

Decision on Application 2016-659 Matthews Corners

DATE: April 5, 2017

FROM: Jay Camp

Background/Issue

Planning Board recommended approval of the request on March 28th with the recommendation that a stop sign be added to one of the drive aisles near Marshalls and that the Academy Sports building have an average of 50% brick on both facades. The applicant agreed to both requests.

Since the Public Hearing, the following substantial changes have occurred to the site plan and building elevations:

1. The applicant has agreed to striping for a left turn lane and the installation of a midblock pedestrian crossing with some sidewalk along Northeast Parkway. A fee in lieu option is also proposed at the discretion of the Town.
2. The future retail building was increased from 8,000 to 10,000 square feet.
3. Additional landscaping is shown along Northeast Parkway.
4. New parking lot trees will benefit from a watering program that may include slow watering bags or a similar approach to ensure tree survival.
5. The existing striped pedestrian walkway will be replaced with a 6' raised concrete sidewalk and 4' planter to provide a safer pedestrian facility and to better direct traffic flow.

Proposed Solution

Staff has no outstanding concerns with the rezoning request.

Related Town Goal(s) and/or Strategies:

Quality of Life

Economic Development/Land Use Planning

Recommended Motion/Action:

Approve application 2016-659.

**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 proposed changes to this major shopping area create a more attractive retail destination with desirable new businesses and will improve the visual appeal of the aging shopping center.

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