

**DRAFT MINUTES
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
PLANNING COMMISSION
TUESDAY, JANUARY 13, 2004 -- 6:30 P.M.
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

The Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission was held on this date with the following members present:

Mr. Craig Barton, Chair
Mr. Jon Fink
Ms. Karen Firehock
Ms. Kathy Johnson Harris
Ms. Cheri Lewis, Vice Chair
Mr. Kevin O'Halloran
Mr. Eldon Wood

Staff Present:

Mr. Jim Tolbert, AICP, Director
Mr. Ron Higgins, AICP, Planning Manager
Ms. Lisa Kelley, Deputy City Attorney
Ms. Missy Creasy, AICP, Neighborhood Planner
Ms. Claudette Grant, AICP, Neigh. Planner
Ms. Mary Joy Scala, AICP, Neigh. Planner

Ex-Officio:

Ms. Mary Hughes, UVa Office of the Architect

City Council Members Present:

Mr. Blake Caravati
Mr. Maurice Cox, Mayor
Mr. Kevin Lynch
Ms. Meredith Richards, Vice Mayor
Mr. Rob Schilling

I. REGULAR MEETING

Mr. Barton called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m.

A. MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY THE PUBLIC NOT ON THE FORMAL AGENDA

Mr. Barton called for any matters from the public not on the agenda. There were none.

B. MINUTES

November 9, 2003 -- Retreat

Mr. Barton called for approval of the minutes. Ms. Lewis moved to approve the minutes for the November 9th special meeting/retreat of the Planning Commission as presented. Mr. Fink seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

December 9, 2003 -- Regular Meeting

Ms. Firehock mentioned a typographical error on page 5 and suggested the phrase "is that" be removed from the third sentence from the bottom of the page. Ms. Lewis noted that the minutes stated she had called the meeting to order at 6:23 p.m. and she had followed the clock in the room; she had asked the reporter why there was a

discrepancy and had been informed that the clock had been fast. Ms. Lewis also asked that the time when a City Council quorum had been attained, which was 7:12 p.m., be noted. Ms. Lewis made a motion to approve the minutes as amended. Mr. O'Halloran seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Barton asked that the Commission bypass item C on the agenda until Mr. Tolbert was present in the room.

D. COMMISSIONERS' REPORTS

Ms. Hughes stated that work was continuing on the pedestrian bridge, which should be open this spring. The new channel for Meadow Creek is finished.

Mr. O'Halloran had no report since his committee assignment is in transition.

Mr. Fink stated there had been no MPO Tech meeting in December.

Ms. Lewis stated that PACC Tech had not met. However, the Board of Architectural Review had a busy meeting in December at which the final approval had been granted for the J&DR Court project.

Ms. Firehock had no report due to her committees not meeting.

Ms. Johnson Harris had attended the Housing Committee Meeting; information was being compiled. There would be a CIP Committee meeting at 12 p.m. January 21st at the CHS Media Center. She also stated the Neighborhood Federation Committee had not met.

Mr. Wood stated the Urban Design Committee had not met. The McIntire Park Advisory Committee had met; the plans were the same as those presented to City Council in early December and the Committee was working on budget.

E. CHAIR'S REPORT

Mr. Barton hoped everyone had received an E-mail he sent regarding a PUD in which proffers had been offered. Proffers are a part of the new zoning process. He and Mr. Tolbert had decided that a committee should be created to review proffers as they arrive at the Commission. Mr. Barton will serve on the committee and had asked Mr. O'Halloran to serve as well; a member of City Council will also be part of the committee.

Mr. Barton stated he and Mr. Tolbert had met with the Mayor and with Mr. O'Connell and had talked about streamlining the public hearing process. The new guidelines were: The chair will introduce the public hearings, clarifying roles and informing the public that each person desiring to speak shall be limited to three minutes; the chair will read the agenda items; staff will make a presentation from staff reports; the chair will ask Planning Commissioners for questions of the staff; the chair will ask City Councilors for questions of the staff; the applicant will have an opportunity to present the proposal; the chair will open the hearing and comments will be received; the chair will close the hearing; the chair will ask the commissioners for questions; the chair will ask Council members for questions; at the end of that cycle, the chair will entertain a motion for discussion and calling the question at the appropriate time -- discussion is limited to the Planning Commission members.

Mr. Barton asked that calendars be consulted when the Councilors were present to identify a mutually convenient date for a work session.

Mr. Barton and Mr. Tolbert would finalize committee assignments in February.

Mr. Barton stated that, in order to facilitate a more efficient and effective relationship with

County colleagues, the Commission would attend the County Planning Commission meetings. Mr. Barton and Ms. Lewis had gone to the first meeting and found that it had been rescheduled.

Mr. Barton and Ms. Lewis were meeting with Mr. Tolbert a week before the regularly scheduled meeting to ensure that all agenda items were understood. He asked that Ms. Firehock attend the February lunch meeting; a different Commissioner would be chosen each month.

Recognizing that Mr. Tolbert had again left the room, Mr. Barton asked if there were any questions regarding Site Plans and Subdivisions. Mr. O'Halloran had a question about Sunset Bridge. Mr. Fink stated that Mr. Tolbert asked that they move item C to the end of the meeting.

Mr. Barton recessed the meeting at 6:54 p.m.

Mr. Barton reconvened the meeting at 6:58 p.m. He asked that the members of the public turn off their cell phones.

II. JOINT PUBLIC HEARINGS

F. JOINT PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. ZM-03-12-13: A petition to rezone from R-2 Residential to R-2 Planned Unit Development (PUD) the property on the north side of Madison Avenue at Meadow Street as a five unit PUD. The general uses allowed in the R-2 zoning are medium density single and two-family dwellings on moderate sized lots at a density of seven to 12 units per acre. The property is further identified on City Real Property Tax Map Number 37 as a portion of parcel 83 having approximately 80 feet of frontage on Madison Avenue, 225 feet of frontage on Meadow Street, and containing approximately .42 acres of land. The general uses called for in the Land Use Plan of the Comprehensive Plan are single and two-family dwellings in a range of seven to 12 units per acre.

Ms. Creasy gave the staff report. The applicant proposes to construct five single-family, detached dwellings that contain similar characteristics to the adjacent Madison Place PUD. Four lots would front on Meadow Street; one on Madison Avenue. Street improvements -- including paving, curb, gutter and sidewalk placement -- would need to be made to bring Meadow Street up to City standards. The proposed common space is 12.09 percent of the development which does not meet the 15 percent minimum common space requirement. Units would be at least 1500 square feet in size; lots are approximately 3,600 square feet. The applicant had provided land use and density breakdowns. The applicant proposes to place an individual concrete structure underground on each lot to collect storm water and release it slowly to the surface rather than having one system for the entire development.

Engineering staff has reviewed the concept but is unable to provide information until the site plan has been submitted for review. No members of the public attended the preliminary agenda meeting on January 5th, nor have any public comments been received at this time. Staff is unable to recommend approval at this time because the proposal does not meet the open space requirement outlined in Section 34-493 of the Zoning

Ordinance. If the application is approved, a preliminary and final subdivision plat and a site plan would be required.

Mr. Barton called for questions of Ms. Creasy from the Commissioners.

Ms. Firehock sought clarification as to how much land was referenced in the missing 2.91 percent of common space requirement. Ms. Creasy stated it was 675 square feet or .0155 acres.

Mr. Barton called for questions of Ms. Creasy from the Councilors. There were none.

Mr. Barton recognized the applicant.

Mr. Tom Hickman, agent for the applicant, stated they were willing to take the access easement and make it part of the common area. Mr. Hickman stated that the concept behind the proposed storm water drainage was being worked on in the Azalea neighborhood.

Mr. Barton called for questions of the applicant from the Commissioners.

Mr. Fink asked how the access easement would look if it were common space. Mr. Hickman concurred that fencing and landscaping would have to stop at the property owners' side of the easement.

Mr. Barton called for questions from the Councilors.

Mayor Cox sought clarification about the graphic showing the path leading from Madison to the common area for Lot 2. Mr. Hickman explained that access was not through Madison for that lot.

Mr. Barton opened the public hearing.

Mr. Richard Holway, of 106 Kelsey Court, read a prepared statement to the Commission stating that the Madison Place homeowners generally favor the new development as long as issues of drainage and erosion are addressed and that the development does not adversely affect the adjacent portion of the Madison Place common area or the houses bordering the new development.

Mr. Craig Van de Castle, a County resident and former resident of Meadow Street, stated that the City's policy of infill without provision for the loss of trees is a shortsighted policy which needs to be changed.

With no other members of the public wishing to comment, Mr. Barton closed the public hearing and called for comments from the Commissioners.

Ms. Lewis observed that the access easement addition was not fully fleshed out. She felt that without some critical information a decision could not be made.

Mr. O'Halloran concurred with Ms. Lewis. He needed more information before he could feel comfortable with approving the proposal.

Mr. Fink felt the plan was good. However, he did want to see the common area issue fleshed out.

Ms. Firehock also wanted to know more about the intentions for the use of the common area.

Mr. Tolbert stated this was a concept plan, not a site plan. The site plan would detail those issues when and if zoning was approved. Mr. O'Halloran made a motion to table the proposal until such a time that the Commission have more information about the common area. Ms. Lewis seconded the motion. Mr. O'Halloran clarified that his motion was to defer the matter until the next regularly scheduled meeting because they did not have the information they needed to deliberate this properly. Ms. Lewis seconded the amended motion. Mr. Barton called for discussion. Ms. Lewis commented that the staff report said the applicant wished to have the common area requirement waived or amended; she thought a formal presentation and justification or discussion of that in writing sent to City Councilors may be helpful. Ms. Johnson Harris sought clarification about concept plans. Mr. Tolbert agreed that a concept plan required feedback but not approval. Mr. Wood asked if the proposal was a zoning change. Mr. Tolbert concurred further stating it was not a site plan review. Mr. Barton stated that he was not prepared to move forward since there was not sufficient nor clear information. The motion carried 5 to 2 with Ms. Firehock and Ms. Johnson Harris voting against.

2. ZM-03-12-14: A petition to rezone from R-1S Residential to Planned Unit Development the properties at 206-208 5th Street, SW. The R-1S zoning allows single-family detached dwellings at seven units/acre. The PUD designation would allow for up to six single-family detached "cottages" at a density of 16.2 units/acre. These properties are further identified on City Real Property Tax Map Number 29 as parcels 52, 53, & 54, having approximately 81.5 feet of frontage on 5th Street, SW and containing approximately 16,021 square feet of land or .37 acres. The general uses called for in the Land Use Plan of the Comprehensive Plan are single-family residential at 3-7 units per acre.

Mr. Barton stated this item had been removed from the agenda.

3. ZM-03-12-15: A petition to rezone from R-1S, R-2 and McIntire-Fifth Street Residential to Planned Unit Development the vacant property of the Johnson Village subdivision and other parcels at Fifth Street and Cleveland Avenue. The general uses allowed in the R-1S zoning are single-family detached dwellings; in the R-2 zoning are

single and two-family dwellings at seven to 12 units per acre, and; in the McIntire-Fifth Street Residential zoning are medium density multi-family residential up to 21 units per acre. The PUD designation would permit single-family detached, townhouses and condominiums, with some commercial space at Fifth Street up to 472 units (or more, depending upon parking), at densities ranging from 3.5 to 26.86 units per acre with an average of 10.8 units per acre. This property is further identified on City Real Property Tax Maps as 22A-3, 22B, parcels 177, 178, 179, 180, 181 and 182, having collectively 43.6 acres of land with 107 feet of frontage on Fifth Street, 2,177 feet of frontage on Cleveland Avenue and 291 feet of frontage on Cherry Avenue. The general uses called for in the Land Use Plan of the Comprehensive Plan are single and two-family residential ranging from 3 to 12 units per acre.

Mr. Tolbert gave the staff report. Mr. Tolbert stated this proposal was also a concept plan.

Commissioners would need to approve zoning which would allow the applicants to submit site plans which would be brought back before the Commission for review. This proposal is also the first to use proffers under the new ordinance. The proposal is mainly for residential with a density range of 380 to 476 depending on the market at the time of the site plans. The current by right zoning would allow 675 units. The proposed properties which would be accessed off of Cherry Avenue would be single-family detached residential. The block designated as A2 in the plans is undetermined and would be townhouses or stacked condominiums. Block A3 would contain townhouses with parking underneath. The proposal does not have any direct street connection to Johnson Village. Block B would be an extension of the current Johnson Village subdivision and would have 36 single-family detached lots. Block D is to be left as open space due to topographical and access issues. Block C1 is the last portion of Johnson Village as originally platted and has two options for development. If zoning is recommended, a range of densities will be recommended with a cap of 476 units. A code of development dealing with the sizes of the setbacks and appearance issues was submitted and would be part of the approved development. An issue which had been discussed was access through Johnson Village from Cherry to Fifth; the Comprehensive Plan has language that does not allow direct access to occur through the subdivision. Mr. Tolbert then listed the proffers: to construct a pedestrian trail up to ten feet wide through the Cherry Avenue parcel located along the existing stream running through Block A1 if a connecting trail has been built within five years of approval of the PUD -- easement and right of way for the trail would be deeded to the City upon completion; to construct and add picnic tables on the Cherry

Avenue parcel that is identified as a pocket park on Block A1; to construct a pedestrian trail on Block D built to Appalachian Trail standards or RTF standards; a cash proffer of \$70,000 to the City for improvements and equipment for the Johnson School playground -- they would be part of the design; and to work with the Johnson Village neighborhood to construct and install landscaping and improvements to the existing signage area. Mr. Tolbert recognized Ms. Kelly to address the proffer situation.

Ms. Kelly reminded the Commission that their role in reviewing the rezoning application was to look at the application as a whole, including any written proffers that have been voluntarily offered by the applicant, and make an advisory recommendation to

Council. Ms. Kelly then addressed the issue of proffers. Proffers must be voluntarily offered by an applicant. Amendments to a proffer may not be proposed at a public hearing. If the Commission feels a proffer is bad, they may use that to deny the application. However, the decision on the application should not turn on the specific content of any single proffer.

Mr. Tolbert stated that staff recommends approval of the application as presented.

Mr. Barton called for questions from the Commissioners for Mr. Tolbert.

Ms. Firehock asked if there had been any traffic impact studies. Mr. Tolbert stated a preliminary traffic study had been done even though it had not been required.

Mr. Barton recognized the applicant.

Mr. Steve Runkle, owner of the Kessler Group, was present on behalf of the property owner.

Ms. Johnson Harris wanted the price ranges for the houses. Mr. Runkle explained that Block A1 would be 250-400,000. Block A2, the townhouses, would be 150-250,000. Block 3, townhouses, 150-250,000. Block B, single-family detached homes, would be 300-500,000. Block C1, stacked townhouses, would be 150-250,000; if condominiums were in C1 and A2, they would be 100-125,000.

Ms. Firehock sought clarification as to what was intended for the commercial block. Mr. Runkle thought it would be something related to servicing the residents.

Mr. Cox wanted to know what the real estate tax benefit would be to the City. Mr. Tolbert stated that studies had been done; the project would generate 950,000 to 1.4 million in annual revenues to the City.

Mr. Cox also wanted to know the impact on the school system. Mr. Runkle explained that the estimates from their studies were: 37 additional elementary students; 16 for grades 5 and 6; 14 for grades 7 and 8; 21 high school students.

Mr. Barton opened the public hearing.

Mr. Bob Roach, of 1604 Trailridge Road, stated his initial reaction was somewhat favorable. However, he did not want through traffic coming through Johnson Village. He asked that everyone who was in agreement with him about keeping Johnson Village free of through traffic please stand. A majority of the audience complied.

Mr. Francis Orebeck, of 730 Village Road, concurred with Mr. Roach. He did not want a through street.

Mr. Shawn McCord, his wife, and their children, of 721 Shamrock Road, spoke and sang against a through road. Mr. Barton sought clarification that the McCords' comments were about the through street or the development. Mr. McCord concurred that the family commented strictly against the through street.

Ms. Judy Richards, of Johnson Village, was appreciative of the design with just the original entrance.

Ms. Liz Caraine, of 2343 Highland Avenue, presented the Commission with a letter signed by 38 residents of Highland and Robertson Avenues asking that access be found from Fifth Street Extended.

Mr. David Lee, of 2343 Highland Avenue, stated that responses to the neighborhood polling had been sudden, enthusiastic and vigorous. He also stated that within the concept of connectivity not all streets are created equally.

Mr. David Rutherford, of 716 Shamrock Road, spoke in favor of keeping Shamrock Road closed.

Mr. Vance High, of 338 Cleveland Avenue, concurred with previous speakers and presented the Commission with a packet of pictures. He expressed concern over erosion and drainage.

Mr. Tony Gentry, of 1526 Trailridge Road, asked that a through road not be allowed.

Mr. John Schmidt, of 720 Village Road, while supporting the PUD, expressed concern about the through road and erosion control and enforcement.

Mr. John Soderman, of 1617 Trailridge Road, expressed appreciation that the developer had been working with the neighborhood.

Mr. William Moyer, of 715 Shamrock Road, asked that Shamrock Road remain closed.

Mr. Jeff Mosster, of 726 Shamrock Road, spoke in opposition of a connecting road.

Ms. Heather Walker, of 603 Shamrock Road, expressed concern about the proffers and who would be required to pay for the upkeep of trails.

Mr. Lawrence Weder, of 2331 Highland Avenue, spoke in opposition of the proposal.

Ms. Andrea Weder, of 2331 Highland Avenue, found the zoning plan unacceptable and suggested the proposal be tabled.

Ms. Lisa Tomlinson, of 701 Shamrock Road, concurred with previous speakers.

Ms. Jean Brown, of 715 Village Road, and President of the Johnson Village Neighborhood Association, spoke in opposition of a through road.

Mr. Jay Levine, of Highland Avenue, complimented the developer for listening to the neighbors and incorporating their ideas into the plan.

Mr. Jerry Mallory, of 4312 Highland Avenue, asked that a traffic study be done since the area seems more like the Highland Robinson Avenue International Motor Speedway.

Mr. Kenneth Bard, of 2316 Highland Avenue, recommended that the proposal be rejected.

Mr. Tim Bingler, of 720 Shamrock Road, spoke against a connecting road.

Ms. Terry DiSentio, of 2307 Highland Avenue, reiterated the need for a traffic study and an environmental impact study.

Ms. Marlene Jones, of 103 Elkhorn Road, concurred with previous speakers about no through street. She also thanked Mr. Runkle and his associates for communicating with the neighborhood. She asked that there be fewer units.

Mr. Al Payne, of 916 Rock Creek Road, expressed his confusion about what would be done on the property behind Rock Creek Road. Mr. Tolbert explained that was Block D, the open space, which would not have any development.

Ms. Ann Wright, of Rock Creek Road, expressed concerns about the outlet on Fifth Street.

Mr. Tom Pitt, of 1520 Trailridge Road, expressed concern about the construction traffic and how long construction would last.

Mr. William Miller, of 1518 Antoinette Avenue, expressed concern about a through street and about the 10-foot path.

Ms. Jeanie Wiley, of 612 Shamrock Road, expressed confusion about the process that would continue after the concept was approved. Mr. Tolbert explained that if the Charlottesville Planning Commission approved the zoning request, it would then go to City Council. If approved, site plans would be submitted that implement the concept plan. Only blocks A2 and C1 could be changed.

Ms. Jane Rittenhouse, of 611 Shamrock Road, asked if the applicant had stated there was a possibility of efficiency apartments. Mr. Tolbert stated the zoning ordinance allows accessory units, which would require one of the units to be owner occupied.

Mr. Barton closed the public hearing. He then called for questions from the Commissioners.

Ms. Johnson Harris, expressing awareness of the traffic in the neighborhood, asked if a traffic study was being considered. Mr. Tolbert stated the applicant had commissioned a traffic study, which had not yet been finished.

Mayor Cox sought clarification about the timetable for the total build out. Mr. Runkle stated his expectation that blocks A1-3 and Block B would be started as soon as they receive site plan approval. Block B should be completed

within three years, probably two. The single-family portion of Block A would be completed within two years; townhouses would be a three to five year project. Blocks A and B would be in development concurrently.

Mr. Barton called for comments from the Commissioners.

Ms. Lewis stated there were a number of criteria they needed to review for a rezoning. She further stated that the proposed use for the property was what one would contemplate for the area. The proposed rezoning would not be a complete change from the current zoning. She felt the development was in keeping with the character and use of adjoining properties.

Ms. Firehock stated her agreement with Ms. Lewis. She further noted for the public's benefit that a PUD gave the Commission greater control over such things as trail width, buffer areas, and tree protection.

Mr. O'Halloran expressed support for the proposed rezoning.

Mr. Fink concurred with Ms. Firehock's statement about Charlottesville Planning Commission control over a PUD. He also stated that the residents had been clearly heard about their concerns over keeping Shamrock Road closed.

Ms. Johnson Harris expressed support for the proposal.

Mr. Wood expressed appreciation for what had been submitted and for the work the developer had done with the neighborhood. He asked that all parties concerned would admit that the Comprehensive Plan would not allow a connection through Johnson Village.

Mr. Barton stated his support for the plan since it proposed a lower density than that allowed by right. However, he expressed disappointment that a connective tissue could not be created.

Mr. Fink made a motion to recommend approval of the application to rezone property from R-2, R-1, McIntire Ridge Residential to PUD on the basis that the proposal would serve the interest of the general public welfare and good zoning practice with the following conditions: maximum density of 472 units; following of the Comprehensive Plan guidelines with no Fifth Street connector. Ms. Lewis seconded the motion. Mr. Higgins called the question; the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Barton called for a brief recess; the meeting stood in recess at 9:28 p.m.

Mr. Barton called the meeting back to order at 9:32 p.m. Mr. Schilling and Mr. Caravati did not return to the meeting after the recess.

5. Closing Alley between UVA Parking Lots: A petition to close the alley right-of-way of 10 feet x 98.7 feet running through the University of Virginia parking lot(s) at Wertland Street and 14th Street, NW.

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The request was to close a private alley. One of the parcels fronts on Fourteenth Street; the other on Wertland Street. The alley was created by plat in 1891. There is a storm water pipe on the alley, which is a private system only impacting that property owner. There are no other utilities present. Vacation of the alley would facilitate development of the two parcels. Using the existing zoning of RUHD, it would be possible to get two additional development rights if the parcels were combined. The alley is valued at \$12,151. Vacation would not landlock any parcel. Staff recommends approval of the application.

Mr. Barton complimented Ms. Scala on the clarity of the report.

Mr. William Bond, of the University of Virginia, stated they wanted to free the parcel of encumbrances so they could do something with the property. The University was unsure of future plans for the property.

Mr. Barton called for questions from City Council.

Mr. Lynch asked if Mr. Bond were aware that the adjacent property owner did not want the adjacent alleyway to be used as an access point to the combined property. Mr. Bond stated they currently did not have access from that alley which was fenced off.

Mayor Cox sought additional information about future use of the property. Mr. Bond stated he would prefer to wait until there were more firm plans.

Mr. Barton opened the public hearing.

Mr. Jim Stultz, owner of the adjacent property, expressed concern that UVa would sell to a developer who would remove the fence.

Mr. Akbhar also expressed concern over future development.

Mr. Barton closed the public hearing. He called for comments from the Commission.

Mr. Tolbert stated that Mr. Caravati had raised concerns about the intent of the closing. Mr. Caravati had asked the City Attorney, Kevin Brown, if there was any way to condition the alley closing. Mr. Brown stated that the only condition that could be placed was that the alley closing would be approved but it would not become effective until there was a site plan submitted for development that met the ordinances of the City.

Mr. Fink stated he would support the condition stated by Mr. Tolbert.

Ms. Lewis made a motion to recommend to City Council that the portion of the ten foot alley that runs between Tax Map 4 Parcel 296 and Tax Map 4 Parcel 302 be vacated by ordinance at such time as a site plan for development is presented to the Commission for approval. Ms. Firehock seconded the motion. Mr. Fink asked if compensation would

be part of the motion. Ms. Lewis amended her motion to recommend to City Council that a fair market value, which would be approximately \$12,151, be exacted from the applicant because the closing of this alley would increase the number of units. Mr. Fink seconded the amendment to the motion. Ms. Firehock expressed reluctance to seek compensation. Mr. Higgins called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

III. REGULAR MEETING ITEMS (Continued)

G. SUBDIVISIONS

1. Huntley PUD, Phases IA & IIA Subdivision Plat Dymond Road off of Stribling Avenue

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The site plan will be approved administratively as soon as the applicant posts a bond. Two new roads were dedicated. There would be 110 lots. The developer would be coming back to the Commission about Huntley Phase III.

Ms. Lewis made a motion to approve the subdivision plat submitted for this application for the Huntley PUD based on the following conditions: that all the comments that were given to staff in a letter dated December 22, 2003, be satisfied; that large shade trees be provided on both sides of all new streets pursuant to City Code; that street light specifications be approved by staff; and that PUD documents be approved by the City Attorney's office. Mr. Fink seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

H. DEPARTMENT/STAFF REPORT(S)

The Commissioners were asked to submit to Mr. Tolbert by E-mail any concerns they had about the Entrance Corridor.

1. Annual Planning Awards

Mr. Tolbert stated the awards could be presented at the March meeting if the Commissioners needed more time to consider or they could turn in their votes tonight and present them in February. The Commissioners opted to turn in their votes tonight.

C. LIST OF SITE PLANS AND SUBDIVISIONS APPROVED ADMINISTRATIVELY

Ms. Lewis made a motion to approve the list of site plans approved administratively December 1, 2003 to January 1, 2004 and the subdivisions approved administratively as well as the Entrance Corridor design applications approved by staff during the same period. Mr. O'Halloran seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

LIST OF SITE PLANS APPROVED ADMINISTRATIVELY

12/1/03 TO 1/1/04

1. Sunset Avenue Bridge End of Sunset Avenue
Improvements by Eagle's Landing at Moore's Creek
2. Chipotle Restaurant – Change of Use 1169 Barracks Road
at Clearview Cleaners
3. 820 East High Street – Addition 820 East High Street
Commercial/Residential
4. Kroger Addition – Pharmacy 1904 Emmet Street
Renovation/Drive Through at Hydraulic Road
5. Hilltop Day Care Center 909 Landonia Circle

Addition
6. Import Car Store – Site Additions 901 Seminole Trail at Hydraulic Road
7. Wayne Oxygen Complex – Addition 1100-1106 East Market Street

LIST OF SUBDIVISIONS APPROVED ADMINISTRATIVELY

12/1/03 to 1/1/04

1. Division of Lot 4, TM 18A-32 No new lots
218 Stribling Avenue David O. & Andrea Bluthardt
File No. 1312 Preliminary & Final
Final Signed: 12/3/03
2. St. Charles Subdivision 24 new s.f. lots
St. Charles Avenue, extended Rich Carter, Southland Homes
File No. T02-000043 Final
Planning Commission: 5/13/03
Final Signed: 12/11/03

LIST OF ENTRANCE CORRIDOR DESIGN APPROVALS

12/1/03 to 1/1/04

- 1. Chipotle Restaurant 1169 Barracks Road**
- 2. 820 East High Street Addition 820 East High Street**

Mr. Tolbert presented the Commission with an agenda for the training session to be held January 29th.

Ms. Firehock made a motion to adjourn this session of the Planning Commission and agree to reconvene on February 10th at 6:30 p.m. Mr. Fink seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 10:28 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted:

James E. Tolbert, AICP Secretary

Approved:

Craig Barton, Chair