

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

**FAIRFIELD PLANNING COMMISSION**

**November 13, 2013**

Scott Lepsky, Chairman, called the Regular Meeting of the Fairfield Planning Commission to order.

Members present: Scott Lepsky, Don Hassler, Bill Woeste, Mark Morris, Tom Hasselbeck and Bob Myron.

Scott Lepsky, seconded by Bob Myron, made a motion to excuse Jeff Holtegel. Motion carried 6 – 0.

**MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING:**

The minutes of the previous meeting, held October 23, 2013, were approved as submitted.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**Dedication Plat – 2401 Bobmeyer Road**

Slides of the site plan and dedication plat were shown. Mr. Bachman explained this is a new business which went before the Board of Zoning Appeals for variances and were turned down. It is owned by a man who operates several car lots in Hamilton. This site will be used for working on cars and storing them until they are placed on the lots. Upon reviewing the site plan, it was determined that additional right of way along Bobmeyer Road was needed. The site plan reflects the new right of way, a new building and paved parking areas. The storage lot will accommodate between 150 – 200 cars. Mr. Lepsky stated the BZA denied the request to allow gravel as the base for the storage lot. Mr. Bachman replied the plans show it paved.

Don Hassler, seconded by Bob Myron, made a motion to accept the Dedication Plat at 2401 Bobmeyer Road.

Motion carried 6 – 0.

**OLD BUSINESS:**

**Modification to Approved Elevation – 5839 Olde Winton Lane (Tabled)**

Don Hassler, seconded by Bill Woeste, made a motion to remove this item from the table. Motion carried 6 – 0.

Slides of the home were shown (original rendering, building permit elevation submission and Mr. Richardson's rendering). Tim Bachman explained the original rendering was approved by the Commission. Staff thought the details had been worked through however, Mr. Richardson is asking for a modification. The original rendering showed what staff thought was a masonry product under the

window. The building permit plan showed brick in this area but Mr. Richardson is stating a masonry product does not work; it needs to be siding. Mr. Richardson's photoshop rendering shows all siding, larger columns on a stone base and flower boxes under the left window and between the two columns. None of the homes in the subdivision are 100% siding; they all have some brick or stone.

Mr. Hassler asked if the foundation was poured with a brick ledge. Mr. Bachman replied the framer took the wall all the way to the edge removing the ledge.

Rex Richardson, applicant, said this house will be a model that is for sale. The style is Nantucket and it was never intended to have brick. Mr. Richardson thought the original rendering showed all siding; the building permit set showed brick. The framer called and said his plan showed a brick ledge on the front. Mr. Richardson told him it was to be all siding so the house was framed to the edge of the foundation. Mr. Richardson stated the people buying the house do not want masonry on the front – they want the Nantucket look. The windows don't match the building permit plan set either. They match the original rendering submitted.

Mr. Richardson stated the Nantucket is a style. In an effort to make a concession, stone was added to the column base. The house sits up a little high because it has a basement but the bottom portion will be screened by landscaping.

Tim Bachman explained initially, the original rendering was approved by the Commission with the condition that the details be worked out with staff. When the building plans were submitted, they showed brick. The framer alerted Mr. Richardson that his plans showed brick and Mr. Richardson then called Mr. Bachman and asked that the brick be modified to siding. Mr. Bachman stated he was not comfortable with approving the modification which is why it is before the Commission.

Mr. Hassler asked if the purchaser was opposed to having brick and Mr. Richardson replied they didn't know they had that option. It was always intended that the house be fully sided.

Erin Donovan asked if someone was moving into the house or if it was going to be a rental. Mr. Richardson replied it will be a model that is for sale; not for rent. The purchaser gave him the money to build this house and use it as a model until it is resold. It is not intended to be rental unless something changes. At the December Planning Commission meeting, they will be bringing in a plan for a walk out model and in four weeks, four houses of which one will be a dedicated model. There is no intention for this house to be rental; it will be their model until the other one is constructed. The buyer supplied the rendering and said this is what they wanted. Mr. Woeste stated the original rendering clearly indicates the use of a different material (texture) under the window. Mr. Lepsky added that the building permit set specifically calls for brick.

Mr. Bachman stated he has a concern regarding the lack of masonry throughout the project. Mr. Richardson is getting ready to submit 4 new homes and if the photoshop rendering is approved, it could set a standard for future homes. Mr. Richardson replied those are a different style and will have brick fronts. He will make the Commission aware of any home proposed that does not have a masonry element.

Regarding the flower boxes, Mr. Richardson stated one has been installed on the front bump out and the other will be located between the posts. The original rendering shows railing and spindles between the posts. Mr. Richardson is proposing a planter as he feels that looks better.

Mr. Hasselbeck asked about the columns as each slide showed something different. Mr. Richardson stated they will be as shown in his photoshop rendering. Mr. Lepsky said he would like to see some sort of masonry product on the home in order to be consistent. Mr. Richardson replied masonry is not a requirement; he could build more homes that are all vinyl. If stone would have looked right, it would have been installed. Mr. Bachman explained that initially, Mr. Richardson was in control of the elevations. That control was lost when the Asher homes were built and the Commission took control of approving the elevations. Mr. Lepsky stated he was looking for a compromise and didn't feel a small amount of stone on the base of the columns was it. Mr. Richardson again replied brick or stone was never intended for this house. Mr. Bachman clarified there was never a requirement for the homes to be a certain percentage of masonry. There is brick, stone or cultured stone on every home and here he is requesting nothing except for underneath the columns. It may be appropriate for this home but the concern is for the remaining homes. Mr. Bachman was happy to hear that the four coming in for review next month will have brick. He told the Commission this house needs to be considered on its own merits; there really is no requirement for a home to have a certain percentage of masonry. Mr. Lepsky said the Commission has been consistent with approving some masonry on all the homes they've reviewed whether it was in this subdivision or somewhere else. Mr. Richardson replied brick or stone looked right on the previous houses, it doesn't on this one. It's not a cost issue but an appearance issue. This house has more exterior details than the other houses. The Nantucket style is all siding with white trim.

Mr. Woeste agreed the home looked better fully sided but he wants to see brick or stone used on the remaining homes to be built. Mr. Hasselbeck concurred.

Mark Morris, seconded by Tom Hasselbeck, made a motion to accept the modification of allowing siding in lieu of the brick knee wall at 5839 Olde Winton Lane with the understanding that the finished home meets the rendering submitted by Mr. Richardson.

Motion carried 6 – 0.

Being no further business, the meeting adjourned.

---

Scott Lepsky, Chairman

---

Peggy Flaig, Clerk