



STAFF REPORT

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION

Village Green Municipal Building, Council Chambers

47 Hall Street

Wednesday, January 13, 2016

7:00 P.M.

1. CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Applicant: Jeff and Becky Sturm
Location: 55 S. Liberty
Zoning: DB, Downtown Business District
Request: To review a certificate of appropriateness proposal to construct a new single family home and the renovation of two existing structures in the future. The existing residential structure will be converted to a mixed-use building, which will include a flower shop and upper floor studio apartment.

Aerial Site Image: <https://goo.gl/maps/nB6oEUGRbv12>

Project Background

The Sturm family purchased the property in late 2015 with the hope to build their family home and renovate the existing structure into a useable business space and second floor studio apartment. They hired an architecture firm shortly after their purchase to draft a site plan and architectural renderings for the proposed home and the two existing structures. In early of 2016, the applicant and their consultants met with staff to discuss the first drafts of the proposed site plan and buildings. Following this first meeting, the applicant took staff's suggestions and redesigned the site plan. At the second meeting, the City Architectural Advisor Chris Meyers, provided design suggestions. This now third iteration has been submitted to P&Z for approval.

Proposal Overview

There are two existing structures on site: a residential home and a garage. The applicant is proposing to renovate the existing residential home into a business space with upper floor studio apartment. Possible, the City and the applicant can come to some agreement for converting the garage into an entryway feature to the city public space. The applicant is also proposing a new single family residential home. The home will be constructed first and the existing structure renovation will happen at a later date, the exact timing is unknown.

Ordinance Review

In accordance with the requirements of codified ordinance 1143.18(j)(2), any change in the outward appearance of a property within the Downtown District shall require approval of Certificate of Appropriateness by the Planning and Zoning Commission if any change in the outward appearance of a property within the Downtown District results in one or more of the following:

- A. The plans call for a new non-residential structure or addition of occupiable space to an existing non-residential structure, whether principal or accessory; or
- B. The plans call for two or more new residential dwelling units; or
- C. There will be a demolition of a structure larger than seventy-five (75) square feet in ground floor area; or
- D. There is a request for rezoning, zoning variance, or subdivision of land within the Downtown District.

This proposal is coming before P&Z as it calls for two or more new residential dwelling units. P&Z does have the right to also send the proposal to HDAC for further review if they so choose.

Staff Comments

Staff is very supportive of the proposal. A new residential home, a renovated existing home with business and upper floor studio apartment, and gateway feature to the city public area are significant positive improvements to the downtown core. The new residential home would be a unique feature along South Liberty Street and add to the mixed-use nature of the downtown core. Furthermore, the new development could help spur further investment in the downtown as it would show that people are interested in the walkable, safe, and well-designed historic district. The development could act as a catalyst development that has others also renovate buildings and live downtown.

The proposal is consistent with the existing zoning code which allows business and residential uses. The development is also consistent with the recently updated City Comprehensive Plan. It is a good form of infill development and redevelopment (p. 26), as well as it being in line with the mixed use village center recommendations of the plan: it would create a commercial building located adjacent to the public sidewalk with prominent main entrances and storefront windows and it especially create a more prominent public street presence for the Village Green through the gateway (p. 30). Lastly, the proposal is consistent with the Powel Architectural Guidelines (PAG), details of which will be provided by the Architectural Advisor.

In sum, staff feels that this development is consistent with all city guidelines and will have many positive impacts on the downtown core.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends approval of a certificate of appropriateness with the following conditions:

1. All City Engineer requirements are met.
2. Staff has final review of the site plan and architectural designs before a building permit is issued.
3. An agreement is formally adopted by the applicant and city to use the gateway feature. If not, then the applicant can renovate the garage for their own use.

2. SKETCH PLAN

Applicant: Margello Development Company
Location: West of Sawmill Road at Zion Drive
Zoning: PC, Planned Commercial District
Request: To review a Sketch Plan proposal to construct two storage buildings, with the option for a third sports building in the future, on a 4.49 acre site. The applicant wished to submit a Combined Preliminary and Final Development Plan.

Aerial Site Image: <https://goo.gl/maps/bmJvXNMGfxT2>

Project Background

This project was first reviewed as a Sketch Plan in 2012. The Sketch Plan included three buildings, two of which were for storage of boats, RV's, motor coaches, and other vehicles. No personal storage was proposed. Also proposed was a building that provided for sports training. That particular building faced Sawmill Road, however it is not on this current Sketch Plan proposal. Staff decided that due to the length of time and that the third building is now not going to be included in the Preliminary Development Plan submittal, that another Sketch Plan review was appropriate. Plus, the submitted plans did not show all of the information that was needed for a Preliminary Development Plan.

Proposal Overview

The proposal has changed a bit since the last Sketch Plan. Building #3 on the site has been reduced in size in order to accommodate a site detention area. This changes the amount of lot coverage by pavement and building, and now building #3 only has one side where vehicles enter and exit the building. Building #3 is now 13,400 square feet. Building #4 remains the same in terms of site layout and size at 26,467 square feet. Building #5 is now slated as "future". It is unknown how long it will be for this building to be built. An access drive off of Sawmill Road is still proposed that will connect through the site. No sidewalks or pathways are shown. Very little landscaping is shown.

Changes since the Last Submission

The size of Building #2, the added site detention area, and the design of the buildings are the only major changes from the previous Sketch Plan review. The applicant and his architect met with our Architectural Advisor and coming from that meeting is what is being presented. The buildings are still all metal siding, with the gabled sides being vertical and the remainder horizontal.

Ordinance Review

The Sketch Plan stage of the development plan review process creates the ability for the Planning and Zoning Commission and the applicant to review together the proposal, and to see how this proposal fits with the surroundings and relates to the zoning regulations in order to see if the applicant should proceed to the Preliminary Development Plan stage. Initial public input on the proposal is also sought.

The proposed land use is not a Permitted or Conditionally Permitted Use within the PC, Planned Commercial District. A use such as this is generally reserved for the PI, Planned Industrial District "Self storage facilities and parking lots or storage areas for boats and/or recreational vehicles". Staff is unsure as to whether this includes the indoor storage of vehicles as proposed, or strictly outdoor storage. The PC district allows for heavier type of commercial uses such as auto service stations and automotive repair, as well as Mobile Home, travel trailer and implement sales, which seem to be uses that are highly more intense than that which is proposed.

Items of concern related to this proposal include:

- Is this use appropriate for the PC, Planned Commercial District as it provides for totally indoor storage of vehicles and no other personal property or chattels?
- Should portions of the buildings (north and south sides) be constructed of some sort of natural material such as stone or brick? A note on the plat for this commercial subdivision suggests Architectural Review being required by the overall developer, which would be Wedgewood Commerce Center developer Charles Ruma. Architectural details shall be reviewed by our Architectural Advisor. Staff recommends more detail be shown, such as lighting and color palette.
- Staff is concerned about there being enough room in between buildings #3 and #4, and eventually #4 and #5, for turning movements of large motorhomes and travel trailers. The applicant needs to provide details showing the turning radii for such units and show that on the plans. This also should be shown for the turning radii at the entry drive at Sawmill Road.
- The landscaping plan needs to include all tree plantings that are required by code. Because of the nature of the proposed buildings, perimeter landscaping cannot be met on Building #4, however that could be made up elsewhere on the site.
- The area for storm water detention may not be large enough.
- There are no provisions for dumpsters for user's trash.
- No sanitary provisions have been shown for the emptying of sanitary tanks on the RVs or travel trailers. This should be provided.
- Staff is concerned that Building #5 is shown as future. This building helps to screen Building #4 and its expanse of overhead doors.

Staff Recommendation

With the above concerns being satisfied with the submission of a Combined Preliminary and Final Development Plan, we recommend that the developer be allowed to file a Combined Preliminary and Final Development Plan.

Sketch Plan Review – December 12, 2012

The applicant is proposing to change the plan that was previously approved for this site. The changes include increased square footage by 30,702 square feet, change in uses from an athletic training building and field area to storage facility for large vehicles such as RVs, boats, cars, and trailers. The site plan is drastically changed due to the much larger buildings that are proposed. Instead of two 10,920 sq. ft. buildings fronting Sawmill Parkway, the proposal increases this to one 25,550 sq. ft. building. This is a much large scale building than the two that were proposed. To the west or behind this building, in the middle of the site, are two 24,416 sq. ft. buildings to house the proposed storage facility use. No outdoor storage is proposed or will be allowed according to the applicant.

The property is zoned PC, Planned Commercial District, as is most of the other properties along this corridor, which is made up of a mix of retail, offices, office warehouse uses, dance studios, day cares, medical offices, etc. The proposed storage use is not a permitted use within the PC, Planned Commercial District. This use is a Conditionally Permitted Use within the PI, Planned Industrial District, generally being the most intense type of uses that are allowed in Powell. Although all storage is happening within the buildings, it still creates the need for much larger buildings that would otherwise be allowed.

Staff is very concerned about the lack of green space and landscaping areas that will be provided by this plan. So much pavement and rooftop is going to create a large need for stormwater retention being designed into the site. Staff does not believe that this plan will be able to provide proper stormwater management.

There are many issues that the Planning and Zoning Commission should consider when reviewing this request:

1. Are the services or uses being provided so essential to the community that this location is the best location in the city to provide such a use? Is the need so drastic to remove property from an income tax producing property to one where no income tax will be generated?
2. Are the building sizes and design appropriate for the area?
3. Is the pavement and building coverage too much?
4. Does this meet our Pedestrian Scale Design Guidelines?

It is Staff's opinion that much more thought and design needs to be placed upon this current plan and it is in need of serious revisions.