

FEBRUARY 24TH, 2015

BARTLETT DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION MINUTES

The Design Review Commission met in the City Hall Large Conference Room at Bartlett City Hall on Tuesday, February 24th, 2015 at 6:15 p.m. for a Special Call meeting. Alderman Elliott, Chairman, presided over the meeting.

Members Present:

Alderman Emily Elliott
Michael Terry
Casper Briggs
Keith Whaley
Frederic Rudd
Joe Ozegovich

Members Absent:

Bill Simpson
Chris Triplett
Melissa Bray

The following advisors were present: Terry Emerick, Director, Planning and Economic Development; Kim Taylor, Deputy Director, Planning and Economic Development; Jim Brown, Director, Code Enforcement; Wade Towles, Assistant Director of Engineering, and Ed McKenney, City Attorney.

Mike Terry opened the meeting with prayer.

The Design Review Commission and the audience recited the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States of America.

Motion was made by Mr. Mike Terry to approve the Minutes of the January 20th, 2015 meeting as submitted. Mr. Frederic Rudd seconded the motion. Voice Vote: All members voted yes. Minutes were approved.

NEW BUSINESS

Site Plans

1. Panera Bread - 8340 Hwy 64, Lot 1 (Chris Haskins, Frank Balton & Co.)

Ms. Kimberly Taylor explained that Mr. Chris Haskins with Frank Balton & Co. is requesting Design Review Commission (DRC) approval of a site plan for Panera Bread. The subject property is located at 8340 Highway 64 within the "C-H" Highway Business zoning district.

The specific request by the applicant is for the approval of multi-color vinyl (1st choice by applicant) or green vinyl awnings to be placed above the windows along the storefront and at the drive-thru window.

Recommendation: Approval of the green awnings or an alternative as recommended by the DRC.

Planning Conditions:

1. It is recommended that the owner/applicant attend the meeting in order to make decisions relative to any changes that may be suggested by the DRC.

Mr. Chris Haskins, Frank Balton Signs, 5385 Pleasant View was present to represent this application.

The awning material sample was displayed for the commission. Question arose regarding the “wheat” pattern which was a usual display at the Panera Bakeries. This is no longer used. Also, questioned regarding the blue color on the sheet in the packets he explained that the colors on the paper sometimes don’t show as they actually are. Their alternate for the awning would be a solid green like the green in the display.

Motion was made by Mr. Frederic Rudd to approve this application for awning for the Panera Bakery, 8340 Highway 64, Suite 101, as presented with the multi-color. Joe Ozegovich seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote: All members voted yes. Motion was carried.

2. Caring Estates - 4965 Brunswick Road (Delinor D. Smith, Smith Building Design & Associates)

Ms. Kimberly Taylor explained that Mr. Delinor Smith with Smith Building Design and Associates is requesting Design Review Commission (DRC) approval of a revised site plan for Caring Estates. The subject property is located at 4965 Brunswick Road within the “RS-15” Residential zoning district.

The Shelby County Commission initially approved this project prior to its annexation into the City of Bartlett. However, due to changes made to the site plan following the County’s approval, and after the property’s 2012 annexation into the City, the applicant obtained site plan approval from the Bartlett Planning Commission on February 2, 2015.

The request presented to the Planning Commission included a revised site plan to expand an existing 8,155-square foot nursing home with a 6,200-square foot building addition, resulting in a 14,355-square foot building. The nursing home is currently an 8-bed facility, but will increase to an 18-bed. A new curb cut to provide access to the site from Baylor Road is proposed, and the existing access from Brunswick Road will remain. A detention pond will also be added to the property along with drainage improvements along the road frontages.

The specifics of the approved site plan were as follows:

| Site Data | |
|---|----------------------------------|
| Site Area: | 3.66-acres (159,430 square feet) |
| Total Required Parking Spaces: | 22 |
| Total Proposed Parking Spaces: (based on the number of beds) | 22 |
| Handicap Accessible: | 2 |
| Regular: | 20 |

| | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|
| Existing Building Area: | 8,155-square feet |
| Proposed Building Area: | 6,200-square feet |
| Total: | 14,355-square feet |
| Green space/Open space: | 78.1% |
| Building Height: | 32'9" |

The specific request to the DRC by the applicant is for the approval of building elevations, fencing, landscaping, and lighting details as follows:

Elevations: The existing building is situated on a corner lot at Brunswick and Baylor Roads. The main entrance and front of the existing structure is on the east elevation facing Brunswick Road. The building expansion will be added to the west elevation of the existing building. Entrances to the expansion will be on the north and south elevations. A new portico will be added to the southeast elevation. All four elevations will match the elevation materials on the existing building which includes: Carrington Tudor Modular Brick, Hardie board siding and block in Natchez Moss color (new paint color for both the existing building and the expansion), Tamko laminated asphalt roof shingles in Rustic Hickory, Tennessee Field Stone (thin cut) natural rock (accents new expansion), and accent trim, handrails, and doors will be painted in Whisper White.

Fence – Currently, there is a wood privacy fence along the west and south property lines, and along a portion of the property fronting along Brunswick Road. There is a chain-link fence along the north property line and along a portion of the Brunswick Road frontage. Landscape Plate 23D which includes fencing will be used to screen the site from the adjacent residential property owner. The applicant would like to modify Landscape 23D by keeping the existing wood privacy fence along the west property line.

Landscaping – The majority of the proposed landscaping will be located along the perimeter of the property up to the greenbelt area. The proposed plantings are as follows: Dwarf Burford Holly, Dwarf Yaupon Holly, Rose Creek Abelia, Encore Azalea, Tulip Poplar, Forest Pansy Red Bud, Alta Southern Magnolia, Emerald Green Arborvitae, Red Maple, and Willow Oak. Landscape Plate 23A will be used for streetscape screening along the road frontages.

Lighting – The proposed lighting will be located along the perimeter of the building. Currently, there are 5, 150-watt pulse start metal halide wall-paks, mounted at 10-feet on the exterior walls of the existing building. Five lights are proposed to be installed on the exterior walls of the building expansion.

Recommendation: Approval with Conditions:

Planning Comments:

1. The applicant would like to modify Landscape Plate 23D, by keeping the current site proof fence along the west property line instead of installing a shadowbox fence with brick columns. The applicant will install the required landscaping.
2. The driveway entrance from Baylor Road will not be gated.

Planning Conditions:

1. The applicant shall revise plant materials schedule on the landscape plan to include a plant quantity column.

2. The applicant shall explain how the site will be irrigated.
3. All existing fencing shall be removed from the site, except as approved by the Design Review Commission.
4. It is recommended that the owner/applicant attend the meeting in order to make decisions relative to any changes that may be suggested by the DRC.

Engineering Conditions:

Engineering: The applicant agreed at the February 2, 2015 Planning Commission to meet the following conditions—not all of these have been incorporated at this time but the developer’s engineer is working on the changes.

1. General:

A. The Site Plan has been revised after our initial review of the plans and a full review of the changes to the plans will be necessary to ensure all the changes have been made throughout the plans and any additional changes found will be marked on the plans and returned to the engineer/developer.

B. A full Site Plan contract will be required. All applicable fees will be included, along with a full bond for the public improvements and conditioned items.

C. At the corner of the roads, some additional right of way will have to be dedicated so the proposed shoulder work is inside the public right of way.

D. Outline Plan condition III-E requires all lighting to be shown on the site plan – no lighting is currently shown.

2. Plat: No revised plat has been submitted with this package.

A. Although the plat has been recorded and the right of way for Brunswick and Baylor has been dedicated, the plat will require re-recording once the site has been finalized to correctly show:

- 1) all easements;
- 2) area (SF and Acres) of the site - after the road dedication;
- 3) actual right of way lines including the additional dedication
- 4) The correct flood map panel number is 47157C0195 G and the effective date is Feb 6, 2013.
- 5) Show the site with all amenities as currently proposed, including the 5’ wide sidewalk.
- 6) If there is still a gate planned, the fire department access drive on Baylor shall include a note that it shall have a Knox Box for access purposes.
- 7) The detention basin shall be labeled as a ‘no-build’ area.
- 8) Remove the two notes at the corner about ‘area to be cleared...’ and put them on the site plan.
- 9) Add the landscape buffer detail currently on the site plan to the plat. The width of that buffer is supposed to be 20’.

- 10) Correct the front yard setback line and show it relative to the right of way line (same ‘bends’).
- 11) Update the property owner information for lot 8, and any others that have changed.
- 12) There shall be no on-street parking available on either street – Brunswick Rd or Baylor Rd. This shall be noted on the re-recorded plat.

3. **Site Plan:**

- A. The Site Plan has recently been revised and will need to be reviewed to ensure all of the correct notes and information is shown.
- B. Draw in the street scape and landscape buffer boundaries along all property lines – except the greenbelt area. At the intersection, the street scape shall be pulled back to keep it out of the line of sight.
- C. Add a detail and dimension from the right of way showing the proposed gate at the Baylor Rd entrance. It shall provide adequate room for the vehicle to pull in entirely off the road with the gate closed. This gate will require a Knox Box for Fire Department access.
- D. Coordinate the Site Plan with the Tree Protection Plan.
- E. The existing chain link fence is noted to be removed, but the scope of this fence is not shown. Add a linear foot amount with the note so the contractors can reasonably estimate the work.
- F. Adequate line of sight clearing is shown based on a left turn with the posted 30 mph speed limit. The extent of clearing should be clarified on the Tree Protection Plan.
- G. The note “All new utilities to be underground shall also be shown on the Utility Plan and the Plat.

4. **Tree Protection Plan:** an updated version was not included for this latest review.

- A. Each of several trees to be saved has its own tree protection circle, while other trees to be saved don’t have one at all. And some shown to be removed have protection circles. This plan needs to be reworked relative to the tree protection circles and tree protection boundaries.
- B. Several of the protection circles overlap the sidewalk, HDPE pipe extension, and/or detention basin area involving more than 20% of their critical root zones. The areas where the sidewalk is to be constructed imply the sidewalk will not be excavated (notes 6B and 6C on the drawing), but rather elevated. This does not seem appropriate for a walking trail. Applicant shall clarify/re-evaluate whether the critical root zone will be cut at least 6” deep for the walkway construction, or if the walkway shall be elevated 4” with no surface cut.
- C. Applicant shall clarify the tree protection for tree #10. This tree appears to be inside the construction area.
- D. A good portion of the walkway is entirely within the tree protection area at the north and south ends. The extent of construction within the tree protection boundary is a contradiction of the intent of tree

protection. Note 6 on the drawing are inadequate to protect the trees relative to the large area within the boundary being disturbed. (See 4B above). Applicant shall correct this matter.

- E. Applicant shall clarify what a “Temporary Tree Protection Construction Easement” is (near the detention basin). If it is simply ‘tree protection’, then it should be labeled as such.

5. **Erosion Control:**

- A. Provide a stabilized area for contractor parking on site. There shall be no parking along the roadside except for construction equipment while the shoulder and roadside swale are being improved.
- B. The construction entrance plan shows a 12’ width for this entrance plus a flare near the street, which is adequate.
- C. Applicant may want to re-evaluate that amount of silt fence shown. In particular, the area west of the Baylor Rd entrance shows a fence on the uphill side of the work. The disturbed areas are lower than that fence.

6. **Grading and Drainage:**

- A. Need to receive and review the detail sheets and notes to ensure they are coordinated with the Grading and Drainage Plan.
- B. All new construction notes should be bold, and existing notes should be not bold.
- C. Road improvements: While full improvements have been waived, shoulder improvements are required for traffic safety purposes.
 - 1) Baylor Road will require a 4’ wide shoulder: 2 feet wide section of compacted gravel and the remainder shall be 2 foot wide of compacted dirt and sod. The general cross-section detail on sheet 2 of 2 simply needs more labelling (compacted gravel and compacted dirt and sod).
 - 2) Brunswick Road will require an 8’ wide shoulder: 2 feet of compacted gravel and the remainder shall be 6 feet wide of compacted dirt and sod. The cross-sectional details on sheet 2 of 2 simply need more labelling (compacted gravel and compacted dirt and sod). They also need the stations identified on the same page (if using with 2 plans), or clearly referenced with the details (this is part of the confusion between the two G&D plans). There are notes on the plan that need to be corrected to match the required width (2’) of the compacted gravel.
 - 3) The roadside swale along both frontages is shown on sheet 2 of 2, but the contour lines and labels are so tight they are difficult to read/follow. Recommend an enlarged plan view of the swale area only, so the contractor and inspector will be able to clearly see what is required.
- D. The cross-sections should show the limit of tree clearing, and that limit line should be carried to the Tree Protection Plan and G&D plan.

- E. The previous submission showed an existing 24” pipe in addition to the proposed 15” pipe from the detention basin discharging onto Brunswick Rd. The existing one has now disappeared. Is it to be removed or left in place and filled? Either option should be noted on the drawings.
- F. Applicant’s engineer shall re-evaluate the elevation of the drive from Baylor Rd as it passes on the west side of the new building addition. The ground shall be 10” below the FFE, and there is a planter between the sidewalk and bldg., so the sidewalk shall be lower than the planter, and drainage is shown to be flowing between the sidewalk and the drive. Further surface drainage shall be at least on a 1% grade. Neither the runoff to the south nor to the east around the front of the existing bldg. has a slope that comes close to 1%. Anything less will lead to drainage problems.
- G. The ‘Lot Grading’ note at the bottom of sheet 1 of 2 shall be renumbered as ‘11’ and included with the first 10 notes above.
- H. Sheet 1 of 2 – There are 5 curves in the driveway, yet only one has geometry provided. Show the geometry for the road for use during construction.
- I. There is an incomplete detention basin note on sheet 2 of 2 that ends with “...towards”. It may ‘belong’ to an offset note near it.
- J. The contour labelling at the south end is deceiving, as those numbers all go with the existing contours – not the new ones, and it is difficult to follow the new contour labels.

7. Utility Plan:

- A. Any new/expanded utilities shall be underground. Note this on the plat and on this sheet.
- B. Add the noted needed to clarify the Utility plan.
- C. Water:
 - 1) Show a new tap and irrigation water meter.
 - 2) Water services will be based on this being a commercial facility instead on individual services to each room/apartment. Applicant’s engineer must show that the existing water service is large enough for an 18-unit facility, or design a new water service. A commercial tap fee will be required with any upgrade.
 - 3) Both the domestic and irrigation water meters shall be sized by the engineer and noted on the drawing.
 - 4) A tentative water plan has been prepared for the required fire protection based on the digital site plan information that has been provided by applicant. This will have to be revised based on the new site plan to reflect the changes.
- D. Sewer:
 - 1) Applicant’s engineer must show that the existing sewer service is large enough for an 18-unit facility, or design a new tap.

The existing tap is a residential tap. If upgraded, a new commercial tap fee will be required based on front footage or acreage.

8. **Brunswick and Baylor Road:** an updated version was not included for this latest review.
 - A. A Plan and Profile page has been provided, but the profile is extremely light in print. This drawing should show the proposed shoulder, paved, gravel, and compacted dirt and the flow line of the roadside swale as well as the slope limit of the back slope of the roadside swale.
 - B. Eliminate references to Shelby County Got ROW.
 - C. There is no need for the adjacent property owner names on this sheet.
 - D. All the notes pertain to construction. The only construction on these roads is the shoulder work, which does not show up on the plan view, but does have a typical detail.

9. **Landscape Plan:**

- A. The landscape plan has been revised. The plan will have to be reviewed in detail to ensure all information is shown correctly.
- B. Show all existing trees to remain and all new landscaping along with outlines of all new/existing construction.
- C. Per outline plan condition III-A, all landscaping shall be irrigated. This should most likely require a second water tap/service, as placing both meters on the same tap will negatively impact the water pressure on the domestic side. Irrigation design shall be noted on the landscape plan presumably to be done by others. This note is to ensure the requirement is met during construction. Both the tap and the meter size shall be included on the Utility Plan.

Fire Marshal:

- A. Fire sprinkler protection is required.
- B. Fire hydrant spacing will be reviewed upon receipt of a detailed site plan incorporating all approved conditions. The maximum distance to a fire hydrant as the vehicle travels is 400' measured to all points of the building.
- C. Applicant shall provide an **updated digital set of drawings** to therndon@cityofbartlett.org to allow for the design of the water plan to be revised to meet the current site plan design for the water main extension that will be required to provide adequate fire protection. Current flows are estimated at 1,600 gpm which will require the building to be sprinkled with the approval of the sprinkler plan by the State Fire Marshall and the City of Bartlett Fire Marshal.

Mr. Delinor Smith with Smith Building Design and Associates, 3831 Lakehurst Drive, Memphis, Architect, was present to represent this application for Caring Estates.

Questioned about the Landscaping Plan showing 23D whether it should be 23A in an area of the plan. It was explained that that classification is correct as this is in a residential setting zoning district rather than a commercial. Question about the fire wall

Talked about the stone shown on the elevation being too light. Mr. Smith stated they have discussed changing it to Arkansas stone which is a darker stone.

Chairman asked Mr. Smith if he was aware of the other conditions of staff. He stated yes.

Question about the Photometric Plan – Talked about the possible need for more lighting in the area by the parking. Felt it was very dark next to Brunswick Road. Mr. Emerick talked about it being a Nursing Home. Downplaying lighting since it is in a residential area. Don't feel it is out of context. Ms. Taylor talked about commercial guidelines with the 2 foot candles for parking lots. Might have a couple of acorn fixtures.

Question about the Shingles. Wanted to know if the shingles are architectural shingles. Mr. Smith related yes they are.

Chairman mentioned the possibility of bollard type lights at each end of the parking. Mr. Emerick related the concern of the neighborhood about this change in the facility changing the neighborhood.

Motion was made by Mr. Mike Terry to approve the Site Plan for Caring Estates, LLC, 4965 Brunswick Road with conditions of staff. That the 23A landscape screen is along Brunswick and Baylor Roads; the elevations front wall is faced with brick veneer; brick base columns at new canopy; fence west property line per 23D correct fence per landscape plate. Kim Taylor talked about the fence columns are in the ordinance but DRC is allowed to meander/waiver. The landscape plate includes brick columns and it is felt these should remain; the Arkansas stone should be included on the façade darker than submitted and that the shingles are architectural shingles. Mr. Keith Whaley seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote: All members voted yes. Motion was carried.

Mr. Terry stated he has not seen a waiver of this type fencing between residential and business except when there are no residential homes built at that time next to them. Leaves this for later when homes are built the owners can come back and require the fence between when they are developed next door.

Asked Mr. Smith whether he was planning to use the Arkansas stone or brick on the columns that the brick would probably be much less expensive. Mr. Smith stated they plan to use brick.

Meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Kit Markham, Administrative Secretary