Agenda Item: Administrative Amendment – Windsor Square

TO: Town of Matthews Board of Commissioners
FROM: Darin Hallman, Planner
DATE: June 14, 2021

Background/Issue:

Per Rezoning Application 2011-580, the Windsor Square shopping center was approved under conditional zoning (B-1SCD). Elevation standards were approved as part of the rezoning for the former JC Penny store. This is currently the only store with required elevations.

Proposal/Solution

At-Home, the new tenant, seeks to make minor changes to the front architecture and add a small pull-off lane for customer pick-up orders. The elevation changes include making the entrance more symmetrical, and adding two “peaks”. Some of the materials and colors are being altered from the original design. The pick-up area would involve cutting into the existing concrete area.

The maximum height for the site is 50 feet. The structure is under that with a maximum point of 46 feet.

One point of discussion from Planning Board was that some type of indicator should be provided noting the direction of traffic.

Financial Impact

None

Related Town Goal

Economic Development/Land Use Planning

Recommended Action

Discuss and approve the At-Home elevations and site plan layout.
STATEMENT OF CONSISTENCY WITH LOCAL ADOPTED GROWTH POLICIES
Final Decisions on Zoning-Related Issues

ZONING APPLICATION # ______________________________
ZONING MOTION # ______________________________
ADMINISTRATIVE AMENDMENT ______ Windsor Square

Matthews Planning Board adopts the checked statement below:

A)  X 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 changes are consistent with the Land Use plan as it promotes non-residential, destination-based land uses along US-74

REASONABLE: These changes are reasonable. The proposed zoning changes do not significantly impact the intent of the original rezoning.

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 changes are inconsistent with the Land Use Plan as the proposal does not prohibit expansion of impulse/commercial land uses along US-74.

NOT REASONABLE: The changes are not reasonable as it does significantly impact the intent of the original rezoning.

(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: June 14, 2021
Current Site Plan & Elevations