

Memorandum

To: Planning Commission Members
From: Development Department
CC: Honorable Members of City Council, Clerk of Council, City Departments
Date: June 25, 2010
Re: Staff Report for JAK Properties – Preliminary Development Plan

Item #1 – JAK Properties – Preliminary Development Plan

(PID#2010005070022)

Application: Preliminary Development Plan
Location: 3722 Grove City Road
Applicant: Kevin & Kerry Ferguson
Ex. Zoning: R-2 Single Family Residential
Prp. Zoning: PUD-R (Multiple Family)
Use: Single Family Residential

Relevant Code Section(s):

- 1101.07 Submission Procedure
- 1135.10 Zoning Districts and Regulations – Residential District Requirements
- 1135.14 Planned Development District
- 1136.06 Standards for Off-street Parking Facilities

Project Summary:

The applicant has submitted a preliminary development plan for JAK Properties located on the northwest corner of Grove City Road and Elm Street. The applicant purchased the three (3) parcels composing the .645 acre site in March of 2010. The site is located in Community Reinvestment Area #3 carrying a fifteen (15) year 100 percent tax abatement on real property improvements. In April, staff met with the applicant concerning the proposed project and at that meeting was provided with detailed plans illustrating the construction of two (2) detached three-unit apartment buildings, similar to submitted plans.

Please note that the Administrative Review Letter (dated June 4, 2010) and applicant's response is based on the proposal for two (2) three unit structures with a density of 9.3 dwelling units per acre (du/ac). Since this time, the applicant has submitted revised plans proposing two different development strategies; one for the construction of two (2) three-unit apartment buildings; and another for the construction of one (1) twin single structure and use of the existing single-family structure (circa 1890).

For the purposes of this report staff considered plans for the construction of two (2) three-unit structures (*titled "JAK Properties" and contained on plan sheets SP1, A1 and A2*) as Option #1 and the twin-single and single family project (*titled "JAK Properties B" and contained on plan sheets SP2*) as Option #2.

Option #1 - Construction of two (2) three-unit structures: JAK Properties

Plan Summary:

The applicant is proposing to develop the .645 acre site with two (2) three-unit apartment structures finished in brick and connected with a breezeway. As proposed, the six (6) dwelling units equate to a density of 9.3 dwelling units per acre and are in excess of maximum code requirements. A variance will be required.

The buildings have been oriented to front Elm Street and Grove City Road and are setback 30 feet and comply with code minimums. Apartment Building "B" fronting Elm Street is setback 25.5 feet from the adjacent single-family residence to the north and, per Table 1135.10, does not comply with the code minimum of 60 feet. Additionally, the western side yard is 6.7 feet and does not comply with the minimum 60 foot setback as required when adjacent to a single-family district. Variances for both will be required and are not supported by staff due to the proposed density of 9.3 dwelling units per acre. The site is located on the fringe and is in an area of transition between the Town Center and unincorporated Jackson Township. Additionally, the site is located in an established area of single-family residences and therefore staff believes this density (multiple family land use) would be more appropriately located within the areas adjacent to the Town Center Commercial Core. One of the principles of the 2008 Town Center Plan was for the increase in density through the intensification of land and building usage to 4.03 du/ac, less than half of what is being proposed.

The applicant has proposed the construction of two (2) ranch style apartment units finished in brick with hipped roofs. It is staff's opinion that the proposed finish and roof type are incompatible with the architecture of surrounding residential structures which primarily utilize the use of wood/vinyl siding and incorporate steeper gabled roof pitches.

Access to the off-street parking area is provided off Elm Street through a single curb cut. A three-car garage and seventeen parking spaces service the six (6) units and are accessed by a single 31.5 foot drive aisle. Per Exhibit D contained with Chapter 1136, Planning Commission is charged with determining whether the vehicular use area for an A-1 and PUD-R is compatible or incompatible when adjacent to a single family residence. It would be staff's recommendation that the vehicular use area be considered incompatible due to the established densities in the surrounding area and require parking setbacks and landscape treatments to comply with Exhibit B-2, "Incompatible Land Use Side & Rear Yard Landscaping Requirements for Off-street Parking Lots" as well as all applicable code sections contained within Chapter 1136.

Option #2 - Construction of one (1) twin-single and an existing single-family structure: JAK Properties B

Plan Summary:

The applicant's alternate design is proposing the utilization of the existing house (built in 1890) as well as the construction of one (1) twin-single (ranch-style) structure setback 6.7 feet from the west property line and setback 22 feet from Grove City Road, essentially matching that of the existing single family structure. The proposed front setback does not meet the minimum distance as required by code however a variance would be supported as the proposed setback reflects that of the adjacent structure. As proposed the three (3) dwelling units would equate to a density of 4.65 dwelling units per acre. Parking would be provided for the twin-single through the construction of a two-car detached garage with capacity to accommodate eight (8) vehicles, including two (2) covered spaces, accessed off the platted 10 foot alley.

Similar to Option #1, the applicant has proposed the construction of one (1) ranch style apartment unit finished in brick with hipped roofs. As previously stated, it is staff's opinion that the proposed finish and roof type are incompatible with the architecture of surrounding residential structures which primarily utilize the use of wood/vinyl siding and incorporate steeper gabled roof pitches. Staff would recommend the applicant consider constructing a 1½- or 2-story structure to better match the existing housing stock.

Code Analysis:

Per Section 1135.14 of the Codified Ordinances of Grove City, Planning Commission is charged with reviewing and evaluating Preliminary and Final Development Plan applications by applying the eight (8) findings.

- (1) **The uses proposed will not be detrimental to present and potential surrounding uses, but will have a beneficial effect which could not be achieved under any other district.**

Option #1 - Finding Not Met: In staff's opinion the proposed density (9.3 du/ac) and use as a residential apartment complex is not compatible and would be detrimental to the surrounding single-family residential uses. As previously stated it is staff's opinion that the proposed is not compatible with the surrounding area as it does not match the existing character of typical residential driveways and does not allow a sufficient area for planting landscape screening.

Option #2 – Finding Met: In staff's opinion the proposed density (4.65 du/ac) and use as a two-family residence is more compatible with the existing character of the area. Additionally, staff is supportive of retaining the existing residence which according to the auditor was constructed in 1890. Staff would further recommend the applicant take this opportunity to restore some of its original qualities, such as the front porch. While the site (or its subdivision) is not contained within the defined boundaries of the Town Center, the "Beulah Park Neighborhood" remains an integral part of the health of the Town Center as well as the plan's overriding vision of creating a "Great Urban Neighborhood." Therefore it's staff's opinion that the proposed use and intensity conforms to the principles of the Town Center Plan.

- (2) **Any exception from Zoning Code (Ordinance C79-74, passed January 20, 1975) requirements is warranted by the design and amenities incorporated in the Development Plan.**

Option #1 - Finding Not Met: In staff's opinion the proposed design of the residential units and site configuration do not warrant any exception from the Zoning Code. As submitted, the proposed development does not meet the area requirements of the A-1 district (as set forth in Table 1135.14 – PUD-R, Multiple Family) in terms of side/rear setbacks, density and in staff's opinion parking setbacks.

Option #2 - Finding Could Be Met: In staff's opinion the proposed design of the two-family residential structure would not warrant any exceptions from the Zoning Code and therefore, as previously noted, it is recommend that the applicant consider constructing a 1½- or 2-story structure finished in wood or a combination of wood and brick as well as utilizing a roof pitch of 6/12 or steeper for the main roof and accented with gabled ends. As stated above this site and surrounding neighborhood is tied to the Town Center and therefore should meet the intent of the Town Center Plan. Therefore it is staff recommendation that any proposed structure as well as any rehabilitation of the existing structure focus on its physical form and compatibility with the architecturally significant (existing) housing stock.

- (3) **Land surrounding the proposed development can be planned in coordination with the proposed development and that it is compatible in use.**

Option #1 - Finding Not Met: The proposed complex is surrounded by existing single family uses with little surrounding developable land. Additionally, the area is primarily comprised of individual owners reducing the likelihood of land assemblage for any future large scale development. Therefore it is staff's opinion that the land surrounding the proposed development could not be planned in coordination with the proposed development and as previously noted the proposed development is not compatible with the character of the existing single family lot area.

Option #2 - Finding Could Be Met: The area requirements for D-1 and D-2 (Doubles, Duplexes and Twins) are treated in a similar manner as existing single-family structures with comparable yard area/setback requirements. This application, if modified from a PUD-R (Multiple Family) to PUD-R (Single Family and Two Family), would allow for similar developments to occur in the surrounding area

on the smaller existing lots which can be found through the "Beulah Park Neighborhood." Staff believes this type of land use pattern is appropriate and consistent with the intent of the Town Center Plan.

- (4) **The proposed change to a Planned Unit Development District is in conformance with the general use intent of the area.**

Option #1 - Finding Not Met: The proposed development is not in conformance with the general use intent of the area which is single family residential (in both municipal and township jurisdictions). As noted above the proposed density (9.3 du/ac) is more than twice that of what is noted within the Town Center Plan (4.03 du/ac). Additionally, the site is located in an area of transition between the Town Center and unincorporated Jackson Township and therefore does not believe it is appropriate or in conformance with the general use intent of the area.

Option #2 - Finding Could Be Met: The proposed development could meet the intent of the area (single family) as well as the intent of the Town Center Plan if the two-family structure is designed in a manner to match the architecture of the significant housing stock.

- (5) **Existing and proposed streets are suitable and adequate to carry anticipated traffic within the proposed district and in the vicinity of the proposed district.**

Option #1 - Finding Met: The proposed site is located on an existing street capable of handling anticipated traffic levels.

Option #2 - Finding Met: The proposed site is located on an existing street capable of handling anticipated traffic levels.

- (6) **Existing and proposed utility services are adequate for the proposed development.**

Option #1 - Finding Met: The proposed site has existing utility service adequate for the proposed development.

Option #2 - Finding Met: The proposed site has existing utility service adequate for the proposed development.

- (7) **Each phase of the proposed development, as it is proposed to be completed contains the required parking spaces, landscape and utility areas necessary for creating and sustaining a desirable and stable environment.**

Option #1 - Finding Not Met: As submitted and in the opinion of staff the proposed development does not contain sufficient landscaping to create and/or sustain a desirable and stable environment.

Option #2 - Finding Could Be Met: As submitted and in the opinion of staff the proposed development could contain sufficient landscaping, parking and utilities to create and/or sustain a desirable and stable environment.

- (8) **The proposed Planned Unit Development District and all proposed buildings, parking spaces and landscape and utility areas can be completely developed within seven years of the establishment of the district, unless otherwise provided for by Council.**

Option #1 - Finding Met: The proposed project, including the building, parking, landscaping, and utility areas could be completely developed within seven years.

Option #2 - Finding Met: The proposed project, including the building, parking, landscaping, and utility areas could be completely developed within seven years.

Recommendation(s):

After review and consideration the Development Department recommends the Planning Commission makes recommendation of approval for the preliminary development plan for JAK Properties B, the construction of one (1) two-family structure and the preservation of the existing single family structure as shown on plan sheet SP2 (dated May 5, 2010), with the stipulations noted below.

1. The applicant shall work with Development Department staff to draft development standards text and shall incorporate the intent and principles of the Town Center Plan with regard to the form, architecture and area requirements.
2. The application should be amended to reflect a request for PUD-R (Two Family and Single Family).