

FORM-BASED CODE COMMITTEE

MINUTES

May 11, 2017

The duly advertised meeting of the Form-Based Code Committee was held on May 11, 2017, at 2:00 p.m. at the Development Resource Center, Conference Room 1A. John Straussberger called the meeting to order. Angela S. Wallace called the roll and swore in all those who would be addressing the Committee. John Straussberger explained the rules of procedures and announced that the meeting is being recorded.

Members Present: David Barlew, Jason Havron, William Smith, Grace Frank, Heidi Hefferlin, Matthew Whitaker and John Straussberger

Members Absent: Gabe Thomas, Ladell Peoples

Staff Members Present: Karen Hundt, Angela Wallace

Applicants Present: John Wise, Pat Neuhoff, and Phil Whitfield

Jason made a motion to approve the Minutes from the April meeting. The motion was seconded by David and unanimously approved.

OLD BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

Case #17-FB-00008 – 13 W. Kent Street

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The applicant, John Wise, has applied for the following modifications:

- Sign Setback from 18 feet to 0 feet

Karen Hundt presented the PowerPoint presentation and staff report.

Discussion: Chris Blevins for John Wise addressed the Committee. We want to put a monument sign in the island. Matt – Where is the right of way line? Chris – I do not know. William – They are now asking to change to a monument sign? Karen – I talked to him and he said he would switch it. There is no modification needed for a monument sign. All we have to consider is the setback. Heidi – There is no diagram showing where the sign will be. John S. – It is not clear because it does not show the property line or the right of way.

Community Comments: None

William – We should not even look at this because there is not complete information. John – We can approve, deny or defer. Karen – I should have realized that he had not submitted a correct site plan.

Matt made a motion to defer Case #17-FB-00008 – 13 W. Kent Street as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Section 38-596(4) and pursuant to the Form-Based Code, subject to any and all conditions. Conditions: need information showing footprint of sign and right of way line.

Heidi seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

Case #17-FB-00009 – 513 W. Manning Street

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The applicant, Pat Neuhoff for John & Lauren Hollingsworth has applied for the following modifications:

- Parking variance from 30 feet to 0 feet
- Setbacks from 0-20 feet to 8-30 feet
- Primary street frontage from 60% to 12%
- Pedestrian entrance does not face the primary street
- Delete intentional public or pedestrian activity space in setback
- Curb cuts from 0 to 1 on primary street

Karen Hundt presented the PowerPoint presentation and staff report.

Sarah Cook w/CDOT - The alley is 12.5 feet wide and is not enough for a curb cut. We can work with the applicant to get the alley entrance to work and be within the code.

Discussion: Pat Neuhoff addressed the Committee. We have a lot that slopes almost 20 feet. The entrance we propose is the original entrance for the home that was there previously. This is where it fits the best. This is on the highest and flattest part of the lot. All the things we are requesting are dictated by the topography of the site. The alley is actually on the owner's property. I think the alley is more like 10 feet and there is a telephone pole there. To put the entrance where the alley is, we would have to move the alley to the right of way which is a steep drop off and move the telephone pole. The grade from where the alley is to the property is very steep. We have added some interior landscaping to offset the perimeter landscaping. On Winchester side there are steps existing and it is very steep.

Community Comments: Matthew Smith - I own the property behind this. There is not going to be a new curb cut in the alley? The sidewalk area at the front of the primary street will it still be there? John - There would be a sidewalk and a green space and then the parking. So the existing sidewalk will still be there. Matthew Smith – What will the scrubs be? Pat – The lot to the left is owned by the applicant so Matthew's lot is to the back of it.

Heidi – The intent of the code is to transition to a more densified property. It looks like you are asking for modifications to everything. Most of the city has an issue with topography. It appears to me you could have positioned your building differently. Pat – We looked at trying to put it in other locations but the topography is a problem. We would have ended up with a 15 foot retaining wall. I think this is a good alternative to the requirements of the code. Without these modifications the owner cannot

develop this. Heidi – I disagree. You could step the building or not put it all against that lot line. Pat – This building needs to be on one level. William – You identified 3 things and the staff then identified 6 things to modify. What is here is not in your application. When you change the application in the process, then it is not presented to the neighborhood association meetings. Pat – The site plan and the elevations shown to the neighborhood associations were the same as what is presented here today. John – I do not think the changes in the application are significant enough to make a difference. Matt – I agree with Heidi. I think you could have changed the location of the building and have a small retaining wall and minimize the work to be done and that would get you closer to the intent of the code. Pat – I think that would require a series of retaining walls. We have a new code and we did our best by adding more landscaping and orienting the building in the best place. We feel it is an acceptable solution. John – Your density is pretty large. You have a lot of asphalt. The building footprint would be about 3000 sq. ft. Then the total would be about 4500. So the total parking requirement would be 8 spaces. John – What is the upstairs use? Pat – Residential. John – Did you consider using the lot next to it? Pat – No. David – I agree with Heidi and Matt. Last month I presented a site very similar to this and designed a plan that was agreeable to FBC.

Heidi – I do disagree with the application and this is replacing a residential building with a commercial building and they are including more parking than is required. I cannot support it. Jason – the telephone pole is a major concern for access to this site. If the pole wasn't there he could use it easier.

Heidi made a motion to deny Case #17-FB-00009 – 513 W. Manning Street as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Section 38-596(4) and pursuant to the Form-Based Code, subject to any and all conditions. Conditions: lack of hardship and lack of intention to comply with FBC.

William seconded the motion. The motion was approved with 5 yes and 2 no (Jason & Grace).

Case #17-FB-00010 – 1823 Rossville Avenue

John S. recused himself from this case.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The applicant, Phil Whitfield for 1823 Partners LLC has applied for the following modifications:

- Primary Street Setback from 15 feet to 25 feet
- Side Street Setback from 15 feet to 155 feet (existing parking lot)
- Decrease lot frontage on side street from 15 feet to 155 feet
- Building Height from 2 story to 1 story
- Landscape Parking Islands from every 5 spaces to every 10 spaces
- Decrease width of perimeter planting from 6 feet to 2 feet in 2 locations

Karen Hundt presented the PowerPoint presentation and staff report. This is an addition of 2 one-story buildings.

Karna Levitt – This seemed to be a good plan submittal. They did take out some islands but included the trees in the perimeter. Heidi – Are you ok with this? Karna – They have not paved every inch of this lot. They have left substantial coverage. Matt – The Council is looking at changing the code but this would still not meet that new requirement.

Discussion: Phil Whitfield addressed the Committee. Karen did an excellent job in describing the plan. This site has created some issues for us. Currently everything on the site is paved. There was an active railway east of this property and part of the existing building abuts that railway. They wanted to create some outdoor space for the office. There actually will be between 200-250 people working in this building. We are providing 80 spaces at this point. The owners have agreements with adjacent owners to share some parking spaces. That is why we eliminated the islands. We felt we could put some outdoor space at the entrance on Rossville Avenue. We have reused the existing parking areas and changed to landscaping. We wanted to have a separation between the hardscape area in the back and the railroad. We looked at a 2 story building and functionally it didn't work. We have a covered porch on the Rossville Avenue side of the building (the front). We have a small place on the front of the building that faces Washington. We have the 100 year flood area on the site facing Washington Street. We are planting about 70 trees on the site.

Community Comments: Longione – I live in this area. We are asking for more information to us in the adjacent community about these projects. Parking is a problem in the south side. Was this plan presented to the neighborhood associations earlier? Where is the parking going to be? I would like for the announcement of these meetings be put on the city calendar.

Phil – The project was well received at the neighborhood association meeting. We will have 250 people working but they will not be there all the time. This is Keller Williams and they have 25 offices across town. They may all be there at most once a month and they will use the shared parking they have with neighboring businesses.

Karen – We are trying to get the calendar on the city calendar. It just takes some time.

David – Where is the primary entrance? Karen – Right off Rossville Avenue. Phil – We also have an entrance on Washington Street. We do have bike parking. David – Can people walk to the entrance on Rossville? Phil – They can park on the street and walk in. Heidi – There are a lot of difficulties with this site. They are working with an existing building. David – I don't see why they have to do away with the landscape islands since they have additional parking. Matt – With the change from 5 to 10 spaces, I don't see why they have to lose all the parking islands. Following the new requirements they would only need 5 islands. Some of the trees they have proposed to use are not going to look good or live well in this plan. William – If you meet the islands every 10 spaces then you don't need to reduce the size of the islands. What is the reason for reducing the size of the islands? Phil – It was so they would work in the parking layout. The plant types are being changed. Karna – If you get the reduction from 13 to 9 feet, this plan would not change. The size of the islands relates to the root growth and the shade potential of the tree. The goal is also to get more soil use. Heidi – Can you provide those islands and still get your parking?

Matt made a motion to approve Case #17-FB-00010 – 1823 Rossville Avenue as submitted pursuant to the Chattanooga City Code, Section 38-596(4) and pursuant to the Form-Based Code, subject to any and all conditions. Conditions: that the landscape islands meet the new requirement set by City Council (1 island every 10 spaces);

1 Approved - because complexity of the site, added pedestrian space on street the building has 2 street lot frontages

2 Eliminated not needed

3 Approved - adding to and using an existing building

4 Approved - using an existing building

5 Approved - using an existing building

6 Approved - there were obstructions in the right of way and were moved inside the property line

7 Approved - there were obstructions in the right of way and were moved inside the property line

8 Approved - but applicant must meet updated tree island requirement (island every 10 parking spaces)

9 Approved - because of restraints on site and the landscape median will allow for soil integration with adjacent islands

10 Approved - same as 9

Grace seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

John S. rejoined the Committee.

OTHER BUSINESS

NEXT MEETING DATE: June 8, 2017

Heidi made a motion to adjourn.

Jason second the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

John Straussberger, Chair

Angela S. Wallace, Secretary