented retaining wall sample meet the intent of the Design Guidelines?

Should the Town Planner approve the change to the Mt. Pleasant Road landscape plate?

Once those questions are addressed, the next steps are a Development Agreement to the BMA, recording the Amended Planned Development, and then an application for the Final Subdivision Plat.

EXAMPLE MOTION #1: (Open Space): To recommend the BMA approve the common open space landscaping, lighting, fencing and entry features for Georgetown PD (formerly known as Mt. Pleasant Trace PD), subject to the Conditions of Approval.

EXAMPLE MOTION #2 (PD L/S Plate): To recommend the BMA affirm the Town Planner's review of minor PD Amendment related to a streetscape plate for the Georgetown PD (formerly Mt. Pleasant Trace PD).

Chairman Doss asked if there were any questions for Staff.

Hearing no questions for Staff, Chairman Doss asked the applicant to come forward.

Applicant, Mark Davis, of Davis Engineering and Consultants, came forward to say he was in full agreement with all of the Conditions of Approval presented tonight by the Staff.

Chairman Doss asked if there were any questions for the Applicant.

Hearing no questions for the Applicant, Chairman Doss discussed the 5 issues at hand with the Commissioners.

Are the proposed open space improvements adequate?

Commissioner Lawhon stated he is concerned about the Japanese trees they plan to use. There are so many of the same kind they might spread a disease. He thought it would be wise to add other types. He also said he was concerned they were close to the sidewalk and he knows that roots cause them to buckle after a few years.

Should the applicant extend the masonry wall to the corner of Lot 57 to match the landscape plate?

There was no discussion.

Should the applicant include a masonry or cedar fence along the entire east property line?

There was no discussion.

Does the segmented retaining wall sample meet the intent of the Design Guidelines?

There was no discussion.

Should the Town Planner approve the change to the Mt. Pleasant Road landscape plate?

Mr. Henninger suggested it be 5 feet off of the sidewalk. The Commissioners agreed.

Motion made by Commissioner Peeler, and seconded, to recommend the BMA approve the common open space landscaping, lighting, fencing and entry features for Georgetown PD (formerly known as Mt. Pleasant Trace PD), subject to the Conditions of Approval, including 2 new Conditions.

Conditions of Approval:

- 1) This development is subject to all applicable standard conditions of approval as adopted by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, Resolution 2006-54.
- 2) If additional right-of-way is required for Mt. Pleasant Road, adjust the grass strip dimension on the Construction Drawings and PD Landscape Plate.
- 3) Label Lot 46, which has been omitted from several plans.
- 4) Extend the masonry wall along the Mt. Pleasant Road frontage to the corner of Lot 57 to match the landscape plate in the PD.
- 5) A 6-foot masonry wall or cedar fence shall extend from the entrance feature to the northeast corner of Lot 64.
- 6) All fencing and signage proposed will require the submittal of separate permit applications prior to installation.
- 7) On the Landscape Detail Sheet:
 - a) Label the height of the masonry wall, columns, and cedar fence.
 - b) Change the entryway sign insert detail which indicates "Mt. Pleasant Trace" to read the new proposed name "Georgetown". Signage approved through a separate process.
- 8) Provide two additional Street Trees near the southeast corner of the property along Mt. Pleasant Road (D.G. III., C., E.).
- 9) Screen all appurtenances such as backflow preventers, controllers, and meters with evergreen landscaping, masonry walls, or opaque fencing (D.G. III., H.).
- 10) All landscaped and disturbed areas shall be sodded and all planted and un-naturalized areas irrigated.
- 11) If lighting is proposed for the mail kiosk, it should be full cut-off and recessed into the canopy to meet the requirements of the Lighting Ordinance.

- 12) If proposed, any lighting for the trails shall be included in the plans and meet the requirements of the Lighting Ordinance.
- 13) Any additions or deviations from the approved plans shall require the approval of the DRC and/or staff prior to any work beginning.

ROLL CALL:

Hepner	Donhardt	Lawhon	Stamps	Lester	Peeler	Doss
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Motion Approved.

Motion made by Commissioner Donhardt, and seconded, to recommend the BMA affirm the Town Planner’s review of the minor PD Amendment related to a streetscape plate for the Georgetown PD (formerly Mt. Pleasant Trace PD).

ROLL CALL:

Peeler	Lester	Stamps	Lawhon	Donhardt	Hepner	Doss
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Motion Approved.

6.b DD20-004 – Schilling Farms Planned Development Area 2, Phase 66 (The Water Tower District, Phase 1) – Request approval of a Preliminary Site Plan for 256 multifamily residential units and 2,193 square feet of nonresidential development on 16.29 acres on the west side of Schilling Boulevard West, south of Poplar Avenue.

Ms. Nancy Boatwright gave the Staff presentation. She stated Schilling Farms, LLC is requesting that

the DRC recommend approval of the Preliminary Site Plan for the Water Tower District. The 53.78 acres in Phase 65 will create 3 Commercial Lots and 3 Future Development Tracts. Lot 1 is a 2.87-acre commercial lot (Schilling Farms Phase 60), Lot 2 is a 16.29-acre mixed-use lot (The Water Tower District Phase 1), and Lot 3 is a 6.913-acre office lot (Schilling Farms Phase 67/ICM). The project presented tonight, the first phase of the Water Tower District, will be on Lot 2.

This phase will include 256 rental dwelling units in 28 buildings. There will be 109 one-bedroom, 93 two-bedroom, and 54 three-bedroom townhomes, along with 2,193 square feet of retail space and 13,562 square feet of resident amenities and a leasing office. Traditional Neighborhood Patterns are allowed if they include mixed uses and buildings greater than 1 story tall.

There are 15 different building types, with 5 types repeated throughout this current development. The buildings meet the standard for a traditional neighborhood pattern. Ms. Boatwright had a sample of the 5 different color types and the proposed materials. All of the materials meet the Schilling Farms Design Guidelines.

The Building Types P2, which are duplexes, may need the building foundations softened. The buildings have been modified with a stoop area and shutters have been replaced with windows. The question is should they be required to add more landscaping and pots.

Ms. Boatwright went through all of the landscape plans with the Commissioners. The lighting and photo metrics were also presented and it was stated they meet all of the preliminary lighting plan requirements.

EXAMPLE MOTION: To recommend that the BMA approve the request for a Preliminary Site Plan for The Water Tower District Phase 1 (Schilling Farms PD, Phase 66) subject to the Conditions of Approval.

Chairman Doss asked if there were any questions for Staff.

Commissioner Lawhon asked if Staff feels like there should be more landscaping on the service drive.

Ms. Boatwright said it is more than was expected for a service drive.

Commissioner Peeler asked about the simulated divided light windows on the buildings. Ms. Boatwright said the buildings are following the Supplemental Design Guidelines, and will have simulated divided light windows.

EXHIBITS

1. PC Conditions of Approval (7/31/20)
2. DRC Conditions of Approval (7/31/20)
3. Applicant's cover letter (7/14/20)
4. Existing & Future Stand-Alone Apartment Development Memo (7/31/20)
5. Excerpt Schilling Farms PD Traditional Neighborhood Pattern (III.L.)
6. Schilling Farms Phase 60 Traffic Impact Study Executive Summary (12/10/18)
7. Storm Water Drainage Summary (4/1/20)
8. The Water Tower District Design Philosophy (5/22/20)
9. Building Transparency Matrix (7/14/20)
10. Building Design Score Matrix (7/14/20)
11. Excerpt from Design Guidelines Appendix IV: Supplemental Standards for Attached Dwellings
12. Schilling Farms PD Outline Plan Sheet 1
13. Preliminary Site Plan Package (7/14/20)
14. Color Preliminary Site Plan (1/15/20)
15. Graphic Material Board & Color Elevations (5/29/20)
16. Perspective Renderings (1/15/20)
17. Retail Building 4 Rendering (3/31/20)
18. Water Tower Rendering (3/31/20)

Hearing no more questions for Staff, Chairman Doss asked the applicant to come forward.

Applicant, Mr. Les Binkley, Schilling Farms LLC, came forward and said he wanted to thank the Staff for all of their help with this difficult development. He said about a year ago they sold their last office site in a different area and they needed to start preparing some more. They acquired a contract with IMC who wanted to be in Schilling Farms. They are planning a nice neighborhood around the office buildings. They are going to a lot of effort to save as many trees as they can. They will include a small amount of retail in this development.

A promotional video was shown prepared by Schilling Farms PD.

Mr. Binkley then addressed Commissioner Peeler's question about the simulated divided light windows. He said Schilling Farms has their own guidelines, even more strict than the Town's, and they will use it to determine where the windows are required.

Commissioner Lawhon asked if all the structures are rentals.

Mr. Binkley said yes.

Chairman Doss asked if there were any other questions for the applicant.

Hearing none, they went back to the four questions Ms. Boatwright had proposed.

There was a discussion whether the Design Guideline requirement for attached dwellings in Traditional Areas to use true divided light or simulated divided light (SDL) windows for any windows visible from the perimeter public streets was used on the buildings that were more than 500 feet from a public right-of-way.

Mr. Binkley said they will mark on the site plans where they are going to use SDL. This will accomplish the requirement in the Conditions of Approval. There will be two colors on the site plan to distinguish between the Town's requirements and Schilling Farm's guidelines.

Ms. Boatwright suggested the Condition of Approval read that the SDL's will follow the Schilling Farm's guidelines.

Everyone agreed with this.

The Commissioners went over the canopies and windows added to the alley-facing façades of the Type P2 Duplex Buildings and decided they meet the Design Guidelines requirement for attached dwellings in Traditional Areas. They feel they include elements on front façades to provide articulation and pedestrian-scale visual interest.

The Commissioners felt the landscaping added to the alley-facing façades of the Type P2 Duplex Buildings met the Design Guidelines requirement that building foundations be softened with landscaping.

Fourthly, they decided Staff will review and approve the final landscaping plan unless there are issues.

Commissioner Donhardt asked how many dumpsters there were and what the rules are.

Ms. Boatwright said it was usually a trash compacter.

Mr. Binkley said there is only one compacter, but trash is picked at the resident's door by a service most nights. They are also still talking about recycling.

Commissioner Lawhon stated he felt this is a really strong concept and an exciting project.

It was decided that item numbers 7 and 8 of the Conditions of Approval will be pending the final submittal. Then they can be struck out.

Motion made by Commissioner Donhardt, and seconded, to recommend that the BMA approve the request for a Preliminary Site Plan for The Water Tower District Phase 1 (Schilling Farms PD, Phase 66) subject to the 10 Conditions of Approval with the addition that they clarify which streets have SDL windows and they are covered with canopies.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. This development is subject to all applicable standard conditions of approval as adopted by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, Resolution 2006-54.
2. Per the Schilling Farms Outline Plan (V.D.) streetscape areas along internal roadways within Area 2 shall be a minimum of 12 feet in width from the back of curb and may use Traditional Neighborhood Pattern Plate A or B.
3. On the Overall Landscape Plan, move the Block C designation from the Future Phase to within Block C.
4. Correct the title block on the Block C Planting Enlargement Plan that shows it to be Block E.
5. Remove all conflicts between light poles and street and canopy trees. Coordinate with the lighting designer on the trees on Blocks E, D, C, F & N, P and the entrance median.
6. True or simulated divided light windows shall be used for any windows visible from the perimeter public streets.
7. Foundation landscaping shall be added at the alley-facing façades at Buildings 15, 16, 19 & 20.
8. Porches, stoops, balconies and canopies shall be incorporated into the front façades of Buildings 15, 16, 19 & 20 to provide articulation and pedestrian-scale visual interest per the Design Guidelines requirements for attached dwellings in Traditional Areas.
9. The Final Lighting Plan shall meet the Lighting Regulations in the Zoning Ordinance and include all required information found in the Final Site Plan checklist.
10. With the Final Site Plan, the following will be required in addition to all other requirements:
 - a. With the Final Landscape Plans, provide materials/details for all fence types.
 - b. On the Final Landscape Plans, label all yard setbacks and landscape buffers.
 - c. On the Final Landscape plans, provide landscaping for any identification sign and include evergreen screening for any ground-mounted lighting. The entire base of the sign should be landscaped with evergreen shrubs.
 - d. On the Final landscape plans, all meters and vents on the building shall be screened with landscaping. If unable to screen, then they must be painted to match the building.
 - e. On the Final landscape plans, all plants shall meet the minimum plant size requirements at installation found in Appendix III of the Design Guidelines as revised in Resolution 2018-05 (attached), including evergreen trees (6 feet with a minimum 2" caliper), upright shrubs (24") and spreading shrubs (18").
 - f. Provide details of the benches proposed in the Central Park Open Space with final plans.
 - g. With the Final landscape plans, all backflow preventers must be screened with evergreen

- shrubs on all sides.
- h. Include any other amenities associated with the pool on the final plans.
- i. On the Final landscape plans, show any planned planter beds or planter pots on the north and east sides of the Type N1 building.
- j. On the Final landscape plans, show the location of the ground mounted lighting at the district landmark signage and provide the appropriate evergreen screening.
- k. Provide details for all walls, fencing and the trash enclosure with the Final Site Plan submittal.
- l. Call out the finish/material for the doors in the RTU wells on the final elevations.
- m. Provide the finish/material for the screening of the RTU wells on the final elevations. Provide a detail/cutsheet.
- n. Include the finish/material for window shutters in the material legend on the final elevations.
- o. With the Final Site Plan, provide a detail for the horizontal slat screen half wall for the RTUs on the elevation sheet in the plan set.

ROLL CALL:

Hepner	Donhardt	Lawhon	Stamps	Lester	Peeler	Doss
Yes	Yes	Yes	abstain	Yes	Yes	Yes

Motion Approved.

Other Business:

7. a Review and discuss proposed changes to the Collierville Funeral Home elevations.

Mr. Groce said to the Commissioners that Mr. Scott Henninger was going to brief them on the change to the Collierville Funeral Home elevations.

Mr. Henninger explained to the Commissioners that he was showing the elevations from last year, and then the changes that have been made. The DRC wanted the applicant to make some improvements and bring it back. The applicant has made significant changes. They have scaled down the roof and the gables. The main concerns are the west and east elevations, which still do not have gables. The Staff is asking the Commissioners if more articulation is still needed.

There was a discussion regarding the elevations and the roof. The Commissioners felt the east and west elevations could use more articulation, especially the east side. They suggested dormers, which would be easier than gables.

Chairman Doss asked if there was any other business.

Mr. Groce said he had no other business.

Hearing no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:25 pm.

Amy Jensen, Administrative Specialist Sr.