



Zoning Committee

REQUEST	Current Zoning: R-5 (single family residential) Proposed Zoning: MUDD-O (mixed use development - optional)
LOCATION	Approximately 2.57 acres bounded by Charles Avenue, Whiting Avenue, Spencer Street, and Clemson Avenue, north of Matheson Avenue. (Council District 1 - Egleston)
PETITIONER	Revolve Residential

**ZONING COMMITTEE
ACTION/ STATEMENT
OF CONSISTENCY**

The Zoning Committee voted 4-2 to recommend DENIAL of this petition and adopt the consistency statement as follows:

This petition is found to be consistent with the following policies of the *Blue Line Extension Transit Station Area Plan* land use recommendations based on the information from the staff analysis and the public hearing, and because:

- The plan encourages a mixture of housing types; and
- The plan encourages the reuse of historic or architecturally significant structures.

However, the proposed density is inconsistent with the land use and community design policies of the *Blue Line Extension Transit Station Area Plan*, which:

- Recommends maintaining the low density residential portion of the neighborhood at up to six dwelling units per acre; and
- Supports opportunities for infill residential development with similar densities and design character as the existing mill village housing; and
- Supports moderate density as appropriate in some locations if the proposal meets the design guidance provided in the Community Design Section of the Plan.

Therefore, we find this petition to not be reasonable and not in the public interest based on information from the staff analysis and the public hearing and because:

- The proposed density of residential portions of the site (12.5 units per acre) exceeds the Plan's recommendation of six dwelling units per acre and is not of similar density or design character as the existing mill village housing; and
- The proposed residential infill does not fulfill the Community

Design Section guidance of the Plan regarding building orientation and compatible scale with the surrounding single-family neighborhood; and

- The proposed reuse of the existing church building allows an amount and intensity of nonresidential uses (including office, event/gathering/activity, and other uses as allowed in the MUDD zoning), that are not appropriate to the site's context within the existing single family neighborhood.

Motion/Second: McClung / Ham
 Yeas: Fryday, Ham, McClung, and Samuel
 Nays: McMillan and Watkins
 Absent: Gussman
 Recused: None

ZONING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

Staff provided a summary of the petition and noted that it is consistent with some of the *Blue Line Extension Transit Station Area Plan policies*. However, the petition is inconsistent with the land use and community design policies of *the Blue Line Extension Transit Station Area Plan*.

A committee member noted that the affordable housing units are off to the left and not integrated with the rest of the development and proposed single family detached dwellings. The member asked if the four affordable units will look like the other residential dwellings. Staff responded that there are architectural standards listed on the site plan, and that a city council member requested elevations for the affordable units. Another member noted that affordable units of their own character can be more affordable without deed restrictions.

A committee member asked for clarification of the permitted uses in Area B. Staff spelled out the uses listed as community recreation centers, athletic facilities, libraries, museums, cultural, galleries, art studios, event/gathering/activity, and/or co-working/shared office uses. Staff explained that the site plan contains a definition of event/gathering/activity use, which was on the previous site plan, and read out the newly revised site plan's definition of co-working/shared office use as follows: office uses with common reception, meeting, conference, break room, and other accessory areas to the offices. Private and/or individual offices are permitted as long they do not exceed 2,500 square feet and utilize the common areas listed.

A committee member noted that parking has been prohibited on one side of Whiting Avenue, and pointed out there are three smaller churches in the area. The member stated that this petition could set a precedent for redevelopment of other churches in the area by encouraging commercial growth in the area. He further state that he was not in favor of an event center at this location within the existing neighborhood.

A committee member stated that the neighborhood is accustomed to increased traffic at certain times due to the

school, and the nature of the event facility would bring more traffic into the neighborhood, which is not good. It was added that the existing church has had the ability to have programs and accessory uses but the proposed event center will be for profit and the nature of the use will encourage businesses, which will bring change to the neighborhood in terms of traffic.

Another member compared an event center and the church, and questioned the volume of increase that this will cause. A committee member stated that a church does not market its spaces as would a for-profit event center facility. Another committee member also expressed concern about the invitation of traffic volume into the neighborhood, and expressed some concern about the density, noting that affordable housing may make the increased density worth it.

A committee member asked about the feasibility of keeping the church but another committee member noted that economic viability is not a land use issue and should not be considered. The committee suspended the rules and asked the petitioner if the project would move forward if the event facility is not allowed. The petitioner's agent, Bridget Grant, responded that the event space is an integral part of the ability to preserve the building, and that institutional only uses would require more parking and a redesign of the site.

A committee member stated that the character of proposed units is not consistent with the surrounding houses, and the scale and massing of the 16 single family detached units is inappropriate. The member added that the existing building and site can be reused with other uses.

A committee member clarified that the area plan's recommended density is six units per acre, the projects proposed density is 12.5 units per acre, and that moderate density is allowed if community design standards are met. A committee member noted that there is a lot of construction in the area, adding that design of the 16 single family detached homes is consistent with what is being recreated in the neighborhood and it is ludicrous to keep it consistent with the Mill Village. Another member pointed out that existing homes in the area and Mill Village are no more than 28-30 feet and 2.5 stories in height, while the proposed 16 units are 40 feet tall and overwhelming to the area.

A committee member asked what density or number of homes would staff want to see in Area A? A committee member responded that eight units would be allowed. A member pointed out that there are some good elements and some concerns associated with the petition.

There was no further discussion of this petition.

MINORITY OPINION

The minority of the committee felt that the petition would result in preservation of the existing structure, and the addition of affordable housing. The proposed height is not a challenge, the

site meets some community design standards that would allow for more density, and the increase in traffic is not deemed that different from the existing institutional uses.

PLANNER

Sonja Sanders (704) 336-8327