Decision on Application 2016-655 Lidl Grocery Store at 9816 Idlewild Road

DATE: April 5, 2017
FROM: Jay Camp

Background/Issue

Planning Board recommended approval of the rezoning request on March 28th. Since the Public Hearing, the following changes have occurred to the site plan and notes:

1. The amenity at the corner has been revised and now indicates a location for a future gateway sign to be installed by the Town. An easement is to be provided to the Town.
2. The roof of the building is now slate gray.
3. Trees, shrubs and brick knee walls were added to the Idlewild Road frontage.
4. All four building facades are 49.7% brick or greater.

Proposed Solution

Although the most ideal solution for this intersection would have been a development that combined all three large parcels, the applicant has made design considerations that will allow future uses to be integrated around the project. Two stub outs to adjacent parcels are provided and cross access easements are also to be provided. The proposed building location as well as the two amenities and landscaping along Idlewild Road should create an attractive gateway into our community.

At this time, there are four outstanding issues.

1. Town Public Works has requested a midblock pedestrian crossing with center refuge on Margaret Wallace.
2. We have not received notification that the PCO Concept Plan has been approved.
3. Interior sidewalk should be provided to property lines along both stub outs.
4. The pedestrian scale lighting along the multiuse path as shown in the 3D perspectives should be included in the conditional notes.

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

Recommended Motion/Action:
Defer Application 2016-655 until May 8th so that the PCO Concept Plan can be approved by the County and the above outstanding issues are resolved.
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.)

Grocery stores are a desirable and important retail land use as they provide Town residents access to healthy and fresh foods. The development was designed in a thoughtful manner and will create an attractive gateway into our Town.

    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.)