

FORM-BASED CODE COMMITTEE

MINUTES

March 9, 2017

The duly advertised meeting of the Form-Based Code Committee was held on March 9, 2017, at 2:00 p.m. at the Development Resource Center, Conference Room 1A. John Straussberger called the meeting to order. Angela Wallace called the roll and swore in all those who would be addressing the Committee. John Straussberger explained the rules of procedure and announced that the meeting is being recorded.

Members Present: David Barlew, Jason Havron, William Smith, Grace Frank, Heidi Hefferlin, Gabe Thomas, Ladell Peoples and John Straussberger

Members Absent: Matthew Whitaker

Staff Members Present: Karen Hundt, Angela Wallace and Phil Noblet

Applicants Present: David Barlew, Ethan Collier and Tom Marshall

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

OLD BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

David Barlew recused himself from the Committee

Case #17-FB-00003 – 504 Spring Street

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The applicant, David Barlew, Jr., has applied for the following modifications:

- Building Height from 50' to 50'6"
- Transparency from 50% to 19%
- Parking variance from 30' to 0'

Karen Hundt presented the PowerPoint presentation and staff report.

Discussion: David Barlew, Jr. addressed the Committee. The site is so steep and we want to fit the building on the site so will not need large retaining walls and substantial earth work. We are trying to maintain the curb cut that is already there and that is what necessitates the extra 6". Since the ground floor will be parking, we thought less transparency would look better. William – What is the slope? David – The slope rises dramatically, I don't know the percentage off the top

of my head. Heidi – When you looked at the transparency what else is on the street? David – A mechanical contractors building and residential bungalow houses. There really isn't a lot of context in this area. John – When I have come across this situation, some people feel it is creepy to have little transparency in the parking garage. What amount of transparency could you reach if you opened it up more? Heidi – I think it would be better to have more transparency. David – At this point we really haven't explored that avenue. I was trying to match the higher floors. John – It seems to me that you could reach the 35% level fairly easily. William – The 30' setback isn't what is usual for a store type building. David – Yes but there are no plans for anything like that here. Jason – Are there any structures behind this building that will lose their view? David – No. That is where the trailers are.

Community Comments: None

John – What percentage of transparency are you comfortable with? Could you do 40%? David – I think so. I thought we would do some type of screened opening. I was trying to keep the look consistent with the other floors. The openings are the same size as the residential window openings. Neighborhood association meeting was held but no one showed up. Sign in sheet was turned in.

Heidi made a motion to approve Case #17-FB-00003 – 504 Spring 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: increase setback, increase building height to 50'6"; reduce transparency to 40% only.

Ladell seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

David Barlew rejoined the Committee

Case #17-FB-00004 – Peak and 729 N. Market Street

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The applicant, Ethan Collier, has applied for the following modification:

- Variance of protected zone from 10' to 0'

Karen Hundt presented the PowerPoint presentation and staff report. Please mention the landscape buffer in the motion. Property is zoned residential attached, applicant is building residential detached.

Discussion: Ethan Collier addressed the Committee: The primary issue is driven by the fact that we are zoned for a 3 story townhouse. We are building 2 story detached homes. We are moving the building closer. The protected zone I'm not sure what it entails. We are not putting a driveway but we are putting a sidewalk. The alley and the driveway would come into that protected zone. The protected zone requires landscaping and fence but no paving. These houses sit such that we would have paving (sidewalk, patio and driveway) that would come into the protected zone. There isn't a protected zone between single family houses in the neighboring area. Since we are building detached houses limited to 2 stories, I don't think they should be there. Jason – At the neighborhood meeting, there was a motion passed in support of Ethan's plan. We

would like to have single family dwellings in this area. John – The garages are at the bottom of the plan. This site is next to a R1 zone. Karen – The idea of the protected zone is that the people in the downtown area were afraid of large buildings coming next to them. So we created the protected zone so it would not be overshadowing the existing residents. Heidi – So instead of rezoning, he is requesting a variance. Ethan – The way FBC is written, we can't do this type of development. So we are forced in order to do this lot size to have detached homes. You can't build this in FBC. We are building the exact same thing under TRZ. Karen – The edits coming before the City Council would allow this type development.

Community Comments: None

John (asked Phil) - If a motion is made, is it tied to this development? Phil – Yes. Ethan – Some of these will have rooftop terraces. While there is no dwelling on a 3rd floor, there is a stair tower that penetrates the roof. Karen – If there is a roof over any part of it would constitute a 3rd floor.

David – If you are going to have roof top terraces, why not get rid of the patios and that part of the driveway? Ethan – Because we can't do the driveways if we do not have that portion. All the houses we have built in this neighborhood have the driveway right up to the property line.

Jason made a motion to approve Case #17-FB-00004 – Peak and 729 N. Market 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: buildings will be single family detached homes, elimination of the protected zone and the landscape buffer zone.

Grace seconded the motion. The motion was 7 approved. 1 opposed (David) 1 recused (Gabe) from vote

Case #17-FB-00005 – 801 Pine Street

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The applicant, Tom Marshall, has applied for the following modification:

- Setback variance for sign from 18' to 0'

Karen Hundt presented the PowerPoint presentation and staff report.

Discussion: Tom Marshall addressed the Committee: Traffic flow dictates where the sign is. This is where the entrance is for visitors and it will have a valet service here. There is about 10' of sidewalk and protected area between the sign and the road. There are no obstructions for traffic concerns.

Community Comments: None

Karen – I checked with the Department of Transportation and they did not have a problem with this. Tom – There are no neighborhood associations in this area. Gabe – The dashed line is the right-of-way line? Tom – Yes. Gabe – Is there any other location you could put the sign? Tom – Not really. Location is due to directing people from out of town and also the use of the valet parking. This will be the only parking service at this hotel.

David made a motion to approve Case #17-FB-00005 – 801 Pine 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: none

William seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

OTHER BUSINESS

6 month amendments – RPA will be presenting the edits to Planning Commission on Monday, March 13 at 1:00. The proposed amendments are on the RPA website. If Planning Commission approves, it will go to City Council.

NEXT MEETING DATE: April 13, 2017

Jason made a motion to adjourn.

David seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:55 pm.

John Straussberger, Chair

Angela Wallace, Secretary