

MINUTES OF THE
October 20, 2016 Meeting of the
Easton Planning & Zoning Commission

Members Present: Members, Dick Tettelbaum, Chairman, Don Cochran, Bill Frost and Paul Weber.

Members Absent: Tal Bone.

Staff Present: Lynn Thomas, Town Planner, Brett Ewing, Current Planner, Stacie Rice, Planning Secretary and Sharon VanEmburch, Town Attorney.

Upon motion of Frost, seconded by Mr. Cochran the Commission voted 4-0 to approve the September minutes as written.

The first item on the agenda was **Blake Street** requesting an amendment to an approved Planned Re-Development application. Rita Petit, Owner and Perry Otwell, Engineer were present at the meeting. Mr. Otwell explained that the subject property is located within the Town of Easton Planned Redevelopment (PR) Overlay District. The purpose of the PR District is to provide a mechanism for the redevelopment, rehabilitation and general improvement of certain older areas within the Town of Easton. Mr. Otwell explained they are proposing to convert two existing open space parcels "A" and "C" to buildable lots. Mr. Ewing stated that no minimum open space percentage is required in the current regulations, the language only refers to "adequate" open space. Ms. Petit explained that there is a lot of drug and loitering activity that occurs on the vacant lot. The Commission voted 4-0 to approve the Planned Re-Development as submitted.

The next item was discussion of **Easton Village Architecture**. Mike Burlbaugh with Elm Street Development and Ryan Showalter were present at the meeting. Mr. Showalter explained that the developer is seeking six (6) specific changes, which range in nature from clarification of a standard to relatively minor revisions to current standards/practice. Easton Village is governed by complicated, multi-layered set of rules/guidelines/standards when it comes to architectural features. The project was approved as a PUD which contained a host of conditions, some of which pertained to the architecture of the development, intended to insure that what was represented to the Council in terms of appearance and quality of the development, would in fact be what was built. The Town Council approved the Architectural Guidelines submitted with the PUD application. Mr. Showalter stated that the mechanism by which these guidelines more directly influence architectural elements of Easton Village is the Pattern Book, which was reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission. Elm Street would like to make changes to various provisions in the Pattern Book. The Staff believes these items are appropriate for consideration by the Commission. Mr. Burlbaugh explained the proposed modifications.

- 1.) **Brick stoop, lead walk, and sidewalks** (*from brick to concrete with framed finish*).
- 2.) **Brick foundation all sides** (*proposing brick clad foundations on all front elevations, and side elevations on corner lots*)
- 3.) **Synthetic (Paint Grade) Exterior Trim** (*Propose to paint grade synthetic trim on all elevations on the first floor, vinyl and pre-finished aluminum trim above the first floor*)
- 4.) **Hardi Plank Siding** (*Propose cementitious siding on all first floor elevations. High-grade vinyl shake and/or lap siding of complimentary color and texture*)

above the first floor) 5.) **Rear Loading House Designs on Front Loaded Lots – Side Load** (Side loaded homes with shared driveways and parking courts. IE – Two homes with a common driveway placed on the property line which then creates a parking court that side-loads into both homes. An easement and maintenance agreement would be created prior to sale of these homes so that each homeowner’s responsibilities are clearly defined. By side loading the houses with parking courts, no garage doors would open directly on to the front street). 6.) **Rear Loading House Designs on Front Loaded Lots – Front Load** (Propose where possible, side-loaded homes with shared driveways with parking courts would be preferred. In some instances, it may be preferable to front load one home that shares a driveway with an adjacent lot that is side loaded. This arrangement would mean the front loaded garage would be less visible front the public street).

Residents of Easton Village expressed their concerns with the modified architecture and the affects it would have on them as well as Easton Village as a whole.

The Commission went through each of the proposed amendments individually. To the extent any of the items are approved, they are only conditionally approved with the Commission reserving the right to approve the exact language to be used to amend the Pattern Book.

For the lead walks, and sidewalks, the Commission determined that the original Town Council approval of Architectural Guidelines and the Pattern Book approved by the Planning Commission both already permit concrete to be used. The Applicant agreed to continue brick sidewalks and lead walks in all areas shown in green on the Sidewalk Exhibit presented. The areas shown in orange on the Sidewalk Exhibit may have concrete sidewalks and lead walks. For the stoops, the original Town Council approval required concrete porches to be veneered in brick or wood lattice to appear as a brick or wood porch so that must be maintained and complied with.

The Commission voted 4-0 to conditionally approve this item.

For the foundations, the Commission determined that the original Town Council approval of Architectural Guidelines permitted various materials to be used for foundations including concrete.

The Commission voted 3-1 to conditionally approve the requirement for brick foundations to be limited to the front of the home and if, the property is a corner lot, the side of the home facing a public street.

For the trim, the Commission determined that the original Town Council approval of Architectural Guidelines was silent on trim materials. The proposed amendment to the Pattern Book is consistent with the spirit and intent of the original PUD, but the Commission wants some additional clarification on materials and wants to see sample products. The Commission wants Christine Dayton, the architect hired by the Town, to review the proposed language and offer suggestions for language to ensure the quality of materials.

The Commission voted 3-1 to conditionally approve this item.

For the cladding, the Commission determined that the original Town Council approval of Architectural Guidelines does allow vinyl siding with specific brands and quality levels specified. The proposed amendment to the Pattern Book is consistent with the spirit and intent of the original PUD, but the Commission wants some additional clarification on materials and wants to see sample products. The Commission wants Christine Dayton, the architect hired by the Town, to review the proposed language and offer suggestions for language to ensure the quality of materials are of an equal or higher quality of materials than what is specified in the Architectural Guidelines approved by the Town Council and to make sure the colors are compatible.

The Commission voted 3-1 to conditionally approve this item.

The Commission separated the next two items into slightly different categories than was originally presented. The first is the location of front loaded garages and the second is shared driveways and courts for both side and front loaded garages.

For the location of front loaded garages, the Commission determined that the original Town Council approval of Architectural Guidelines requires front loaded garages to be set back a minimum of 20 feet. Even though there is a drawing that shows front loaded garages flush with the front, the Commission felt that the wording requiring a 20 foot setback is more specific and governs. The Commission felt that the proposed change is not within the spirit and intent of the original Town Council approval.

The Commission voted 4-0 to deny this change because it is a material change from the Town Council approval and should go through the PUD Amendment process.

For the shared driveways and parking courts, the Commission determined that the original Town Council approval of Architectural Guidelines does not address this issue, and that the proposed change is not within the spirit and intent of the original Town Council approval.

The Commission voted 4-0 to deny this change because it is a material change from the Town Council approval and should go through the PUD Amendment process.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m. by motion of Mr. Cochran seconded by Mr. Frost.

Respectfully submitted,

Stacie S. Rice
Planning Secretary