**Architectural Review Committee**

**Special Meeting**

**February 25, 2020**

**Call to Order**

**Members Present:** Shirley Jacobi, Mike Cousins, Tom Strayer; Barry Woods

**Members Absent:** Chad Gooding

**Others Present:** Ryan Crum, Director of Planning & Building; Tonya Galbraith, Town Manager; Jennifer Pack, Planning & Building Administrative Assistant; Amanda Dierdorf, Land Acquisition Manager for Fischer Homes

**Public Present:** Greg Brewer, as Woodhaven resident; Jim Maddox, Woodhaven resident

**Approval of Minutes**

Mr. Strayer made a motion to approve the minutes from the January 21, 2020 meeting. Mr. Wood seconded. Motion to approve passed 3-0 with 1 abstention.

**Agenda Considerations:**

None

**Old Business**

None

**New Business**

*Fischer Homes - Woodhaven New Models & Elevations*

Ms. Dierdorf: Fischer Homes prides itself on being the leading builder in the area when it comes to architecture and keeping elevations in our communities current and innovative and helping communities stay competitive as new consumers look at many housing options. We know that elevations are first impressions. The new urban contemporary models that we are unveiling here at our Woodhaven community have been approved in other communities around the Indianapolis area.

Looking at Woodhaven specifically, we have approximately 114 homesites left that will take us to build out through 2024. Our market research was conducted in August of 2019 and when surveying communities in major markets in the Midwest, including Indianapolis, respondents indicated that modern, urban elevations were often preferred over traditional styles and would attract anywhere from 20% or more consumers to a given potential neighborhood. Those who preferred more traditional styles indicated that the more modern styles were a second favorite, so it would still be acceptable.

Elevations styles have changed over time, and Fisher Homes in recent years have continually innovated and offered new designs, including some that were different from the norm at the time. It’s customary for builders to update offerings over the years as design trends changes. Updated offering will continue to add value to existing community members homes and bring additional buyers into the McCordsville Area. We feel like this would be a positive benefit for not only Woodhaven but McCordsville as a whole.

Meyer Research, leading new home research company, remarked in their first quarter 2020 report that mixing traditional and more contemporary designs is accepted, on trend, and leading to improved sales and attract otherwise consumers that may not look in this area.

At Woodhaven, while these options are available, they are not required. There is still the option to choose the existing elevations – they are not replacing elevations. The anti-monotony standards will still apply, we’ll be using the same color packages that would be consistent with the neighboring homes as well. Fischer wants to do this to bring something fresh, current, innovative to McCordsville.

Questions from the board

Discussion between Mr. Strayer and Ms. Dierdorf regarding the market studies.

Ms. Jacobi asked if any of the proposed models had been built in the Fishers area. They have not, they are only proposed in Woodhaven, Franklin Township, Avon, and some areas in Marion County.

Discussion among Mr. Cousins, Ms. Jacobi, and Ms. Dierdorf about the difficulty viewing the line drawings of the elevations and comparing them to existing models. Ms. Dierdorf offered to continue the meeting until she could present full color drawings.

Discussion between Mr. Strayer and Ms. Dierdorf regarding the style and the popularity of the style, Mr. Strayer stressing that this modern urban style hasn’t made it out to the suburbs. Ms. Dierdorf said that Fischer is leading that movement to the suburbs.

Mr. Strayer asked Mr. Crum about when it was appropriate to ask for public comments because he was looking to the residents who live there to tell the Committee how comfortable they are with the new styles, because he believes it comes down to context. Ms. Jacobi asked how will they know until something is built in the new style if they like it or not.

Public Comments

Mr. Brewer, Woodhaven resident: Opposes the designs, believing they are too modern for what is already in the neighborhood, that the designs will not blend in with the existing designs. Stated that he’s not comfortable with the neighborhood being a “guinea pig” for new designs. States that Woodhaven is about 68% built out and was taken over from a different builder, and Fischer Homes has done a good job so far integrating the Maple Street series with the previous builder’s designs so there is continuity within the neighborhood. His and his neighbor’s concerns are that one of the modern urban designs will be built in the middle of a street that is already mostly built in the existing style and it won’t blend with the aesthetics of the neighborhood. He’s received at least a dozen emails from neighbors opposed to the new designs, and he’s forwarded those to Mr. Crum. He’d rather see the new designs as a separate subdivision in town.

Ms. Jacobi asked about having a street or a section with the homes. Mr. Brewer responded that it wasn’t his desire but a compromise he could accept.

Jim Maddox, Woodhaven resident, stated that he agreed with Mr. Brewer, and agreed that near downtown, the style looks sharp. He stated that having one of the new sections that hasn’t been built yet allow the homes would be compromise, but doesn’t feel the style would fit in with the sections that are nearly finished.

Discussion between Ms. Dierdorf, Mr. Strayer, Mr. Brewer, and Mr. Maddox regarding the number of opposition letters versus the number of homes built in in Woodhaven. Ms. Dierdorf stressed that the market research strongly indicates the design would be successful. Mr. Strayer pointed out that all of the letters are opposed and generally the Committee will receive at least some positive feedback in addition to the opposition. He continued, saying that he would like to see more diversity in style and would push for it, but this is contextual

Discussion among Mr. Cousins, Ms. Dierdorf, and Mr. Crum about façade articulation and what is required in Woodhaven.

Mr. Strayer stated that he likes the style and would like more diversity in McCordsville, but in the context of the existing homes in the Woodhaven, it’s not a good idea. The current residents built with a certain expectation of what the neighborhood would like. He pointed out that no residents spoke in favor of the style. He supported the idea of allowing the urban modern models in new sections that are just starting (Sec. 7a and beyond), but not as infill in the existing sections.

Discussion among board members and Mr. Crum if limiting the model to certain areas is allowed by the PUD, and if so what sections. It was agreed that the two most Northern East-West streets (Sections 7A and 8) would be allowed to have the Urban Modern models offered. Mr. Crum observed that there are about 27 lots in Section 7A and more in Section 8.

Roof Pitch Discussion and Trim Discussion

Mr. Crum informed the Board that the Commitments require roof pitches to be 6:12. On the proposed models are shallower by design (4:12). When a discussion on roof pitch arose in the past, the Committee decided it had to go through a Commitment modification process because there is not a style exception in the Commitments. This same issue arises with the trim. The design on the Urban Modern has 1 x 4 trim which is appropriate for the style. The Commitments require 1 x 6 trim.

It was decided that Mr. Crum would get clarification from Mr. Morelock to see if a Commitment Modification is needed. If it is, Mr. Crum would work with the petitioner to move that forward.

Anti-Monotony Review

Cumberland Coastal Classic & Yosemite Cambridge Cottage: These do not need to be on the matrix

Cumberland Coastal Classic & Yosemite Cambridge Cottage w/Porch: These do not need to be on the matrix

Wesley Western Craftsman (no porch) & Greenbriar Hyde Park Cottage: These do not need to be on the matrix

Wesley Western Craftsman (no porch) & Greenbriar Hyde Park Cottage w/Covered Entry: These do not need to be on the matrix

Wesley Western Craftsman (no porch) & Greenbriar Coastal Classic: These are **too similar** and must remain on the matrix

Wesley Western Craftsman w/porch & Greenbriar Hyde Park Cottage w/Covered Entry: These do not need to be on the matrix.

Wesley Western Craftsman w/porch & Greenbriar Coastal Classic w/Porch: These are **too similar** and must remain on the matrix.

Wesley Modern Farmhouse w/porch & Greenbriar Coastal Classic w/Porch: These do not need to be on the matrix.

Danville Modern Farmhouse w/porch & Danville Modern Farmhouse w/Covered Entry: These are **too similar** and must remain on the matrix.

Cumberland Coastal Classic w/extended porch & Yosemite Cambridge Cottage w/porch: These do not need to be on the matrix.

Cumberland Coastal Classic w/extended porch & Cumberland Costal Classic: These are **too similar** and must remain on the matrix.

Yosemite American Classic w/covered entry & Danville Modern Farmhouse w/covered entry: These do not need to be on the matrix.

Yosemite American Classic w/covered entry & Danville Modern Farmhouse w/porch: These do not need to be on the matrix.

Yosemite American Classic w/porch & Danville Modern Farmhouse w/covered entry: These do not need to be on the matrix.

Yosemite American Classic w/porch & Danville Modern Farmhouse w/porch: These do not need to be on the matrix.

Yosemite American Classic w/porch & Yosemite American Classic w/covered entry: These are **too similar** and must remain on the matrix.

Yosemite Western Craftsman w/extended porch & Yosemite Western Craftsman: These are **too similar** and must remain on the matrix.

Harper American Classic w/covered entry & Cumberland American Classic: These do not to be on the matrix.

Harper American Classic w/porch & Cumberland American Classic: These do not to be on the matrix.

Harper American Classic w/porch & Harper American Classic w/covered entry: These are **too similar** and must remain on the matrix.

Harper Modern Farmhouse w/porch & Harper Modern Farmhouse w/covered entry: These are **too similar** and must remain on the matrix.

Motions

1) Mr. Strayer moved to direct staff to discuss with legal counsel the direction to take on the roof pitch issues. Mr. Woods seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

2) Ms. Jacobi moved that if the Urban Modern model move forward to Town Council, it be limited to Sec. 7A and Sec. 8. Mr. Woods seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

3) Mr. Woods moved to approve all non Urban Modern elevations as presented, subject to the anti-monotony list. Ms. Jacobi seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

4) Mr. Strayer moved that if the Town Council deems that the ARC has the ability to make modifications to the PUD without a formal process, then the Board approves the Urban Modern model elevations as presented, amended to allow 1x4 trim as the minimum size and with a minimum roof pitch of 3 ½ :12. Mr. Woods seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

**Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.