

**Planning Commissioner's Written Comments
August 11, 2015**

Davis Park West Revisions (Z1500015)

Buzby: I vote to approve.

Freeman: Concern about site materials. In design I can support moving forward.

Harris: Voted yes.

Huff: It is disappointing that the developer decided not to retain an element of variety in his building plan.

Miller: The city council should reject this rezoning request.

In this case, the developer wants to adjust design commitments in the original development plan to do a number of things. First, the developer wants relief from the provision that would limit buildings to three and four stories. I have no objection to this. The 50 ft. height limit will still regulate the overall building height. If the developer wishes to include a two-story building in his project or make all of his buildings four stories I would not object. In the suburban context of this site, I do not see how a story limitation in addition to a height requirement serves to improve the appearance of the project or protect neighboring properties and land uses. No neighbor has raised an objection or put forward a policy reason for the limitation.

Next, the developer wants relief from his commitment to use a variety of materials on the exterior of the buildings. The current plan requires the developer to use a combination of brick, block, stucco and glass. Instead, the developer wants to be able to clad his buildings with a single material and to include cementitious panels in the list of possible cladding materials. I object to this change. We should use design commitments to promote variety and attractiveness in the design of large buildings in the community. When developers make design commitments, we should make them stick to them. In this case, this developer essentially wants to be able to build buildings covered with hardy-plank panels like the 605 West Chapel Hill Street project. More large multi-family buildings clad with this material will not improve the appearance of the community.

I do not believe the request to be inconsistent with the comprehensive plan, but I still oppose it.

Whitley: I vote to approve.