Agenda Item: Zoning Petition 2021-734, Vanessa Elias & Bernardo Rosario, 556 W John Street. Change in Zoning from R-20 to O(CD)

TO: Matthews Planning Board Members
DATE: October 11, 2021
FROM: Nadine Bennett, Senior Planner

Background/Issue
The applicant proposes to change the zoning from R-20 to O(CD) to accommodate a law office. The current building will remain and undergo renovations.

Comments Raised at the Public Hearing(s):
Applicants were asked to provide additional notes on the site plan to address the landscaping buffer, signage, and a maximum square footage for the building. The applicants provided additional requested notes; however, changes to the site plan to accommodate the landscaping buffer have resulted in issues with the parking layout. As of the writing of this memo, the applicants have not provided a workable solution and may need to request one or more variances to accommodate the parking spaces, drive aisle, landscaping buffer, and the existing accessory structure.

Proposal/Solution
Because parking requirements have not been met at the time of this memo, Staff recommends that the decision on Zoning Petition 2021-734 be deferred until such time as the applicants either provide a site plan that meets the requirements of the ordinance or obtain one or more variances from the Board of Adjustment.

Recommended Motion/Action
If the applicants provide an updated and acceptable parking layout prior to the October 11 meeting, Staff recommends approval of Zoning Petition 2021-734, change in zoning from R-20 to O(CD) at 556 W John Street, with proposed conditions.
Matthews Board of Commissioners adopts the checked statement below:

A) _____ The requested zoning action, as most currently amended, is recommended for approval, and has been found to be CONSISTENT with the Matthews Land Use Plan (or other document(s)), as follows:

CONSISTENT: The rezoning is consistent with the land use plan because it both preserves and enhances a property in a historic part of Matthews and provides a residential style office cottage, as envisioned along John Street.

REASONABLE: The rezoning is reasonable in that it is in keeping with other uses along the corridor.

OR

B) _____ The requested zoning action, as most currently amended, is not approved, and has been found to be INCONSISTENT with the Matthews Land Use Plan (or other document(s)), as follows:

INCONSISTENT: The rezoning is inconsistent with the Land Use Plan in that this location is not currently a historic district.

NOT REASONABLE: The rezoning is not reasonable as it will create additional traffic along W. John St.

(In each case, the Statement must explain why the Board deems the action reasonable and in the public interest (more than one sentence). Reasons given for a zoning request being “consistent” or “not consistent” are not subject to judicial review.)

Date: October 11, 2021