

**FLORENCE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT  
FLORENCE GOVERNMENT CENTER  
BUSINESS MEETING  
JANUARY 9, 2019  
7:00 P.M.**

---

Mr. Pieper called the meeting to order at 7:05 P.M.

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT**

Ms. Dee Begley  
Ms. Lois Evans, Vice-Chairwoman  
Mr. Timothy Pieper, Chairman  
Mrs. Linda Schaffer

**BOARD MEMBERS NOT PRESENT**

Mr. Charlie Reynolds

**LEGAL COUNSEL PRESENT**

Mr. Dale Wilson

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

Mr. Pieper stated the Board members received copies of the minutes of the Florence Board of Adjustment meeting of November 14, 2018. He asked if there were any comments or corrections? Ms. Evans made a motion to approve the minutes as written and Mrs. Schaffer seconded the motion. Mr. Pieper called for a vote and it carried unanimously.

**AGENDA ITEMS**

1. Request of VME Properties, LLC for a Conditional Use Permit. The Conditional Use Permit is to allow a townhouse development, at a maximum intensity of 8 dwelling units per acre, with an accessory swimming pool, clubhouse and parking. The approximate 7.8 acre site is located on the east side of Hopeful Church Road and the west side of Hopeful Road and is immediately to the north of 7015 Hopeful Road, south of 6767 Hopeful Road, and west of 6795, 6809, 6829, 6855 and 6897 Hopeful Road, Florence, KY and is zoned Suburban Residential Two (SR-2).

Staff Member, Todd Morgan, presented the Staff Report which included a PowerPoint presentation (see Staff Report). He stated he prepared a Memorandum, which included some additional Staff comments (see Exhibit 1). He also received an email from Mike Ford, with Boone County Schools, after the Staff Report was finalized (see Exhibit 2).

Mrs. Schaffer asked if a sidewalk needed to be put in along Hopeful Church Road? Mr. Morgan said sidewalks already exist along the entire Hopeful Church Road frontage. He asked for a sidewalk connection to be provided between the development and these sidewalks and the plans show it. Mr. Morgan reviewed the PowerPoint slides showing the existing sidewalks on Hopeful Church Road.

Ms. Evans asked what sidewalks were proposed on Hopeful Road? Mr. Morgan said the applicant is proposing to install some sidewalks per Josh Hunt's request. Mr. Morgan reviewed the proposed sidewalks that were shown on the plan.

Ms. Begley asked if the back of the units would need to have fencing or landscaping to screen them from Hopeful Church Road? Mr. Morgan responded the applicant will need to install street frontage landscaping per code. He is also recommending a condition which would require additional berming or evergreen plantings along the Hopeful Church Road frontage that would comply with Section 308 B. of the Boone County Subdivision Regulations (see Exhibit 1).

Ms. Evans asked if secondary access was discussed? Mr. Morgan said the applicant's original plans showed a second means of access in the property's 50' panhandle. That location would have put a second access point between two existing houses. Most of the future townhouse residents would have used that access point because it was closer to Cayton Road. One thing the Board could consider is requiring the panhandle to be upgraded with grass pavers so emergency response vehicles could use it in the event of an emergency. A locked gate would be required to prevent the residents from using the emergency access point. Boone County emergency personnel would have the key to the gate.

Ms. Evans asked if the panhandle was an access easement? Mr. Morgan responded that the panhandle was part of the subject property. Mr. Morgan added the panhandle area will have to be landscaped per code if emergency access isn't required. Mrs. Schaffer asked how much landscaping would be required in the panhandle if emergency access isn't required? Mr. Morgan replied a 20' wide buffer (Buffer Yard B) would be required.

Mr. Pieper asked the applicant's team if they would like to make a presentation? Mr. Jeff Flaherty, with Cardinal Engineering, said he would answer the Staff comments. He said he would let the architect address letters A. and B. after he went through the other comments.

**C. How tall will the pool fence be? Is decorative fencing proposed?** 6' tall decorative fencing is proposed. He submitted an exhibit into the record showing the types of fencing they were considering (see Exhibit 3).

**D. The sole access point for the development has been relocated directly opposite Hope Trail. Has the applicant's team contacted the City of Florence regarding sight distance and an Encroachment Permit?** They have prepared a sight distance study that's included in their revised packet of drawings (see Sheet C-5.0 in Exhibit 4). The Boone County Zoning Regulations indicates the sight distance needs to comply with the requirements of the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet. The plan shows the required sight distance of 115 feet.

Mrs. Schaffer asked if the required sight distance takes the speed limit into account? Mr. Flaherty responded it does.

**E. The applicant's engineer indicated that the development will not have a dumpster. Will the trash company have any issues turning around?** Mr. Flaherty told everyone to look at Sheet C-3.0 (see Exhibit 4). The plan shows that they have added a turnaround across from the detention basin. This will be signed as a no parking area and allow the trash trucks to turnaround. The area is bigger than what is typically required for a T turnaround.

**F. The applicant's engineer indicated that most of the guest parking lots would be lit with light poles (see plans) and the guest parking lots near the clubhouse will be lit with wall packs. How tall are the proposed light poles? Will downcast light fixtures be used?** Mr. Flaherty stated the light poles would be 12' tall and have downcast light fixtures. He has also prepared a photometric plan (see Sheet C-6.0 in Exhibit 4). The plan shows the intensity of the light. The footcandle measurements at the property lines are 0.0. This plan also shows that they have removed the light pole that was proposed behind building 9. That was one of the Staff recommendations. He said the plans do not take into account each unit's porch lights or garage lights.

**G. The applicant indicated that the townhouse units would be purchased. Is a Home Owners Association going to oversee the common areas?** Mr. Flaherty said the townhouse units will be purchased and there will be a H.O.A. to maintain the clubhouse and common areas.

Mr. Morgan said he got several calls from neighbors and they asked if the project would be a rental project? Is there any possibility that the project could transition to a rental project? Mr. Flaherty responded that it would not be a rental or apartment project. They plan on building and selling all the units. However, there could be cases where somebody buys a unit and rents it out.

Mr. Pieper asked if the common areas included the perimeter landscape buffer areas? Mr. Flaherty said they would be common areas.

Ms. Evans asked what the H.O.A. fee would be? Mr. Flaherty responded the owner is not present this evening because of a family emergency and he would be the one that needed to answer that question.

**G. Have trip generations figures been prepared?** Mr. Flaherty said they have been prepared and he submitted them into the record (see Exhibit 5). They show 31 trips in the A.M. peak hours (7 entering and 24 exiting) and 40 trips in the P.M. peak hours (25 entering and 15 exiting).

**H. The utility plan shows where the development is tying into the City of Florence's sanitary sewer system. Has this been confirmed with Florence Public Services. Boone County G.I.S. doesn't show the sanitary sewer manhole that is being tied into.** Mr. Flaherty said they surveyed the property and they looked at the utilities. There is a stub coming off the manhole that they are proposing to tie into. The manhole is shown on Sheet C-2.0 (Exhibit 4) and is located near Station 220+00.

Ms. Evans asked if the property owners would be responsible for their own water and sanitary sewer bills? Mr. Flaherty responded they would be. Ms. Evans asked if the townhouses would have gas and electric service? Mr. Flaherty responded he believes they will only have electric service. Mr. Nodas Paradimas said he was the architect for the project. The project will have both gas and electric if they can tie into gas.

- I. **Please confirm the proposed sidewalk system. The plans delineate the sidewalks differently.** Mr. Flaherty said the sidewalks are delineated differently because the grey sidewalks are flush with the ground and the speckled sidewalks are raised and act as curb.

Mr. Piper asked if all the sidewalks would be concrete? Mr. Flaherty responded yes.

- J. **Landscaping plan comments (see attached plan and buffer yard descriptions).**

- **The street frontage buffer areas are required to be screened with street frontage landscaping (see description in the Staff Report).**
- **Buffer Yard B is required where the development adjoins residentially zoned properties (see description in Staff Report).**
- **The parking lot between buildings 7 and 9 cannot be located in the required Buffer Yard unless a Variance is approved by the Florence Board of Adjustment.**

Mr. Flaherty said they have revised the landscaping plan (see Sheet C-4.0 in Exhibit 4). It shows the parking lot between buildings 7 and 9 has been pulled pack so a 20' landscaping buffer can be installed. They can landscape the panhandle as well unless the Board wants them to keep it open for emergency access. They have added notes to the plan showing the plantings that would be installed.

- A. **Building elevations were submitted for the townhouse buildings and materials are noted. Has a sample board been prepared?** Mr. Paradimas said the owner doesn't have any issues with the Staff recommendations. He brought samples of the proposed materials and passed them around (see Exhibit 6).

- B. **Building renderings were submitted for the clubhouse but they do not address specific building materials. Will the building materials match the townhouse buildings?** Mr. Paradimas indicated the clubhouse and townhouse buildings would use the same building materials. Mr. Morgan asked if the same proportion of masonry would be used in the clubhouse building and the townhouse buildings? Mr. Paradimas said it would roughly be the same. Mr. Morgan said that is something the Board may want to condition if they approve the project.

Ms. Evans asked if all the buildings would be the same? Mr. Paradimas said they will mix and match a little bit. The siding textures could be varied to help break things up. Mr. Morgan said the building elevations showed that the front porch areas would have some standing seam metal roofing. Mr. Paradimas said he did not bring that sample. Mr. Morgan asked what color that roofing would be? Mr. Paradimas answered it would be an earth tone.

Ms. Begley asked if the buildings would be constructed on slabs? Mr. Paradimas said they would be.

Mr. Flaherty said he would like to thank Staff. Their original plan basically followed the 2001 approved Site Plan. With Staff recommendations, they revised the plans and have created

a much better development. They are trying to be a good neighbor and meet all the regulations. Mr. Morgan asked Mr. Flaherty if he could take a look at the landscaping plan (Sheets C-4.0 and C-5.0 in Exhibit 4)? These plan shows the supplemental landscaping from Section 308 B. of the Subdivision Regulations being added along the Hopeful Road frontage. His recommendation was that this landscaping be added along the Hopeful Church Road frontage. Mr. Flaherty said they could agree to a condition and revise the plans as needed. Mr. Morgan said the Board could also analyze this supplemental landscaping along the Hopeful Road frontage if they feel it's needed. Any supplemental landscaping would need to be added as a condition.

Mrs. Schaffer asked if all the buildings were meeting a 30' setback from the property lines? Mr. Flaherty responded they were. She asked what kind of landscaping would be installed between the building and Hopeful Church Road? Mr. Morgan said the submitted landscaping plan shows some trees that are to be retained. The applicant's next step will be to submit a Major Site Plan application if the Conditional Use Permit is approved. These plans will include full civil drawings and precise grading limits. The grading plan would show him how many trees will be preserved and how much credit can be applied towards the buffer yard requirements and any Board of Adjustment conditions.

Mr. Flaherty added that labels have been added on the landscaping plan showing where Buffer Yards A and B will be installed. The landscaping plan submitted with the Major Site Plan would be more precise and show trees to be retained and species for new plantings.

Mrs. Schaffer said the rear patio pads are shown at 4'-4" wide on Sheet A103 (see Staff Report). Mr. Flaherty agreed and said they are also shown as grey spots on Sheet C-3.0 (Exhibit 4). She stated the patios aren't that big and there will hardly be any yard area left after the buffer yards are installed. Mr. Flaherty agreed. She said it seems like they are trying to squeeze in the maximum number of units that can be permitted and she has concerns about the neighbors because they were located there first.

Mrs. Schaffer asked what the plan was for the panhandle area? Would be it be landscaped or would it be used for emergency access? Mr. Morgan said there is email from Fire Marshal Vogelpohl in the Staff Report. It indicates that Florence Fire Department shouldn't have any problems if the development only has one access point. Mrs. Schaffer said she recommends the area should be landscaped to better buffer the neighbors. Mr. Flaherty added that there will be some natural buffering because of the grades. Mrs. Schaffer said one of Mr. Hunt's comments in the Staff Report dealt with the lack of storm sewers and the potential for flooding since the finished floor elevations are at the lowest point. Mr. Flaherty said there will be a ditch and they will also install storm sewers and that will keep water out of the buildings. Mrs. Schaffer asked if the detention basin would be required? Mr. Morgan said it will be required and the City of Florence has asked that fencing be installed around it. Mr. Flaherty said that fencing would be similar to the swimming pool fence.

Mr. Pieper asked if anybody from the Board had additional questions? There was no response. Mr. Pieper asked if anybody from the audience wanted to speak?

Ms. Ruth Tilley said she lives on Hunterallen Drive. She would not be opposed to the project if the access was proposed on Hopeful Church Road and a traffic signal was installed. It's difficult to get out of Hopeful Road and turn onto Cayton Road in the morning

and evening peaks. She is concerned about school busses and trash trucks. She thinks the traffic generation numbers that have been presented are low. A traffic signal is needed now for people turning onto Cayton Road from Hopeful Road.

Ms. Kathy Alexander said she lives at 254 Suzanne Way. She asked how much the units would be sold for? Mr. Paradimas said that wasn't known yet. She said Hopeful Road is very busy and curvy. She and her husband were run off the road on one occasion because someone was traveling the road too fast and came across center. This is something to consider if more people will be traveling the road. One of the handouts they received came from Boone County Schools (see Exhibit 2). She asked if the email says that the schools can handle the growth from this development? Mr. Morgan said that is what the email says. She said that Hopeful Road isn't maintained real well and there is a lot of brush near the road. She asked if it would be maintained better if this development is built?

Mr. Dave Kesselring said he lives on Hope Trail and strongly opposes the request. Hopeful Road is narrow and curvy and the estimates for the additional traffic seem conservative. There are 52 houses in their neighborhood and most of the households have two people that work with cars. A lot of households also contain children. Some of these children drive and others are driven by their parent to their activities. The plan that was previously approved for the subject property was approved in 2001 and their development was constructed in 2006 and 2007. As a result, there are a lot more homes and traffic on this section of Hopeful Road. Construction traffic should also be considered. Will it use Hopeful Church Road or Hopeful Road? Colonial Heights also receives a lot of emergency calls and ambulance traffic. There are also a lot of people that walk on Hopeful Road and there are no sidewalks. This development would probably add more walkers on Hopeful Road.

Ms. Bethany Mejia said she lives at 262 Suzanne Way and the back of her property backs up to Hopeful Road. One of her concerns is the dirt, dust, and debris from construction. She has never needed a fence because there are very few cars that travel past her house. She said she has a mentally disabled child and would like the applicant to install a fence on her property if the development is approved. She needs safety for her daughter and would also like more privacy. This development will feel like it is in her backyard. It will take 10 to 15 years for the new trees to mature and people will miss the turn into the development and travel down to the turnaround at the end of the road. She also agrees with the other speakers that there is horrible traffic on Hopeful Road. She disagrees that the schools can handle the growth. All the kids from the new condos across Hopeful Church Road go to Yealey Elementary and the classrooms are getting fuller every year. They are already at their maximum. The solution would be to build more schools in Florence. She is worried about traffic and the safety of her children.

Mr. Chester Randle said he lived at 6808 Hopeful Road. His property is located across from the panhandle on the subject lot. He said he would be concerned about an emergency access point being created in the panhandle because it may not be kept locked. He would see headlight glare every time a vehicle used that access point at night. He is also concerned because of the grade of his lot and drainage. He has a culvert pipe underneath his driveway and it has clogged with gravel and mud ever since the development at the back of Hopeful Road was built. He has complained about it several times but no one ever cleans it out. He worries what will happen if the development is

constructed because the problem will probably get worse. He is also concerned about traffic. He totaled his car at the Hopeful Road/Cayton Road intersection at Christmas because nobody would let him out. The lane to turn left on Hopeful Church Road was backed up past Hopeful Road. When someone finally waved him out he hit another car. It's terrible to get out now without this development. He has lived on his street for 32 years and the problem is getting worse. There are also a lot of speeders on the street. All of these things concern him because he has bad sight distance from his driveway. It used to be a nice place to live but it isn't anymore.

Mr. David Espejo said he lived at 254 Suzanne Way. He is concerned about the curvy road. His wife mentioned earlier that they were almost involved in a head-on collision and runoff the road. He would recommend that stop signs or light systems be installed on the road. Mr. Morgan replied that Hopeful Road is a City street and they would have to be willing to make improvements. This Board does not have the ability to make that a condition. Mr. Espejo asked if these minutes could be shared with the City Administration. Mr. Morgan said they could.

Ms. Cheryl Dawson said she lived at 6897 Hopeful Road and her property adjoins the subject property. She doesn't want this big of a project with all these residents living next door to her. This is way too much development in such a little space. There is already too much traffic. It is hard to get out on Cayton Road and there is no other choice because the other end of Hopeful Road comes to a dead end. She recommends that a building or two be eliminated because the development is way too tight.

Mr. Joe Rowland said he has lived at 255 Suzanne Way for over 12 years. He knows the applicant is saying that all the townhouses will be purchased. He asked what would stop people from buying them and renting them out? His other concern is if the road can handle the development? He was not aware that access to Hopeful Church Road was being prohibited. He does not see any aspect of this development that will protect the people that already live there. He is also concerned about the schools. His granddaughter lived with him last year and she went to Yealey Elementary. They couldn't put another desk in the classroom and she spent the entire year on the floor. He questions if Mr. Ford's email (Exhibit 2) is accurate. He hopes the Board doesn't approve this request based on the comments they have heard.

Ms. Colleen Crigler said she lived on Hunterallen Drive. She agrees with everything that has been said from the people that are opposed to the request. She also has concerns about the access point being located in a curve. She said it is a matter of time before someone comes around that curve and doesn't see someone coming out. That is a bad spot for an access point. She recommended the access point should be moved further southwest past Hope Trail if the project is approved.

Ms. Lori Rowland said she lived at 255 Suzanne Way. She thought she read something in the Staff Report that involved a Waiver for the access point on Hopeful Church Road. Mr. Flaherty said they contacted Kentucky Transportation Cabinet because they would like to have an access point on Hopeful Church Road. They were told it wouldn't be permitted. In addition, Planning Commission Staff asked that the access point on Hopeful Road be aligned with Hope Trail. Mr. Morgan asked if he had the email from Kentucky Transportation Cabinet that denied access on Hopeful Church Road? If so, could it be submitted into the record?

Mr. Dave Kesselring said if the State is saying it isn't a good idea to have additional traffic come out onto Hopeful Church Road then why is it a good idea to take it out the back door to Cayton Road. People use Cayton Road as a cut through to get from Hopeful Church Road to the businesses that are located off of Mall Road.

Mr. Flaherty submitted an email from Linzy Brefeld, with Kentucky Transportation Cabinet, into the record (see Exhibit 7). It documents that Kentucky Transportation Cabinet will not permit access from the state route. Mr. Morgan read Ms. Brefeld's email into the record. Mr. Flaherty said they followed that email up with a phone call and the state was adamant that they wouldn't allow the development to have an access point on Hopeful Church Road. Ms. Begley asked how this was presented? She asked if a right turn lane out of the development was ever discussed? Mr. Flaherty said they volunteered to do a Traffic Impact Study and they were told not to waste their money or time because an access point would not be permitted on Hopeful Church Road. Ms. Begley asked if Hopeful Road came to a dead end beyond the proposed development? Mr. Flaherty responded it did. Mr. Morgan reviewed a PowerPoint slide and showed the dead end. She asked if the State would consider connecting the dead end to Hopeful Church Road again with a traffic signal? Ms. Cheryl Dawson said they opened up the dead end when Cayton Connector was being constructed. It was hellish coming out onto Hopeful Church Road at that point because the angle is bad. There were a lot of accidents there. Ms. Begley asked if a traffic light would be considered? Mr. Morgan replied Kentucky Transportation Cabinet would have to be agreeable. Ms. Bethany Mejia said she would be concerned if the dead end would be removed because everybody would use their road as a cut through. She walks on Hopeful Road almost everyday and has almost been hit. Nobody ever obeys the speed limit.

Mr. Raul De las Fuentes said he lived on Yealey Drive. One of the deciding factors when he moved into his neighborhood was how good the houses looked because of the green areas. He doesn't think it's fair for someone to come in with a 63 unit townhouse development and compromise the look of the neighborhood. They are asking for a lot of units on a small piece of ground. The traffic from this development should be considered carefully. He likes to walk on Hopeful Road but he may not be able to if they double the amount of houses that use it for access. He would like to see a sidewalk added on Hopeful Road. The numbers of vehicles that are shown in the submitted traffic study seem low and don't make sense to him. The development would have 158 bedrooms.

Ms. Katrina Kutschman said she lived at 258 Suzanne Way. Her property is gated and she has young children. One of her concerns is lighting because her kids windows would face the development. Another concern is property values because they have no idea how much these units will be sold for. It's possible this development could impact their property values.

Mr. Dave Kesselring said the City of Florence has a contract with Rumpke for trash removal. He asked where the residents would keep their trash containers? He said there is usually not enough parking in developments like the one that is proposed. It's possible that the turnaround could be used to park additional cars if there is a parking shortage. Where would vehicles turnaround if this occurs?

Ms. Lori Rowland said she was curious what days and times the traffic study was conducted? Mr. Flaherty said he didn't know the answer. He added that the peak times come from a model. Mrs. Schaffer said traffic counts can be different if school is in session or it's near Christmas.

Ms. Bethany Mejia asked if Colonial Heights was notified? Mr. Morgan said they were notified. He outlined the three forms of notice that were given. She said they have a lot of ambulance calls and the added traffic from this development will make response times worse. The last time she called an ambulance for her daughter it took them 30 minutes to get to her house. It should only take them 5 to 10 minutes to get to her house. This is a big safety concern.

A woman from the audience said she was surprised a longer notice period wasn't required. The signs were posted two to three weeks ago. The general consensus is the residents don't want the project and it's a hazzard. They hope the Board will see it that way.

A man from the audience asked where the guest parking was located? Mr. Morgan reviewed the PowerPoint slide showing the guest parking. He asked Mr. Flaherty if the amount of guest parking changed with the plan revisions that were submitted this evening. Mr. Flaherty responded it hadn't changed. The man from the audience asked how many parking spaces each townhouse unit would have? It seem like the development will be able to accommodate 200 vehicles (2 per unit and 70 guest stalls). Mr. Paradimas said that was correct.

Mr. Flaherty said he would like to follow up on the Traffic Study. The Traffic Engineer's notes say the new trips estimated for the proposed development during A.M. and P.M. peak hours are on the low side. Significantly less than the 100 trip typically used as a threshold for requiring a Traffic Impact Study. With that said, they would be happy to make a Traffic Impact Study a condition of approval.

Mr. Paradimas said he wanted to address some of the comments. Unfortunately, their Traffic Engineer isn't present this evening and access from Hopeful Church Road has been denied. They can look at flipping the access for the development on Hopeful Road. They can also provide more specific information for their Traffic Study if the Board wants a specific day or times analyzed. There will be construction traffic regardless of who develops the property. Every townhouse will have its own trash container and they will be kept in garages. This is pretty typical for any single-family residential dwelling. They can look into the trash truck more if they need to. He said the purpose of this meeting is to hear the public concerns. Some of the issues will be able to be resolved and others will not. As far as the comments regarding school capacity, the Board should be looking at the comments from Boone County Schools. The Board should also be looking at the comments from the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet. The applicant's team can ask them more specific questions if its needed. All the comments about road improvements on Hopeful Road would need to be run past the City of Florence. They are seeking 8 dwelling units per acre because it is allowed in a Suburban Residential Two (SR-2) zoning district. They are staying in the guidelines. Ms. Begley said the proposal is for the maximum intensity permitted. She asked if it would be possible to scale the development back a little bit? Mr. Paradimas said that is something he would need to discuss with the property owner. She asked if they could eliminate the building near the detention basin? It would allow them to provide a bigger turnaround and have more open space.

Ms. Evans said a lot of neighbors have spoken about the curvature in the road. The applicant may need to rework the access to get it out of the curve. They should analyze the proposed access more thoroughly. Mr. Flaherty said they are willing to review the access. Planning Commission Staff recommended aligning it with Hope Trail. Mr. Morgan said the access point was slightly offset with Hope Trail when the plan was first submitted. He recommended the access point be aligned with Hope Trail if the sight distance was adequate. The access point should either be aligned with Hope Trail or offset significantly.

Mr. Flaherty said there are laws that prevent soils and mud from being carried onto streets. They will need to submit a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) with their final plans.

Ms. Bethany Mejia asked if they were going to fix the drainage? There is constant standing water that can get knee deep. Mr. Morgan said the applicant will need to submit full civil plans and address storm water and detention on the site if the Conditional Use Permit is approved. These preliminary plans do not have that level of detail.

Mr. Dave Kesselring said he thinks Hopeful Church Road was put in about 20 years ago to take traffic off a very narrow and curvy Hopeful Road.

A man from the audience asked when the Board is going to act on the request? He said he is asking because all the interested parties were not present this evening. Mr. Morgan said the Board needs to make that decision. They could act tonight based on the record or table the meeting to another night. Mr. Wilson agreed.

A woman from the audience said she is concerned that Colonial Height doesn't even know about the request. Mr. Morgan said they were given notice. He also posted the sign on the subject property so people from Colonial Heights and Hopeful Trails Subdivision would see it.

Mrs. Schaffer said she believes the current plan is too intense for the parcel and the area. Much of the area surrounding the site is zoned SR-1. She also doesn't think the parking is adequate for a two and three bedroom development. She likes the idea of eliminating a building and revising some things. She likes the thought of the panhandle area being screened versus being used for emergency access. She thinks that's what the neighbors on either side would want to see. She would also like to note that the development is being presented as an owner occupied development. This does not mean that an individual couldn't purchase a unit a rent it out. She would be willing to postpone action if the applicant wants some time to look at revising the plan.

Mr. Morgan said if the Board postpones action he recommends the applicant should bring back some information to address the questions and comments that were brought up tonight. Price points and H.O.A. bylaws dealing with renters, and permitted garbage can locations would be helpful information. Ms. Evans asked if the information would include a new Traffic Study? Mr. Flaherty said the traffic consultant took traffic counts. It was not a full blown study. Based on the rules in the manual, a project with that low of an intensity does not require a full blown study. Mrs. Schaffer said she doesn't want a full blown study. She just wants to know when the traffic counts were taken. Mr. Pieper asked if it would be helpful if they went back to the State with a full Traffic Study? Mr. Flaherty said they can. They started the Study and were told not to waste their time. They would like to have an access point on Hopeful Church Road.

Mrs. Schaffer said she would make a motion to table the request so the applicant can have time to take the comments from tonight and make the plan more compatible. Ms. Begley seconded the motion. Mr. Morgan recommended that the Board schedule the next meeting at 2/13/19, at 7:30 P.M. Mr. Pieper asked Mr. Flaherty if that was enough time? He responded it was. Mrs. Schaffer and Ms. Begley said they were agreeable to including that in the motion. Mr. Pieper called for a vote and it carried unanimously. Mr. Morgan said the public would not be given any more notice. They are welcome to spread the word about the meeting. He also reminded the public that the meeting will pick up where this one left off.

**OTHER**

No other matters were discussed.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Pieper asked for a motion to adjourn. Mrs. Schaffer so moved and Ms. Begley seconded the motion. Mr. Pieper called for a vote and the meeting adjourned by unanimous consent at 9:30 P.M.

**APPROVED**

---

**Mr. Timothy Pieper, Chairman**

**Attest:**

---

**Todd K. Morgan**  
**Senior Planner**

**Exhibits**

1. 1/9/19 Memorandum from Todd Morgan
2. Email from Mike Ford
3. Pool fencing
4. Revised drawings submitted by applicant
5. Trip Generation Study
6. Photos of Building Material Samples
7. 11/1/18 Email from Linzy Brefeld