

## **\*PRE-HEARING STAFF ANALYSIS\***

### **Rezoning Petition No. 2008-67**

<b>Property Owner:</b>	Sharon Arms Apartments, LLC
<b>Petitioner:</b>	Colwick Medical Partners, LLC
<b>Location:</b>	Approximately 1.7 acres on the east side of Colwick Road between Chiswick Road and Greenwich Road.
<b>Center, Corridor, or Wedge:</b>	Wedge
<b>Request:</b>	O-2 (office), to NS (neighborhood services)

### **Summary**

This petition seeks approval for up to 31,125 square feet of medical office use and up to 10,375 square feet of neighborhood retail services. This includes all uses permitted in the B-1 (neighborhood business) district. A total of 159 parking spaces are provided, including on-street parking.

### **Consistency and Conclusion**

The proposed office development is not consistent with the *South District Plan*. However, the site has long-standing O-2 zoning, is surrounded by other office uses along Colwick Road, and does not abut existing single-family residential development. Because the proposed medical office use is consistent with its surroundings and the existing zoning, it is considered appropriate. However, the proposed neighborhood business uses are inconsistent with the plan and cannot be supported. In addition, the amount of parking proposed is inadequate. Staff can only support this petition if the parking ratio is increased and the potential business uses are removed from the petition.

### **Existing Zoning and Land Use**

To the north is an office building zoned O-2. To the east is an elementary school in the R-3 district. Another office building is to the south in O-2 zoning. Across Colwick Road to the west is a combination of office and commercial uses in the B-1 district.

### **Rezoning History in Area**

The Cotswold shopping center was reconfigured with a rezoning to CC (commercial center) in 2006.

## **Public Plans and Policies**

The *South District Plan* (1993) recommends multi-family residential for most of the east side of Colwick Road. Office use is recommended at the southern end of the block. Commercial uses are recommended west of Colwick Road.

## **Proposed Request Details**

The site plan accompanying this petition contains the following provisions:

Fifty-six of the 159 parking spaces (35.2%) are compact spaces.

The proposed building is three stories in height. Elevations are included as part of the site plan.

Outdoor lighting will be full cut-off and will not exceed 25 feet in height.

Uses permitted in the neighborhood services (NS) district are all of the uses allowed in the B-1 district, including but not limited to restaurants, a wide variety of retail uses, offices, day labor service agency, or child care center.

## **Public Infrastructure**

**Traffic Impact / CDOT Comments.** CDOT estimates that trips generated from the site would increase from the existing 250 to approximately 1500. CDOT is requesting a ten-foot bike/pedestrian connection through the site from Colwick Road to the elementary school.

**CATS.** CATS did not comment on this petition. There is local bus service on Colwick Road.

**Connectivity.** This site is in a developed area. CDOT is requesting a pedestrian access through the site to the elementary school.

**Storm Water.** The petitioner has agreed to “provide storm water detention and water quality treatment on the site”. Their note should specify that they will comply with the adopted Post Construction Control Ordinance even though that ordinance does not become effective until July 1, 2008.

**School Information.** This non-residential request will not add students to the school system.

## **Outstanding Issues**

**Land Use.** The proposed office development is not consistent with the *South District Plan*. However, the site has long-standing O-2 zoning, is surrounded by other office uses along Colwick Road, and does not abut existing single-family residential development. Because the proposed office use is consistent with its surroundings and the existing zoning, the proposed medical office use is considered appropriate.

However, the potential extension of commercial uses east of Colwick Road is not supported by adopted plans and policies and cannot be supported by the staff.

**Site plan.** The site plan accompanying this petition contains the following deficiencies:

In most zoning districts the minimum amount of parking for medical office is one space per 200 square feet of gross floor area (or 5 spaces per 1,000 square feet of floor area). For the proposed 31,125 square feet of medical office in this petition the necessary parking would be 156 spaces. Since none of the uses permitted in the NS district are excluded on this site plan we can only estimate the additional parking needed for the “NS uses”. A reasonable example would be a 5,000 square foot restaurant and 5,375 square feet of “other business uses”. These uses would generate the need for an additional 62 spaces - a total of 218 spaces. With only 159 spaces provided there is a 27.1% deficiency in needed parking.

Staff has sought to find an up-to-date parking demand ratio for medical office buildings based on empirical studies. The Institute of Transportation Engineers conducted a study in 2007 and found that a parking ratio of 4.5 spaces per 1,000 square feet of medical office floor area would meet parking demands 85% of the time. Staff is willing to use this ratio. It results in an overall parking demand of 202 spaces on this project and a supply of 159 - a 21.3% deficiency.

There is no open space or tree save area proposed on this site. An open space area consisting of existing trees, an employee break area, water quality rain gardens, or similar amenities are needed on the site.

On-street parallel parking must be a minimum of 22 feet in length and must be at least 20 feet from all driveways. The on-street parking proposed does not meet these standards. Complying with these standards will result in the loss of two parking spaces from those shown on the site plan.

The “potential connection for shared parking” noted on the site plan needs to be modified. Since the uses on both sites are predominantly the same, “sharing” would probably not be allowed. Alternatively, a long term lease could allow additional off-site parking.

Note #9 needs to clarify that this development will comply with the Post Construction Controls Ordinance.