

Meeting Minutes of the Board of Zoning Appeals
Friday, April 17, 2020
Zoom Meeting Minutes

The Board of Zoning Appeals met by Virtual Zoom Meeting on Friday, April 17, 2020 at 5:30 P.M. with the following members in attendance: Don Bramblett, Leana Melnichuk, Jim Badger, Anne Poliakoff, Reed Teague, and Ryan Gaylord. Livia Cantrell was absent. Representing the Planning Department were Natalia Rosario, Planner III; and Julie Roland, Administrative Assistant. Martin Livingston, Neighborhood Services Director also attended this meeting.

Roll Call

Mr. Bramblett, the Chair, called the meeting to order and stated that public notice of this meeting was given twenty-four (24) hours in advance, limited to a request for pre-litigation/mediation or an appeal to the Circuit Court, to be filed within thirty (30) days after the decision of this Board in accordance with Section 603.6 of the City of Spartanburg Zoning Ordinance.

Roll call was taken – Six Board Members were present, with Mr. Gaylord recused from the meeting because he was acting as Agent and representing the applicant in tonight's case. The five remaining Board Members present constituted a quorum; and he had each Board Member introduce themselves.

Approval of Agenda for the April 17, 2020 Meeting

Mr. Badger moved approval of the Agenda for the April 17, 2020 meeting, and he was seconded by Mrs. Melnichuk. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 5 to 0.

There were no meeting minutes ready for approval. However, the meeting minutes from the February 20, 2020 Planning Commission Meeting had been provided to the Board Members from a Conditional Use request the applicant was granted on the property for their information.

Old Business – None.

New Business:

SE 20-02-01 Special Exception Request from Ryan Gaylord, Agent, on behalf of Chip Lawrence, Owner. The Applicant is seeking a Special Exception to allow the expansion of the Hillcrest Self-Storage Facility, located at 1455 Fernwood Glendale Road, Specifically the rear portion of the Parcel #7-13-07-014.01; that is currently zoned B-1, Neighborhood Shopping District.

Ms. Rosario, Planner III was sworn; and she submitted the meeting packets the Board Members had previously received, tonight's presentation, and slides into Evidence as Exhibit A. She shared some slides of the property and surrounding area; and she pointed out the property and informed the Board Members the property in question was mostly wooded, some hardwoods, but a good deal of pine, and she said they could see the built out self-storage business that fronts on Fernwood-Glendale Road;. And she said this was voted upon for a special exception in 2015, by this same body for the front portion; and that the construction was done during 2016. So you all did give this property and this use a special exception. They went through construction and they've been operating since 2016, I guess, just for the sake of the record, they took a vacant and blighted parcel that was bringing in no taxes, and now they're essentially bringing in \$60000 in tax to the city every year, bringing this parcel online. Ms. Rosario said this request is to expand the special exception and the business to the parcel that is immediately adjacent to the rear of their fronting parcel; and the Applicant Mr. Lawrence did own that property. We went through the Planning Commission process to rezone this portion of the property to B-1, and the Planning Commission at their February 20th meeting had voted to recommend the request favorably to City Council; after which time the City Council approved the request. The back portion of the parcel is now zoned as B-1, but does require a special exception for a self-storage use. Ms. Rosario explained there were a good many of the neighbors that had attended the Planning Commission Meeting, as well as the City Council Meeting regarding this project wanting to be heard. She thought the main issue was a gentleman that lived on Auburn Court, who had some runoff issues, but the storm water pond as proposed, I believe will help mitigate a lot of those issues as well as a discussion on lighting, how the lighting is cast, where it's cast. The Owner, Mr. Chip Lawrence, had agreed to use lighting features that don't cast outward. He has also

provided a foot candle plan, which she shared on the screen, and she explained they could see that on the interior of the site where the lights were casting, it's around maybe 0.8 up to four foot candles. So that's pretty decent amount of brightness you can see, but to the rear of this particular building, which goes out to be the RL Jordan site, they're not casting anything out there. And if we scroll down, you can see they stop casting light pretty much where their existing storm pond is. And the proposed buildings right now, aren't showing any lighting obviously, but part of the site planning process will be for them to provide a foot candle plan for the additions. That said, the existing foot candle lighting, the lighting that's cast out to other properties is essentially zero. So while the neighbors may be able to see the light over there, they're not actually, having it cast on their property. So, that was another item to cover. Ms. Rosario said Mr. Lawrence had always been very amenable to working with his neighbors. We did have a couple people actually come speak in favor and comment on what a good neighbor he's been.

Ms. Rosario informed the Board Members she would go over the Analysis of Mandatory Written Findings for the Board to consider when reviewing a Special Exception Request they had previously received in their meeting packets; and that Staff had based its recommendation on the analysis of the following criteria that the proposed use and any associated development had to meet.

- 1) Traffic Impact – As far as traffic impact, traffic impact for this particular use is actually really minimal. There's not usually more than 14 trips at the peak PM hour. So it's usually anywhere from 10 to 12 people, if that, in an hour.
- 2) Vehicle and pedestrian safety – The proposed development wouldn't add any safety issues for vehicles because they only have the one controlled access at Fernwood-Glendale Road; and the parcel that we're discussing right now actually had no access to any right of way, and it was landlocked, and had been that way for a long time, which is why it's remained vacant. There's never been any good or feasible use for that parcel until now. She said she knew Mr. Bramblett had sent out commentary that they had received via email today; and he had mentioned a discussion that we'd had earlier regarding the length of the buildings and fire safety, and fire maneuverability. As part of our site plan review, we do require a firetruck access plan, as well as fire separation inside the buildings between the units or sprinkling, which was one thing required, and the Building Department, herself, Storm Water, Spartanburg Water all review the site and make sure that it meets our current standards for site planning, storm water, that sort of thing.
- 3) Potential impact of noise, lights, fumes, or obstruction of air flow on adjoining property – As far as potential noise, lights, fumes, or obstruction of airflow on the adjoining property; the development is expected to have a minimal impact on noise, lighting and air flow. It was previously the site of an Ingles grocery store a long time ago. So this use will certainly have a lesser amount of visitors than the Ingles had, but it will add maybe another five or six people per hour, if you average it out for the traffic impact. As far as what they're doing for the buffers on this rear portion, because it does back up to all single family homes, they're leaving a 50 to 60 foot buffer all around this parcel, which I think they're only required 25. But they're leaving that 50 to 60 feet, leaving those trees untouched and putting the fence on the interior of that so that the folks who are adjacent essentially just see the woods that they've always seen and a fence. She said hopefully, during the summer months, they won't be able to see through that woods portion; and on the Southern boundary with the parcel on Auburn Court, the owner had actually agreed to overbuild. So he's adding another storm pond to control for this impervious, additional impervious surface, as well as he's going to attempt to hold as much as they can from the RL Jordan site, which was developed without the benefit of storm water facilities back in the day. So there's basically a whole bunch of street flow heading in the southerly direction that this storm pond will catch. It's about 50 feet wide and a couple hundred feet long. So it's very large and it will be beyond the buffer. So that really leaves 100 feet between the parcels on Auburn until there's actually a building on this site, if, and when hopefully it gets developed. Ms. Rosario said as she mentioned before, the owner is trying to be a good neighbor and he's going to implement light fixtures with caps to control light leak and pollution.
- 4) Adverse impact of proposed use on the surrounding area including the aesthetic character of the area

As far as the adverse impact of proposed use on the surrounding area, including the aesthetic character of the area, the proposed use would not have an adverse impact on the surrounding area and

Board of Zoning Appeal Minutes – Friday, April 17, 2020 Zoom MT Mins.

the aesthetic character. Again, throughout the planning commission process, the owner was very receptive to neighborhood issues, and we did receive a couple letters, one from RL Jordan, and one from, I believe a nearby doctor who said that the area has vastly improved since he's moved in and built his facility because there's much less vagrancy in the area.

- 5) Orientation and spacing of improvements or structures – The structure will be constructed on the existing theatre footprint and is proposed to utilize much of the additional (and unnecessary large) parking area on-site. As far as orientation and spacing of improvements of structures. I'll pull up the site plan here shortly. Or if Ryan, you want to share your screen, either way, so that you can see how those buildings are laid out. It is a preliminary plan that may change when we start the full review. I'm thinking primarily because of the firetruck routing. I know Mr. Buddy Bush, our Building Official is always concerned about having a space to navigate even the largest ladder truck to the interior of any site.
- 6) Compliance with the comprehensive plan – The 2004 Comprehensive Plan recommends the area to become a “General Activity Center. So along from a Glendale intended to be a general commercial area, serving the neighborhood or regional market to contain a wide variety of commercial repair service and office uses, public civic and recreational uses are also compatible with this general activity center. And of course that includes LOD, Limited Commercial, B-1 and B-3. Again, this is zoned B-1. So after having gone through this process and reviewing what they've submitted, it is staff's opinion that the proposed special exception will not adversely affect the adjacent and surrounding property owners.

Staff's Recommendation

Consequently, Staff recommends approval of, and this is the old case number from 15, I apologize, of the special exception for this property that's being heard tonight. And with that, I'm going to pull up the layout just so that y'all can have it in front of you. And if you have any questions, please ask away.

Board Questions for Staff:

Mrs. Poliakoff asked with the storm water, how they would make sure that is going to be done properly; and if it was not, what would happen at that point. And then the second thing is, with the fire regulations, would that change the buffer zone possibly, the width a bit.

Ms. Rosario said those were good questions; and the storm water aspect is managed by Jay Squire's, our Storm Water and Street's official. So we do have someone on staff who's essentially his main concern is making sure that the water flows to the right places. He has been out to the site and spoken with the engineer and the owner regarding the proposed pond. He couldn't give me too much commentary because he hasn't seen the engineering specifics of it. But being that it's actually retaining more than what his standards require, I believe we'll be in good shape there. She said as far as keeping up the storm ponds or retention areas, that's probably the most important part of a storm retention area is making sure that it doesn't get bogged up and end up not working properly. So as part of site plans like these, we ask the owner to submit to us a storm water management plan. And if they don't keep up with their ponds, then we can come in and cite them. And in the worst case scenario, we would summons them to court. She said the fire regulations, those do not impact the buffers because we're more than five feet away from any property line that's basically the fire concern on property lines, and primarily the concern is about fire rating inside the structures. She said if a fire began in one unit, it doesn't spread to the rest of the units and destroy everything as well as how a fire vehicle navigates the site. So they want to make sure 1) that the buildings are not going to combust and burn down immediately; and 2) the firemen can get in there. And 3) there was access to hydrants, which is part of the review. I'm not sure that, that's been taken into consideration, but at this point I should say. I remember the last time we did it, they did add a hydrant up, I believe along the boundary with the RL Jordan site. So they may need to add another one depending on the distances from a hydrant, but that is covered throughout the site plan review process.

Mrs. Poliakoff said her main thought about the fire was the thoroughfare. Would that impact the buffer zone for the neighbors.

Ms. Rosario said the way that they're showing it in the design and that we've been discussing it, all of that circulation is on the interior and those buffer zones really are able to be left alone.

Mr. Bramblett said he was concerned about the water too. And it isn't just capturing as much as they can in the new retention pond, but where does that discharge go. What happens when it leaves there. We're not too far from the Lawson's Fork Creek and ideally the thing to do would be to pipe that water all the way to the creek. There's several nice condo buildings on down Clemson Street turns into Far Stokes Way. He would hate to think that they may have more volume of retention by building another pond, but what happens to the water when it leaves there. Mr. Bramblett said he didn't become aware of some of this till this afternoon when he read the minutes from the last Planning Commission meeting. And he believed it was Mr. Kinard that lived on Auburn Court apparently ever since this facility was built, he's had a lot of water come across his property. He knew how disturbing that could be, plus the erosion and other problems. So hopefully the retention pond will slow that down, but if they had a big rain, which we often do, especially with the changes we've had in our weather with an outflow pipe being installed, is the plans to have an outflow pipe installed out of that retention pond and take the water somewhere else if that pond fills up.

Ms. Rosario said she did not have all of the details of the pond because they haven't engaged full civil engineering, until they actually get approval to move forward, I don't have the specifics on where it would go, but Mr. Trey Blackwood, the engineer did send us this email just a little while ago, actually at the end of the day. So if you don't mind, I can go ahead and read it out. And then we can kind of discuss from there. Trey states, "As a follow-up to our discussion regarding the proposed expansion at Hillcrest Self-Storage, while the proposed design has not proceeded beyond conceptual layouts, several items related to storm water have been discussed with City staff, City of Spartanburg and SCDHEC had the same requirements when a detention pond is used to address storm water discharges. Ms. Rosario said the normal design process includes a hydrology study to model the existing conditions prior to any demolition or construction. And the developed conditions after construction is completed to include paving and landscaping. A comparison is made between the discharge rates for each condition. The detention pond is designed to ensure that the discharge rate of storm water after construction is equal to, or less than the existing condition discharge rate for each storm event study. A normal storm water permit requires this comparison for the two year and ten year storm events. This pond is revised to ensure this requirement is met. A detention pond does not reduce the amount of storm water that leaves the project site, but it slows the discharge rates at which it does leave. She said for this specific project Mr. Lawrence and Mr. Gaylord had provided direction for the design to exceed the minimum requirements of the two and ten year events. The additional design parameter will provide additional storage capacity in the pond itself and allowing more water to be temporarily captured and slowed as it travels downstream." And he also states, "We can also examine adding construction features such as a plunge pool just beyond the pond outlet pipe, which helps reduce water velocity coming out of the pipe, reducing potential issues downstream." And so that increased storm event design is actually to 25 years, which is what SCHEC requires you contain on your site, which not that this has anything to do with SCDHEC sorry, but it is a larger amount than most requirements, water retention that they're planning for. Ms. Rosario said So as far as specifically where it discharged, she did not have an answer for that, but we definitely can see that they're trying to get something in place that will slow the water down so that the gentlemen on Auburn sees much less flooding. His issue is really flooding and erosion. And it's again, partially due to where his property is. The RL Jordan site has no storm water. So everything is flowing down to him. Jay Squires has gone out, spoken with him, and we have replaced a couple of catch basins in the system that needed replacing in the hopes that it make everything run more smoothly. That said, I think as far as where the outlet will come is more of a question for the storm water design, but Mr. Gaylord or Mr. Lawrence may be able to shed a bit more light on that.

Mr. Bramblett thanked Ms. Rosario and said he wanted to make it clear that he certainly wouldn't expect the owner of the property to flip the bill for some major water changes, once the water leaves his property, but at the same time he thought it should be on our minds as this develops that, the water was not just going to evaporate. I mean we're going to have to do something with it. And he was glad there's more attention brought to that about the water. He said when RL Jordan opened there wasn't even a requirement.

Ms. Rosario said at that point in time, it's just running off into the woods.

Mr. Bramblett said addressing that, he did not know if there's still grants available through the Clean Water Act from the Federal Government, or if there's some state money around that eventually the SCDHEC could chip in and to make sure that this water issue is taken care of because that's being a good neighbor. He asked Ms. Rosario regarding the lighting on Aspenwood, did she get any letters from residents on Aspenwood.

Ms. Rosario said she did not. She said they had a few folks from Aspenwood attend the City Council meeting and their main concerns were the lighting, of course, which she believed they had semi-addressed in the discussion of where and how those light packs and what they'll be constructed out of and how the light casts, as well as he's leaving the fence on the other side or closest to his property line or inside his property to allow those folks on Aspen Wood and Auburn, essentially to benefit from an expanded backyard so that they're not looking at a fence and then trees that they can't-

Mr. Bramblett said there's a long building on the property line that runs parallel to Aspenwood, he thought; and it did not appear to have any wall packs proposed for that wall.

Ms. Rosario pointed to where the property line was and showed the area that would remain undisturbed as the buffer and then the fence, but as of right now there was no plan to mount lighting facing any single family homes.

Mr. Bramblett said when you drive up and down Aspenwood between the houses, you can see back to that property, so that's good. He would like to just throw in the fact that he had designed parking lot lighting himself, and sometimes it's better to have pole lights on the edge of your property shining back toward the buildings rather than have wall packs shining outward. And so if you have a situation where a wall pack might pollute the back of someone's house, they could think about maybe using something else; and he said there were all kinds of new lighting out. There's all LED and they could consider using a 16 foot pole light or something that shine back on the building. He said you keep your photometric for your parking lot above what the minimum required without shining a light on somebody, and then as Ms. Rosario had mentioned the cutoff lighting, which that had improved a lot.

Ms. Rosario said she did not know if they've considered the pole lighting. Potentially that's a discussion, but I do know that their desire's to do everything they can to keep the light from bothering their neighbors.

Mr. Bramblett said some of the spaces appeared to be pretty large, which he knew Ms. Rosario said she was going to look into those; and he said if you've got a lot of spaces, it seems like, people want to bring pretty big trucks in there, and they can load up. If you've got 2000 square foot space, you don't want to bring pickup loads every time. You would want to bring a pretty big truck load in there. That was one of his concerns. He knew Ms. Rosario had said they're going to look at the trucks, the ability for trucks to maneuver within the parking lot and the firetrucks. So, that pretty much answers that. The other thing was, if you've got 120 foot long building, you could damage a lot of stuff with a fire. Whereas if you had a 260 foot building with a gap between them, then if one caught on fire, it wouldn't necessarily damage as much stuff. So that was something he had a concern about, but he believed she had answered that. **Mr. Bramblett** said in **Mr. Lawrence's** favor, he had rode by that space several times over the last four years; and he was real proud of him for what he's done there; and it was a nice facility. And he thought he's trying to be a good neighbor. He felt like he'll do all he can to work these issues out; and he just wanted to bring out his concerns and make sure they're noted.

Ms. Rosario thanked **Mr. Bramblett** for his concerns and comments. And said if there were no more questions, **Mr. Gaylord** and **Mr. Lawrence** were present to address the Board Members.

Mr. Ryan Gaylord, Agent on behalf of **Mr. Lawrence**, Owner was sworn and informed the Board Members as Ms. Rosario had pointed out; four and a half, five years ago, they came to this committee with the front portion of this property. At that point that portion was basically empty concrete pad, where

the angles had been, the empty concrete pad and I think there were some mattresses and just some other refuse such as trash and largely there some pictures from back in that time period, that Natalia had included in this package that he thought a lot of them that were still on the Board would remember. Mr. Gaylord pointed to the property and said the back part of this parcel had been developed is part or mainly as a commercial concept that was put together in the late seventies for what it was going to be the grocery store and, and a commercial area and for whatever reason, they left the layout of it. It's probably because they wanted the development itself to front more onto Fernwood- Glendale, which was just his speculation; but they left this back parcel that nothing was ever done with it. Ultimately because even though it was part of that commercial development, zoned R 15, it was left landlocked and has never been put to any productive use. He said as RL Jordan had noted, and this may have been in the Planning Commission records, RL Jordan noted that for 30 years they had issues of theft and vandalism that they believe comes from this area because it's unsupervised and otherwise there's no control over it and then also the eye-physician whose office is across the street from the storage facility had noticed vagrancy and homelessness coming in and out of the area. He said he agreed with Mr. Bramblett entirely that Mr. Lawrence had done a superb job in building a very highly efficient, productive facility. The neighbors he had met and interacted with through this process have all appreciated and enjoyed him, especially the neighbors who are on Clemson Street, who were more in the area of the current facility and the neighbors who are on Auburn Court and Aspenwood had interacted with them a great deal. He said they met with her and other neighbors, after the Planning Commission meeting, then attempted to hold a separate community meeting, which at least one person had gotten notice of and was able to attend to go over this project and then had since spoken with neighbors after the City Council meetings. He said it was Mr. Gill who was the gentleman Mr. Bramblett had referenced earlier that lived on Auburn Court. Mr. Gaylord said he was the one that had the complaints of the water and they spoke a good bit with him and he guess he had let the City Council know that primarily he was in favor of the project, that he just wanted to make sure that the water was addressed. Mr. Gaylord said they certainly agreed that it needed to be and have a plan in place where we think it will be.

Mr. Gaylord felt Mr. Gill's water issue was frankly a lot more of a longstanding issue than he said at the Planning Commission meeting. Largely, he felt a lot of this water, as we've seen, as we've been out there with Mr. Squires from the city, a lot of it actually comes off the RL Jordan property and note that in all the four years or so, since this the applicant's property had been built, there had never been any complaint about the water really wasn't until we came to the Planning Commission that we heard anything about it and we've since spoken to some contractors who'd been out there at that looking at the water issue there on that Auburn Court, well before Mr. Lawrence had ever built.; and with that said, Mr. Lawrence wants to go above and beyond of what's required to make sure that that is not an issue. Mr. Gaylord said there were some practical issues that make certain remedies infeasible. He said he had mentioned piping in order, what you would want to do there is you'd want to pipe it into the closest catch base and which is about 300 feet away which would also require you to go through Auburn Court. So you have to dig up the road, then replace it and repave it in between the distance. The car and the actions would be part and parcel of the distance, it's just simply not a feasible action to take, but what we've looked at and spoken to Mr. Blackwood about is taking this storm water management plan and exceeding the requirements, so as Mr. Blackwood noted in his letter, the current requirements for the city or for a two and ten, you have to plan for a two and ten year event. He explained the present pond on the current Hillcrest Self-Storage facility was developed to the 25 and 50 year stormwater event. So it's well in excess of what was presently planned and required and that's also what would be, what we're looking to do here is, is plan to that same level and I've told Ms. Rosario that to the extent that we want to make that a condition of the development that's fine, certainly in favor of that. Most certainly something we're going to do, is plan that to the 25-50 year level as which is the same as what's been done on the front section.

Mr. Gaylord said he would also point out that as Ms. Rosario explained it's not just a matter of the construction of the pond that was important, it's the fact that it's maintained because if you get a bunch of silt buildup, the depth of it is impacted and it doesn't retain as much water and doesn't do what it's supposed to do. As we've been looking at this water issue with Mr. Squires from the city out there with the neighbor, he went over and looked at the current pond and confirmed that it's been properly maintained, that it doesn't have any silt issues, so certainly we all continue to do the same things and

making sure that this back pond does that. He said part of the implementation of this is that (1) the pond would be overbuilt as you see on the proposed layout, what that ultimately means is that, in addition to this expanded buffer we have the current buffer requirement between, or what the current code requirement would be a 25 foot buffer between these properties on Aspenwood and Auburn in this development. Mr. Gaylord said they had increased that to a 60 foot buffer requirement. If the committee decided they wanted to make that a condition of the approval, they would certainly be in favor of that, and then on Auburn Court a 50 foot setback, which is double the requirement. Mr. Gaylord said just practically speaking, because there's going to be this over-engineered pond there on the side inside of the setback area, you end up getting about another 50 or so feet maybe more and so you've got at very least a 100 feet between the property line inside of building. You would note from the layout of the building and the layout of the preliminary plans, that largely we have tried to develop this in a, what you might call a fortress style layout and the idea of that is that all the activity takes place on the inner side of the building, so that you've got, that's the area where it would be lighted, where there would be lighting directed. Mr. Gaylord explained it probably would not apply as much as a pole, because ultimately you want to try to keep that lighting source lower and then direct it, whereas if you put it on a pole, there's a risk that it is just higher and it reaches more area. That said, the back parcel is going to be developed in the same, with the same ideas and concept of the front parcel so that you would still have the same 0.0 light reading encroaching onto the areas outside of the development itself, so it'd be the same and the same kind of application. He said there was a lot that's been done to try to go above and beyond what the code may require and that's going to continue as this project would continue. Presently where the water flows through this parcel, rather it comes up from the RL Jordan, then there's outfall portion that comes off the upper development, so all of that would accumulate into the pond and then would flow out, back out towards the Auburn Court properties. Regarding the Auburn Court properties, if you look at the preliminary site plan, there is the two parcels they're labeled "7-13-07-015.00" and then, "014.00", presently the water flows basically down between those two parcels, there's a natural ravine Mr. Gaylord explained about the ravine on the property and he pointed it out on the screen, and said it flows down into that, flows underneath the driveway, one of the driveways, this is the driveway for the 015.00 parcel has an elevated driveway, has a drainage pipe that goes through it, water flows through there, and then there, and then it collects in sort of a pond-ish area in front of those homes. He believed that's the way it's been for a long time based off looking at the way those driveways have been built up and developed. He said beneath it the water he'd suspect might flow that same way, of course it's going to be slow to good to try to dissipate its energy and how far it's going to go and ultimately reduce the burden and impact on the neighboring parcels. Mr. Gaylord said Mr. Bramblett had asked, how you ensure that the water is done properly; again, if you wanted to say, well, as a condition, this, that it be developed to the 25-50 year plan, which is 25-50 year event, which is our plan I don't see any issues with that. Mr. Gaylord also pointed out for Mr. Bramblett that he thought there was a misinterpreting part of the site layout, so when you note the size of the dimensions to me, the dimensions of the buildings as listed out, so building F is listed as 25 x 130 feet, building E is 40 x 70 building D is 40 x 150, that's the building itself, that's not the individual storage unit. So that's not a single storage unit, that's the building that would then have your standard size storage units within it. So this isn't going to be a development that takes some larger industrial size storage or, or is used by something.

Mr. Bramblett said for clarification, he was looking at the existing buildings and they may be subdivided too, but there's one, and that's the, next to the retention pond is 45 x 50 and it has a firewall, has two firewalls in it and I assumed that those spaces were that big, but they may be subdivided as well.

Mr. Gaylord said they were subdivided, so the firewall that you note and, when they talked previously about this; he had now come to realize and understand is that for every 2,500 square feet of space, you have to have a firewall and so those buildings on the existing development, as you're looking at that building that's closest to the pond there, that 45 x 50 is not intended and does not represent the size of the unit, but rather the space, the space before there is a firewall. So they might have, might be multiple units.

Mr. Bramblett asked so the units are within the spaces are actually smaller?

Mr. Gaylord said that was correct; and the units in this development presently in the units that would be developed as part of the proposed development are all going to be different size units, but they're all your smaller supporting residential, your individuals coming in and out, not, not tractor trailers.

Mr. Bramblett said what he was using for the larger buildings in the proposed area was just the length of them. Like the first B is a 30 x 185 feet, that seems like 185 feet out of the long distance there and maybe for safety and for fire prevention, splitting a building that long up seems to me to be a worthwhile thing to do so that like he had a 10, 20 foot gap between say if you had a hundred feet and then a gap, and then the 85 foot building would be a safer construction than a full 185 foot length that's why I brought those buildings up in the back.

Mr. Gaylord said he thought ultimately the way that the code contemplates taking care of that was that you use these firewalls is the fire prevention and then as we look at it, the length of the building actually ends up helping blocking some of the light out, because if you have some of those space, it's more area where even if it's not white, shining through the other property, but just the visible and any visibility of light from the others, that's part of why that's been looked at in that manner. If there's something else that needs to be done the idea is to try to minimize these more present issues to make sure that the aesthetic that's been there is allowed to remain as much as possible and part of that is you see all the trees that are noted within the setback area, all those would be left to keep that forested look. Mr. Gaylord said In addition, those are just the large trees. He thought there were about 68 trees that would be left. In addition to those, you're going to have the smaller saplings that are there which would also serve to block light and preserve the present forest aesthetic. Mr. Gaylord said also, one of the things that Mr. Lawrence has looked at was siding. The current color of the siding of the front part is sort of an off white and, I guess technically, one of the options would be to get more of a browner color, more of a mocha or something and so what we look, what he's considered is putting the sign that would be on the sides of any of these buildings that face Aspenwood or Auburn and on that side, putting it, using this, this color siding that's going to blend in more with the forest aesthetic

Mr. Bramblett asked about another area and said he was surprised nobody ever took that wooded area and made a park out of it or something.

Mr. Gaylord said it was just as one point on this preliminary layout, I think something that may change is if you're to look at buildings D and E there's thought of ultimately flipping those so that D runs along the back of the pond to try to, again, increase that, that fortress style and to again, have where less lights going to be less activity, less lights going to be on any part of the buildings that faces the neighbors.

Mr. Bramblett said that was good; and he asked did any other Members have any questions for Mr. Gaylord before they moved to the public hearing portion.

Ms. Rosario said as she mentioned earlier, the Planning Commission and City Council had a good bit of interaction with the concerned neighbors so she was not sure if all their concerns had been answered or if perhaps three meetings was one too many for them, unsure, but I have not received anything this go round written or otherwise.

Mr. Bramblett: opened the public hearing; and he said if there was anyone present who would like to speak against the project, they could speak by raising their hand button on the computer or speak to the Board Members by telephone. There was no one to speak in opposition of the request. Mr. Bramblett asked if there was anyone who wished to speak in favor of the request. There was no one to speak in favor of the request. Mr. Bramblett closed the public hearing portion and said they would move on to Board Deliberation.

Board Deliberation:

Mrs. Poliakoff moved to accept the proposal as recommended and presented by Staff; and she was seconded by Mrs. Melnichuk.

Mr. Bramblett was there any discussion of motion. There was no discussion.

The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 5 to 0.

Mr. Bramblett thanked Mr. Gaylord, and Mr. Lawrence; and he wished Mr. Lawrence a lot of luck with his project.

Staff Announcements:

Ms. Rosario said Mrs. Roland had emailed everyone some online training that MASC had announced; and it was not very expensive; and of course the City would pay for it for everyone that needed their required 3 hours of Continued Education training.

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 6:30 P.M.



Don Bramblett, Chair

Edited by Julie Roland, Administrative Assistant