

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR VOTING MEETING OF THE**

**FAIRFIELD PLANNING COMMISSION**

**OCTOBER 28, 2009**

Jerry Dailey, Chairman, called the Regular Voting Meeting of the Fairfield Planning Commission to order.

Members present: Jerry Dailey, Deborah Rhees, Terry Senger, Don Hassler, Jeff Holtegel, Dan Murray and Scott Lepsky.

Jeff Holtegel, seconded by Terry Senger, made a motion to excuse Scott Lepsky from the Public Hearing held on October 26, 2009. Motion carried 6 – 0.

**MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING:**

The minutes of the previous meeting, held October 14, 2009, were approved as submitted.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**Application for Concept Plan Approval – Creekside Manor P.U.D.**

Clare Schneider, representing the applicant, gave a slide presentation to the Commission which is made a part of these minutes (attachment "A"). She stated the development will be called Creekside Manor and is being developed by McFarland Properties. The market for this type of housing is now. Nine out of sixteen lots are "soft sold". Six out of the nine are to current Rolling Hills residents.

Mr. Dave McFarland, stated this is an infill project in an existing subdivision which has a natural buffer of trees around it that will remain. With this buffer, the adjoining properties are difficult to see. The average lot size is 9,500 and the proposed homes will be brick or a brick combination with an attached two car garage. Mr. McFarland showed a slide of one of the proposed homes. It's 2,400 s.f. (1,600 s.f. on the first floor/800 s.f. basement). The next slide contained a list of standard features the homes will have.

Since many homes share a common driveway, Jeff Holtegel asked about additional parking. Mr. McFarland stated the setback for the homes will be 23' or 24' so there would be room on the double wide driveways on which to park. Don Hassler asked how wide the common drives would be and whether a fire truck could maneuver them. Tim Bachman explained the common drives would have to be built to a standard. Once fire apparatus drives in, they have to be able to get out. This can be accomplished by a cul-de-sac or a "T" turnaround. This plat was reviewed by the Staff Technical Review Committee and another concern is utilities. Currently, sanitary sewer lines run through the open fields of this property. The sewer in some places is 17' deep and additional easements may be necessary. The plan also shows a manhole located in a detention area which the city would not allow. This is only a concept plan though and details will need to be worked out.

Mr. Bachman stated that parking should be further discussed. Olde Winton has small lots and has alleys to access the homes. There are only 4 or 5 homes built so far but there is a public street on  
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

which people can park. With the layout of Creekside, the only additional parking would be on the portion of public street or possibly the pool parking lot during off season. Driveways might be able to accommodate 4 vehicles.

Discussion was held regarding lot sizes. Mr. Bachman stated that lots at Olde Winton are 40' minimum, 50'- 65' frontage at Benchway and 65' frontage at Village Green. The Village Green lots are a minimum of 6,500 s.f. so they're 100' deep. Village Green had front and rear yard setbacks of 25' which left 50' for placement of the home. Some of the Creekside lots are not as wide as the Village Green lots but are deeper. Mr. Bachman added that the existing lots adjoining the proposed development are larger than the minimum R-0 requirement of 14,000 s.f.

Tim Bachman asked Mr. McFarland if he has worked through the lot sizes to ensure the proposed homes will fit. Using lot 15 as an example, Mr. McFarland stated the previous home shown is 52' deep and 40' wide. It would be tight but it would fit.

Mr. Bachman told the Commission that the Public Works Department ran a trip generation report. The program used was Microtrans which shows for 16 empty nester homes, trip generation would be 60 per day. When the project is entered as a planned unit development, trip generation per day increases to 120.

Concerning the Land Use Plan, Erin Donovan looked at the entire plan and this piece of property is called out as parks and recreation space. The Housing Section states "Decrease or increase in household size will impact the need for future housing numbers and types. If size is decreasing, it may be sign of an aging population and will need to provide housing for the elderly population. According to the 2000 U.S. Census, there were just over 4,880 households with the age of the householder 55 years or older. In addition, there were 3,585 households where the age of the householder was at the tail-end of the baby boom population – those born between 1946 – 1965. As this baby boom population enters retirement age, adequate housing needs to be available to meet their needs. Currently Fairfield has a mixture of duplexes, ranch style condominiums and single family homes on small lots, but not many developments aimed towards young active senior adults. One objective in the Housing Section that addresses housing supply in Fairfield states "Ensure that an adequate supply of housing is available to meet the needs, preferences and financial capabilities of Fairfield's households now and in the future."

Dan Murray pointed out the many challenges that lots 10 and 11 have in regard to the trees, creek and grades. Tim Bachman explained that if the Army Corp of Engineers designates any of the area along the creek as blue stream, no filling can be done without their approval. Fill can be placed outside of blue stream area with a controlled fill or the home would have to be piered. Sediment has to be kept out of the stream.

Don Hassler expressed his concern with future access to the pool property if and when it ever develops. He asked how wide common drives have to be and Tim replied a fire lane has to be a minimum of 20' which allows the truck to maneuver around a building. They need to also have an area to put their outriggers down. We have allowed 24' but a typical residential street is 28'. Tim

Bachman said if the intent is to be able to extend a public street to the pool property in the future, that cannot occur if this plan is approved. The pool property could either not develop or the Commission could allow a private drive back to the property. With the P.U.D., a perpetual easement can be provided for access. Tim added that the S.T.R. committee also discussed flooding of this property. During the Father's Day flood of 2003, the water was so high that the City had to clean the pool parking lot.

Jeff Holtegel stated that Rumpke will not pick up trash set out along the private drives. Mr. McFarland added that the Post Office will not deliver mail back there either.

#### CITIZEN COMMENTS:

Tom Spenceley, 5643 Chatfield Dr., stated he was a member of the pool for 21 years and served on the board in various capacities so he is familiar with the finances of the club. His property abuts lots 3 and 4 and he gets run off from the pool property. Several years ago, the City Engineer looked at the drainage he receives and suggested that a retention pond be built on the pool property. They did not have the money to do that so he still receives drainage. The developer may fix the current problems with the pool but they do not have the membership to even operate. They are asking the member to pre-pay their 2010 membership fees.

John Lawson, 5780 Windermere, backs up to lots 11 and 12. He has lived here since 1993 and witnessed floods. If the property is filled, how will it affect other properties up and down stream. During one rain event, he had to call to City and inform them that the water moved the concrete manhole base located in his yard. Mr. Lawson also expressed his concern with how the building setbacks might be altered if wider utility easements are needed for several lots.

Christine Hacker, 5760 Windermere, expressed concern regarding the water problem in the area. She has a past history with the swim club but does not feel that putting a P.U.D. in her back yard will enhance property values. The three P.U.D.s that were discussed earlier are on the edge of residential or commercial developments.

Jerry Huth, 5846 Windermere, stated the City's Master Plan was conceived years ago to make the community better, not worse. The City needs to be careful when altering the Master Plan to allow smaller lot subdivisions. Fairfield is an aging community and Rolling Hills is an excellent example of an older established subdivision that is well maintained. It's one of the nicer neighborhoods in Fairfield.

Frank Vitale, 5542 Sir Lancelot, asked what will happen to the property should the pool fail. Who would it belong to? Tim Bachman replied the property is zoned R-0 which is 14,000 s.f. minimum lots. If the pool goes away and the bank decides to sell the property, a developer could come in, build a public street, go through the platting process and develop the property to R-0 standards. The Planning Commission would need to approve the plat and technical issues would be checked for compliance with city ordinances.

Betty Schneider, 445 Gregorian Dr, has lived in Fairfield for 39 years and was a member of the swim club for 16 years. She would like to see the pool saved and more up-scale housing for seniors.

Karen Drake, 220 Hidden Hills, stated 120 kids belong to the swim club and the membership has increased this year.

Annie Grimes, 140 Westbourne, said the aquatic center is too busy. The swim club employed 42 kids this past summer. It keeps kids busy and off the street.

Doug Fisher, 5726 Windermere, backs up to lots 12, 13 and 14. The trees along this boundary are old; he planted them. The pool property will not be an option for additional parking as the gates will probably be locked during the months the pool is not used. He asked how Lauryn Meadows was previously zoned and Mr. Bachman replied R-3, multi-family residence. Mr. Fisher asked when the Land Use Plan was approved and Mr. Bachman stated the draft plan was reviewed in June by the Planning Commission. Mr. Fisher said the open field adjacent to the swim club property is probably zoned R-0.

Kathy Montgomery, 5909 Coachmont, has lived in Fairfield since 1982 and supports the proposed project.

Lynn Wood, 5578 Chatfield, expressed her concern with what will happen to the pool and property if it becomes vacant. The pool will need to be filled in and the property maintained. She also felt the pool fits the needs of the community.

Bill Meyer, 885 Maple Ridge, stated he cannot see any builder/developer being able to build a house this size and sell for the price proposed. It would work out to be approximately \$155/s.f. He expressed his concern with the homes becoming rental property if they don't sell.

Peter Grimes, 14 West Knoll, asked what would be built on this property if the club goes under. There is already rental property in the neighborhood. The Planning Commission needs to look at the value of these homes. If built, they will increase property values in the neighborhood without impacting salability of the existing homes since they serve a different market. He feels this plan will keep the pool, keep children busy and keep property values up.

Judy Jennings, 905 Maple Ridge, said a price tag cannot be put on what the pool has contributed to the community and Fairfield. She expressed her concern with what will happen to the area if the pool is not there.

Phil Mullins, 6 Wilhelm, had children that initially belonged to the club. Fairfield is changing and the swim club is doomed. Development of any kind is not going to save the pool long term. If the bank gets the property, they will have to build under the existing zoning.

Jim Budkie, 5656 Kingsbury, has been a member of the club. The proposal is to have higher density property governed by an H.O.A. The H.O.A. can change. A number of builders have looked at the property and cannot save the pool and construct 5 – 6 homes under the current zoning. The letter  
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes  
October 28, 2009/Page 5

sent out by Dave McFarland mentioned that membership has decreased to about 200. The majority of comments are not in support of the rezoning the property. He submitted a petition with 263 signatures opposing the rezoning of this property.

Deborah Rhees expressed her concern that the drainage for this property had not been addressed. She stated she was not in favor of increasing the density in this area.

Don Hassler was concerned with the new flood boundaries proposed and that Mr. McFarland might not be able to get all the lots as proposed.

Jerry Dailey stated the Commission has approved areas in the city with smaller lots. The developments filled the entire area though, not just a portion.

Scott Lepsky expressed his concern with the flooding implications and did not feel this proposal is good for this particular piece of property.

Terry Senger stated the run-off, traffic, trash collection, etc., are issues that will need to be addressed. The developer is willing to make the repairs to keep the pool open. There are 200 members that belong to the pool and the petition submitted had over 200 signatures asking the proposal not be approved. Back when the pool was built, there were no HOA's. Today, a pool like this one would not be built without being in a HOA. They have sought out their best option to keep the pool. An important consideration is that if the plan does not go through, residents will be looking at a vacant fenced in piece of property. At some point, someone will buy it from the bank and if developed to R-0 standards, this process will not be a part of the approval. Because of the uncertainty, Mr. Senger stated he will support the proposal.

Dan Murray stated the pool is important to the neighborhood and to the community and felt it should remain.

Jeff Holtegel stated he could not support the rezoning. After listening to the comments and seeing the presentation, there are a lot of issues with the proposal. The fact that the pool is having problems should not impact the rezoning. Mr. Holtegel had concerns with the layout, density, common drives, setbacks, fire access and flooding.

Jeff Holtegel, seconded by Deborah Rhees, made a motion to recommend disapproval of the P.U.D. Concept Plan application for Creekside Manor.

Motion carried 5 – 2; Terry Senger and Dan Murray dissenting.

### **REPORTS/STUDIES/GENERAL DISCUSSION**

Jerry Dailey reminded the Commissioners of the Joint Public Hearings on November 9<sup>th</sup>.

Being no further business, Jeff Holtegel, seconded by Don Hassler, made a motion to adjourn.  
Motion carried 7 – 0.

---

Jerry L. Dailey, Chairman

---

Peggy Flaig, Clerk