Decision on Application 2016-654 Ridge Church

DATE: April 5, 2017
FROM: Jay Camp

Background/Issue

Planning Board took no action on this case on March 28th. Since the Public Hearing, the following changes have occurred:

1. The catering facility building has been shifted so that one of the two large oak trees to the rear of the site can be saved.
2. The sidewalk on the property frontage has been increased to 10’ in width.
3. The internal driveway connection to the adjacent property was removed.
4. Detailed building elevations have been provided.
5. At the corner of the site, +/- 0.17 acres is to be dedicated for future right of way. About 0.09 acres along Independence Pointe Parkway will be reserved for future right of way but not dedicated.

Proposed Solution

The issue of realignment of Independence Pointe Parkway continues to be the primary concern that Town Staff has with the rezoning request. While the applicant has made attempts to shift future building additions away from the intersection, we still have concerns that the road project may significantly impact structures on the site. Sheets 4.0-4.7 are schematic in nature and do not reflect exactly how the site will be developed.

Although we continue to have reservations and concerns about this request due to the road realignment and potential right of way needs, we do not feel that we have enough concrete information to deny the church the ability to expand at the site.

Related Town Goal(s) and/or Strategies:
Quality of Life
Economic Development/Land Use Planning

Recommended Motion/Action:
Approve Application 2016-654
SUGGESTED
STATEMENTS OF CONSISTENCY AND REASONABLENESS
Final Decisions on Zoning-Related Issues

ZONING APPLICATION # 2016-652

Matthews Board of Commissioners makes the following 2 conclusions:

1)  _X__ The requested zoning action, as most currently amended, **IS CONSISTENT** with the policies for development as outlined by the Matthews Land Use Plan.

    OR

    _____ The requested zoning action, as most currently amended, **IS NOT CONSISTENT** with the Matthews Land Use Plan and/or other adopted land development policies and plans.

(A requested zoning can be found “consistent” and not approved, or found to be “not consistent”, but approved.)

2)  _X__ The requested zoning action **IS REASONABLE** and in the public interest because:

    (ex., may be appropriate with specific surrounding land uses; has been shown that it will not create significant new traffic beyond area roads’ capacities; creates/increases desirable use in Town.)

    The rezoning allows for a church and a proposed catering facility, which are allowed uses in the B-1 District.

    OR

    _____ The requested zoning action **IS NOT REASONABLE** and in the public interest because:

(Reasons given for a zoning request being “reasonable” or “not reasonable” are not subject to judicial review.)

Decision Date  _4/10/17_