

Relevant Regulation:

The commercial district where this project is located is the only district in the Village Growth area that has no set limits on the area of a structure or design guidelines for its looks and it relies totally on Section 4.3(3). 4.3.4 *Site Plan Review Standards: (3)*

Adequacy ofexterior building designs in regard to achieving maximum compatibility with adjacent property and with the character of the neighborhood.

Please note that this is not limited to the “Commercial District”. There are no specific design controls for the District such as “pitched roofs” etc.

As well keep in mind that all that can be reviewed is whether the current submitted design complies with the regulations. The charrette process that arrived at this design is not a part of the review, nor is the question of whether it is a new design or not. Comparisons with previous designs or whether it is an “improvement” or not relevant either.

Two definitions may be helpful:

Compatibility, harmonious, agreeable or congenial combination, well matched

Character the set of qualities that make something distinctive, interesting or attractive

Previous Decisions:

The Planning Commission 12/10/86 - 15 Lot Commercial Subdivision Final Plat Approval contains:

#8 Potential purchasers are notified that the Commission will carefully review the site plans and proposed uses, and that those lots on the exterior of the development (which includes lot 15) will receive particularly close attention for aesthetically pleasing construction.....

While not binding on you, it is advisory

You have received two requests that the height and dimensions of the structure should be erected at the site. David White contends that the photo renditions are a better visualization and I’m sure this will be discussed at the meeting. If you do decide to request an on site delineation it would also be helpful to have grade stakes at the perimeter of the constructed earth platform near Darkstar and the on the Quonset hut lot where the farmers market area will be. I think that this would be useful, and my reasons are below.

Review of Submission Narrative

For clarification, the structure, while described as having a “hipped roof” actually is a flat roofed structure as bounded on three sides by a truncated hipped perimeter roof (Plan A-1).

“Adjoining property” is easily defined, however neighborhood can be defined to meet one’s purposes and expanded or contracted to include examples to prove a point. It is yours to define. It would seem that the neighborhood that should be considered for this project would be what the structure directly relates to, not for example Saputo or NRG, although NRG is visible in the distance. If you choose to do a site visit I think it will be clearer what structures actually “interact” with this property and which don’t.

Abstract analysis may also not be reliable. The issue of the perception of a structure was raised in the Hannaford submission and analyzed simply as a function of the length of a structure's sides. The actual impact of a façade however is more complicated. First of all the façade length is actually what is visible from a given point, not the total of the measurements of two sides. Secondly the visibility of the façade is also a function of its height, as well as its total height in relation to its surroundings. An alternate analysis of the larger neighboring structures and Hannaford is. (measurements approximated)

	Maximum visible façade	Façade total area	Façade front	Façade front total area	Height above neighboring lot
Hannaford	310	8292	255	6820	3 – 7 feet
Darkstar	150	3000	66	1320	0
Nestech	268	5630	100	2400	0
Firehouse Plaza	268	4288	250	4000	0
Village Center	230	3680	230	3680	6' road 2' neighbor

Since the elevation of the site will be raised approximately six feet, compatibility should also consider this modification to the neighborhood as well. At a recent DRB meeting the impact of the raised Kinney site and its relationship to the surrounding neighborhood was clearly identified.

Hannaford will be about 50% larger than the general neighborhoods largest structure and 200% larger than the average one. The size of the existing structures ranges from around 21000 square feet footprint (Firehouse Plaza, the Ministorage and Nestech) to 900 square foot residence, with an average size of about 7400 Sq. Ft. (Tail hook) and a median of about 4416, (the Vet clinic). While size, in itself, is not an issue, a larger structure in relation to the smaller structures that constitute the neighborhood becomes more of a challenge.

While arguments may be offered because it is compatible with this facet of one structure, and some other facet of another, it therefore passes the maximum compatibility test, a site visit when some rendition of the structure is in place will offer a better, "real time" comparison of this to the structures that comprise the basic fabric of the area may well be the most helpful in reviewing this standard.

Any decision will have to include findings, conclusions and an order and now is the time to prepare.

Peter Erb

Zoning Administrator and Staff for this project for the DRB