PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
MONDAY, JUNE 13, 2016
6:00 P.M.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS:	Chairperson Eric Woolridge, Vice-Chairperson Greg Simmons, Caroline Catoe, Michelle Dineen, Susan McCracken, Matthew Long, Matthew Vincent, Cameron Lippard, Charlie Myers and Jeff Templeton
PLANNING STAFF:	Bill Bailey-Planning Director, Jane Shook-Planning Supervisor, Brian Johnson-Urban Design Specialist and Marlene Crosby-Board Secretary

Chairperson Woolridge called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Member Lippard made a motion to accept the agenda as presented, seconded by Member Long.

Vote:

Aye – All
Nay - None

The motion is unanimous.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Member Lippard made a motion to approve the May 2, 2016 Quarterly Public Hearing minutes, seconded by Member Myers.

Vote:

Aye – All
Nay - None

The motion is unanimous.

Member Templeton made a motion to approve the May 9, 2016, Planning Commission minutes as amended with two changes, seconded by Member Dineen.

Vote:

Aye – All
Nay - None

The motion is unanimous.

<u>CASE 20160266 Landscape Contractor</u>: Amend UDO Subsection 31.12.01 regarding landscape contractors.

Mr. Bill Bailey, Director of Planning and Inspections Department explained that the proposed draft changes brings the UDO into compliance with recently amended state statutes.

Mr. Brian Johnson, Urban Design Specialist explained the language was similar to the language for general contractor's work over $30,000. He said this is specific to landscape work.

Vice-Chairperson Simmons confirmed that labor and material costs are included in the $30,000.

Discussion ensued on the types' of landscaping projects which would likely trigger the requirement to use a licensed landscape contractor.

Mr. Johnson talked about the bond that is carried with the contractor's license; he said it is good to have if there are ever any complaints made against the contractor's work. He talked about the number of contractor's that have gotten their license. Member Long said he knew of some contractor's that had gotten their license.

First motion and vote:
Member Lippard made a motion, seconded by Member Vincent that the proposed amendment to the Town's zoning ordinance is consistent with the Towns comprehensive plan and other applicable plans of the Town which relate to this application because it brings the UDO language in alignment with current NC statutes requirements concerning the licensure of a landscape contractor.

Vote:

Aye – All
Nay – None

The vote was unanimous.

Second Motion and Vote: Member Lippard made a motion, seconded by Member Vincent that the Planning Commission recommends approval because the text amendment brings the UDO language in alignment with NC statutes.

Vote:

Aye – All
Nay – None

The vote was unanimous.

<u>CASE 20160275 Marketplace Planned Development – Zoning Map Amendment</u> John Winkler with The Winkler Organization has filed a Zoning Map amendment Petition for a planned development consisting of a mixed-use building containing both residential and commercial uses, including a parking deck for properties located at or near 783 West King Street (Watauga Co. PINs: 2900-79-7562-000 & 2900-79-6480-000).

Mr. Bailey presented this case as outlined in the meeting packet. He noted the applicant has made revisions to the proposed plans as a result concerns stated at the June 6, 2016 special public hearing.

Discussion ensued as to whether the public hearing was still open. The meeting continued with the public hearing considered open.

Chairperson Woolridge explained that the floor would be open to public comment after Mr. Davis gave his presentation on the plan revisions.

Mr. Jim Deal, Attorney for the applicant summarized the revisions that are reflected in the proposed plans and Mr. Brent Davis from Brent Davis Architecture handed out revised plans and elevations (permanently attached) and reviewed each of the revisions.

Mr. Davis said the compact parking spaces have been re-calculated to address the people's concern regarding the ease of getting in and out of their vehicles. In the re-calculation the compact parking widths changed to 8' 8"to 9 feet wide. Mr. Deal said that he estimates around 15 parking spaces were lost in the revision of the plan. Mr. Deal said it dropped their estimated parking to 350 spaces from 367 spaces. Mr. Deal the engineers would have to determine where the support columns would need to be placed which may cause a further reduction in parking spaces.

Mr. Davis presented the following changes:

King Street: The windows closest to Murphy's have been modified to be folding doors which would open the space on the street. Other folding windows were added. Mr. Davis noted that the "arrows" as shown on the plan indicate that the windows and doors could be opened. Mr. Davis noted that the lobby had been narrowed to provide additional room to the restaurant spaces on either side of the lobby. Mr. Davis explained that there were options for steps down into the commercial spaces due to the change of grade along the sidewalk. Mr. Davis further described the potential for outdoor seating at the corner of King Street and Water Street at the 45 degree angle portion of the building.

Water Street: Mr. Davis noted the addition of windows and doors similar to those on King Street.

On the Howard Street elevation, Chairperson Woolridge asked the width of the door going into the restaurant. Mr. Davis said the width is five feet.

On the King Street elevation, Member McCracken asked why the entrance to the commercial tenant on the right was on the side of the building.

Mr. Davis said there was a request to put it on the side. Chairperson Woolridge explained that the original plans showed a main entry into the building a lobby. He said that he requested entry off of another street.

Discussion ensued on the location of the doors on King Street for the restaurants. Mr. Davis said there will be more planning for the restaurant entry depending on what the tenant will want for the restaurant. Mr. Davis said the revision on King Street opened up about 70 percent of the linear footage of this side of building for the restaurant.

Member Catoe asked, if you include parking, what is the square footage of the commercial area. Mr. Davis said it is 30,000 square feet.

On the King Street side, Mr. Davis explained how they made a change to the parking deck entrance that gained square footage to the building.

Chairperson Woolridge asked if the entrance to the building will be off of Water Street. Mr. Davis said yes. Mr. John Winkler, the applicant for this project, explained that they removed the big lobby opening on King Street based off of a request to remove it.

Chairperson Woolridge if there were other comments regarding the redesign of the proposed project.

Member Vincent asked about the parking spaces. Mr. Winkler gave a breakdown of the parking spaces, he said that 210 spaces have been allotted for long term monthly spaces and 140 have been allotted for hourly parking spaces for a total of 350 spaces. Mr. Winkler explained the cost of the parking deck is around $5 to $6 million dollars and there will be a ten percent deposit needed prior to construction of the parking deck. Mr. Deal said the tenants will have to pay for their parking. Mr. Deal said another part of it is the restaurant customer and staff parking is taking into consideration.

Discussion ensued on the changes to the original lobby area off of King Street to a hallway which now would lead to the parking deck and the residential units.

Chairperson Woolridge asked Mr. Davis what their thoughts were on signage for the building. Mr. Davis said that they created the sign bands to help with sign options on the building and to break up the look of the building.

Chairperson Woolridge said he felt that good well-planned signage is important and wanted to suggest that all the retail or restaurant signage be projecting signs.

Mr. Deal said that signage could this be placed as a condition on the proposed project. Mr. Bailey said if the applicant deviates from the current ordinance, there would need to be a recommendation made for it. Mr. Bailey pointed out that the Council could make a different recommendation on it.

Mr. Deal noted that they have a deviation on the square footage for wall signs.

Discussion ensued on different types of signage and adding dimension and character to the building. Member Lippard said he does not want to see the signage making it look like a government building.

Member McCracken asked about the previous main hall lobby door and noted that the entry way was more open than what is currently being proposed. She asked if the commission needed to discuss the change in door width at this meeting. Member Lippard said it was the consensus of the commission to not have the main entrance look like an interior mall. Mr. Deal said the revised change to the main hallway entry is a direct result of what the commission said they wanted to see at the June 2016 special public hearing. Member McCracken said she liked the idea of having a lobby because of the winter weather and she noted that she liked the idea of giving the entry a more welcome feel. Mr. Deal said you would have to take into consideration the loss of square footage for restaurant seating.

Discussion ensued on the type of entry way into the main hallway. Mr. Davis said he could make a change to the double doors off of the street.

Mr. Bailey explained the process for recommendations that should be followed so the Council can see what has been done.

Discussion ensued on how the King Street hallway functioned for ADA compliance.

Chairperson Woolridge noted it was the consensus of the commission to recommend projecting signs on the proposed building.

Discussion ensued on awnings. Mr. Johnson said that some people like awnings and some people do not like them. Mr. Johnson said the purpose of awnings is to provide protection from the weather. Mr. Johnson talked about the maintenance issues from the Public Works standpoint concerning the awnings. Mr. Johnson said the Community Appearance Commission supports the use of awnings.

Member Lippard said he feels like the Downtown area needs architectural style in their signage and awnings. He said the tenant would hopefully have some stylistic ideas that will make the building pop.

Vice-Chairperson Simmons talked about the possibility of a tenant using a structural awning.

Mr. Davis talked about identifying entrances into the proposed building, he said he would be glad to look at other possibilities on this topic, if needed.

Mr. Bailey talked about the Deviation Analysis in Accordance with UDO 9.10.05 (B)(1) located on page 58 of the meeting packet and he read number two from this list.

Mr. Deal said maybe there needs to be a recommendation from the commission for the applicant to look into projecting signs rather than sign bands. Mr. Deal noted that he was not sure what the square footage should be. It was noted that 48 square feet is a lot of square footage.

Mr. Bailey said that the applicant might want to think about doing some combination of sign band and projecting signage.

Ms. Shook asked that any recommendations for the signage be very clear so that Staff would be able to issues permits without confusion.

Chairperson Woolridge asked the applicant if the applicant would be agreeable to number two. Mr. Deal said yes they are agreeable to it.

Chairperson Woolridge asked about window logos. Mr. Bailey said the Town does not regulate anything inside the windows.

Discussion ensued on the deviation table and signage.

Mr. Bailey read UDO Article 26.07.01 through 26.07.07 about the signage that is allowed and not allowed in the B-1 zoning district. Mr. Bailey noted that a freestanding sign is not proposed at this project.

Ms. Shook talked about the Staff revising the sign ordinance and this would be a good opportunity to discuss sign-package requirements to include in the sign ordinance.

Mr. Deal talked about identifying the Marketplace building versus the tenants that live there. He talked about using a wall sign that directs the public to the parking deck.

Mr. Bailey said one of the things that the Staff tries to promote directory signs that help the public understand who is in the building.

Discussion ensued on projecting signs and wall signs.

Vice-Chairperson Simmons talked about the street level commercial uses on page 58 of the meeting packet. He talked about the King Street and Water Street sharing square footage and Water Street and Howard Street sharing square footage for commercial uses. He talked about the raw requirements outlined on the Deviation Analysis in Accordance with UDO 9.10.05(B)(1). He reviewed the changes that were made to the table. Vice-Chairperson Simmons and Member Long agreed that the commercial parking spaces are not included in these calculations.

Vice-Chairperson Simmons discussed the complexities of measuring commercial area in a building which has three different street frontages with varying topographical changes which change the street level of the building on all three sides.

Mr. Deal said all three street facing sides of the building having commercial square footage.

Vice-Chairperson Simmons talked about the Howard Street parking deck entrance and accessing the parking deck at this location which is parking deck level three. Mr. Deal noted that the applicant is not positive if they can put any bicycle parking at this location until they get the design from the construction company.

Mr. Winkler talked about the possible addition of 48 to 64 more bicycle parking spaces and the location of the bicycle parking if they do not have to install several water meters.

Vice-Chairperson Simmons said the only time he almost got seriously injured was on a bicycle in a parking deck.

Mr. Deal talked about the challenges of putting bicycle parking on level three of the Howard Street side of the building with the possible challenges of the installation of the water meters. Mr. Deal said they would work with the Public Works department on this.

Discussion ensued on the commuting by bicycle and being able to locate the parking deck on level three. Mr. Davis said he would work on this.

Member Dineen asked if the balcony doors were glass. Mr. Davis said yes they are proposing glass on these doors.

Vice-Chairperson Simmons talked about the configuration of bedrooms. He said originally there were 100 one-bedrooms, 31 two-bedrooms and three three-bedroom units. The current proposal is 44 one-bedroom units (44 bedrooms), 50 two-bedroom units (100 bedrooms), and five three-bedroom units with (15 bedrooms) for a total of 99 units and 159 bedrooms.

Mr. Deal said they tried to balance the mix of the number of bedrooms and the number of parking spaces to make enough profit to pay for the building. Mr. Winkler said the parking deck alone will not support paying for the building.

Member Lippard talked about the student housing, young professionals and family. Mr. Deal said there are five three-bedroom units. Mr. Deal explained the leasing process and who is obligated to pay the rent on the units.

Member Myers asked for clarification on the hallway that goes to the back of the building, if it was created as a result of reducing the main hallway. Mr. Davis said it was not shown in the first concept of the plan.

Member Myers asked how wide is the alley way between Murphy's Restaurant and the southwest corner of the building. Mr. Davis said the distance is seven feet. It was noted that the applicant only owned five feet of the seven foot alley.

Member Myers asked about fire access issues on the Murphy's side of the building. Mr. Deal said they had not had any comments about it from the Fire Department during the plan review.

Mr. Winkler said the building and parking deck will be sprinkled.

Member Vincent asked about other exterior building materials other than brick that they might be looking at to use on the building. Mr. Davis said as far as trim materials, they are looking at a manufactured stone which is a ground limestone mixed into a slurry and poured into a form. It will give them a lot of the design elements they are trying to achieve. He said they are still researching trim materials. He noted that real limestone is very heavy and difficult to work with on the building.

Member Vincent asked about the materials for guard rails. Mr. Davis said some type of metal that is powder coated.

Mr. Davis said they have more research to do for molding and pilasters, etc.

Chairperson Woolridge asked the commission members about their feelings on the exterior building materials. Member Vincent said he is still trying to decide what the look of Boone is because every building is different. Member Long said that he likes the look of the proposed plans as it relates to the exterior of the building.

Member Dineen asked if there will an opportunity to add live plants in the enclosed atrium. Mr. Davis said the atrium will be enclosed and a conditioned space with sky lights. Mr. Winkler said that they have not yet researched this topic.

The first speaker was Mr. Eric Plaag. Mr. Plaag introduced himself as the Chair of the Historic Preservation Commission, but noted that he is conveying his thoughts as a citizen of Boone and not as the Chairperson of the Historic Preservation Commission. He said that he had emailed many of the thoughts that he is sharing at this meeting to the Council and he had asked that those concerns be forwarded to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Plaag commended Mr. Winkler and his development team for listening to concerns voiced at the neighborhood meeting on April 5, 2016 regarding the proposed project.

Mr. Plaag said the reduction in building height along King Street and Howard Street is a modest improvement. He said although flawed and incomplete the applicant has tried proposed to modify the architectural elements that are more appropriate to Downtown Boone.

Mr. Plaag said the biggest flaw is thinking the parking deck will improve parking in the Downtown area. He said the problem is Mr. Winkler's reason for asking for parking in Downtown Boone. He further talked about the parking allowances mentioned in the Staff report for this case, he said they are maximum and not minimum allowances. He talked about the proposed 367 parking spaces and what is permitted by the UDO. He said that Mr. Winkler is hoping to make a profit from the long-term leased parking spaces.

Mr. Plaag talked about the traffic study showing an increase in traffic.

Mr. Plaag talked about the not having the commitment in writing for any hourly parking arrangement. He urged the commission to get it in writing, if they want it to be part of the deal.

Mr. Plaag said partnering with the university and other commercial companies on the proposed parking deck would keep parking from coming onto King Street, Howard Street and Water Street and help mitigate parking issues in the Downtown area.

Mr. Plaag talked about the problems with the increased traffic flow will increase rather than decrease the current traffic issues.

Mr. Plaag strongly urged the Planning commission to deny the PD request because it exceeds the UDO limits on parking, height limitations and because of under-performed street-level commercial use. He noted that parking is not one of the categories of commercial space.

Mr. Plaag talked about the use of inappropriate building materials such as fiber cement, composite trim, cast concrete and parapet walls and exterior balconies that are not found in Boone's architectural.

The PC has the power to use the PD process for the appropriate building materials. He suggested that the Planning Commission members make use of that power.

Mr. Plaag handed out a photo named Downtown redevelopment concept from the Boone 2030 Land Use Plan, and noted that the design was more appropriate for Downtown Boone.

Member Templeton asked Mr. Plaag about one of the building materials. Mr. Plaag asked to complete his presentation before addressing his question. He said the materials used in the photo are appropriate for Downtown Boone.

Mr. Plaag handed out a rough sketch dated June 2, 2016 of the proposed Marketplace re-design levels that he had drawn (permanently attached). The sketch showed three levels of the building from King Street, Water Street and Howard Street. He reviewed the mix of uses on each level. He talked about the garage access on Howard Street. He said this building design fits the property and it does support the PD process. He noted that Howard Street would be the only access point for the parking garage.

Mr. Plaag asked the commission to encourage Mr. Winkler and Mr. Deal to consider his design proposal or to revise their proposal to a design that would make a better fit for Downtown Boone.

Member Templeton talked about the proposed building materials not being harmonious with the Downtown area. Member Templeton asked Mr. Plaag in his opinion what he thought is the appropriate building materials for the Downtown area. Mr. Plaag said the HPC has been engaged in the survey of Downtown Boone to help establish for the appropriate architectural materials for the Downtown area. Mr. Plaag referred to the Downtown guidelines draft that has been reviewed by the Community Appearance Commission. Mr. Plaag said the solution is to figure out what you want your Downtown area to look like. He said raw brick is a historic building material and certain stylistic features.

Mr. Plaag talked about the Planning Commission not attending the Historic Preservation Committee meetings and asking for advice on building materials. Member Lippard said he is not required to go to the HPC meetings and said he is not beholden to the HPC, he is beholden to the Council.

Member Long asked if members of the CAC have communicated with the HPC. Mr. Plaag said yes they have. Member Long noted that he depends upon and respects the opinion of the CAC that relays their information to the Planning Commission.

Discussion ensued on to appropriate building materials in the downtown area and how they compare to existing buildings.

Member Lippard said the commission appreciates Mr. Plaag's comments regarding helping to make the Downtown buildings more ascetically pleasing on a Downtown strip, however, he feels that we have one of the ugliest Downtowns because everyone got to choose what they wanted at one time. He said we are having some guidelines placed on this proposed project which is more than a step forward than any 1920's building built in this Town.

Member Lippard said it is good that the HPC finally has one representative that comes and talks constantly about this subject. He said if you are a public entity you should share that information and the commission should not have to ask for it, he said he wants to make sure that this is clear.

Mr. Johnson talked about the look of the Farmers Hardware building having the look of concrete. Mr. Plaag said it was appropriate to use concrete, when that building was built.

Member Lippard said right now the commission has to figure out what the commission needs to discuss regarding building height, traffic issues, hourly parking. He said he does not see any agreement on materials at this time.

Member Long talked about the Downtown Boone Development Association comments being incorporated into the proposed plans that included the balconies. Mr. Plaag said there are no buildings in Downtown Boone that has balconies.

Vice-Chairperson Simmons noted that the illustrations in the Boone 2030 Land Use Plan were for illustration purposes only and that a person cannot choose just one photo from the plan to indicate importance. He noted that description found on page 223 of the Staff Report regarding the illustrations was important.

Member McCracken made a motion, seconded by Member Lippard to recess the public hearing.

At 8:12 p.m. Chairperson Woolridge called for a short break.

At 8:24 p.m. Chairperson Woolridge reconvened the meeting.

Chairperson Woolridge asked the Planning Commission regarding their thoughts or concerns on the proposed project.

Member Templeton said he is in favor of the proposed project. He said this is a viable and needed project for the Downtown area.

Member McCracken said she is generally in support of this proposed project. She said that she would like to see a condition placed on the project that no less than 40 percent of the total parking spaces be for short-term parking. She talked about the 50 percent requirement for commercial and that she has struggled with it. She said she would like to see more flexibility be given to the petitioner to be able to make the best use for the lobby hallway space. She said she would like to see a right turn on Water Street.

Mr. Deal said they are in agreement with 40 percent or whatever the ultimate percentage is. He also said the more hourly parking the better.

Discussion ensued on the possible traffic issue at 5 p.m.

Member Dineen said she would like to see more housing for young professionals and families but the market does not lend itself to this type of housing. She noted her concern for having this large amount of parking at this location.

Member Lippard said he has taken into consideration that the applicant is willing to work with the Council and Planning Commission on this proposed project and trying to make the plans more suitable to the Downtown area. He said he appreciates the public comment because it reiterates what they have been doing. He noted that the commission can never make everyone happy. He said some of the things that need to continue to be discussed are the projecting signage, awning and the parking being specified as the 40 percent for hourly parking. He thinks the building height issues have been dealt with well, he likes the sliding doors that open up into the sidewalk environment, regarding the lobby, he doesn't care if it has one or not. He said he hoped that the housing options in the future would include young professionals.

Member Vincent talked about the parking issue in the Downtown area. He commended the applicant and his team for working with everyone and making the revisions to the proposed project. He said he would like to see the façade of the building broken up. He supports the proposed plan.

Member Myers talked about the availability of parking in the parking deck for the Downtown businesses. He said the softening the streetscape with the sliding doors and the projecting signs would be a good addition. He said he is in support of the project.

Member Catoe asked about the number of bedrooms, if Council approves can they be changed again.

Mr. Bailey said they have to go back through the approval process, if they change the layout of the unit mix.

Member Long talked about the difference between affordable housing and housing for young professionals. He said he would recommend this proposed project to the Council.

Vice-Chairperson Simmons said he agrees with Member Long and Member Vincent and he talked about hourly parking, and making it clear as to what the sign package is. He talked about the discussion regarding bringing vitality to the street. He talked about the change of the unit-mix being included in the recommendation. He supports this proposed project. He also reminded the commission to include the information on page 192 in the packet, when making recommendations.

Mr. Bailey said a statement should be made if the unit mix needs to be specific.

Member Vincent talked about the marketing research for the proposed project.

Chairperson Woolridge asked the applicant if they would agree to no more than five three-bedrooms and zero four-bedroom units. Mr. Deal said yes.

Member McCracken said she is struggling with the number of bedrooms. She asked if we should the commission should say they do not want to see more than ten percent of the one or two bedroom units. Chairperson Woolridge said they want to keep the bedrooms at one and two bedroom units.

Discussion ensued on the signage requirements for the proposed building.

Discussion ensued on building identification signs. Mr. Winker showed a rendering of the 45 degree angle of the building that faces the court house with the name Marketplace on it.

Chairperson Woolridge discussed with Staff how to describe the sign requirements.

Member McCracken asked if there was any signage in the Downtown area for parking. Mr. Bailey said yes.

Chairperson Woolridge told the applicant that the commission is working on substitute language for number two on the deviation list.

The commission discussed using a sign band and the possibility of the option of an awning at the entrances.

Ms. Shook talked about the directory signs that are allowed by right. Ms. Shook explained the benefit of a directory sign.

Chairperson Woolridge asked the applicant if would agree to these options. Mr. Deal said yes.

Mr. Bailey reminded the commission members to include the PD findings found on page 191 of the meeting packet into their motion for recommendations for conditions.

Discussion ensued on acceptable building materials. Member Long said the commission members are in agreement that they did not want to see hardy board used as building material. Mr. Bailey read about the acceptable building materials.

Member Long asked about the architectural exterior building materials and should they be addressed now. Mr. Deal said the applicant would not mind appearing before the Community Appearance Commission again for a final approval, if needed.

Discussion ensued on the type of building materials that should be used on the proposed building. Chairperson Woolridge asked what the applicant would agree to use as building material.

Mr. Bailey said the Council modified the requirements for materials in the B-1 zoning district which are red brick or darker, natural stone, use of concrete. He said simulated brick, cultured stacked stone is prohibited.

Member Long suggested noting that architectural concrete would be prohibited under the current ordinance.

Mr. Johnson explained that the building material has to physically attach to the building.

Mr. Bailey said the CAC members showed a concern for the use of EFIS.

Mr. Davis noted that pre-cast concrete is thick and heavy and he further described this material.

Member Catoe asked if the railings are acceptable per the UDO. Mr. Bailey said yes.

Mr. Johnson talked about the variations of building materials that break up the look of the building.

It was noted if the applicant wanted to use slate as a building material that it would be allowed.

Chairperson Woolridge summarized the recommendations discussed by the Planning Commission members and agreed upon by the applicant as follows:

1. At least forty percent (40%) of the project's parking will be dedicated for short-term hourly parking.
2. The development is limited to the proposed five 3 bedroom units and is not allowed to have any 4 bedroom units.
3. The applicant is granted an exception to allow cast concrete or similar material (such as cast moldings) for accent trim as shown on the building.
4. The applicant's removal of the request for the deviation regarding attached wall signage to be allowed the following:
    a. The applicant is allowed to place a building identification sign [such as "Marketplace"] within the sign band or cornice band at each of the 45 degree angles proposed for the building.
    b. Each [commercial] tenant will be allowed up to a 16 square foot projecting sign and an awning sign [meeting the requirements set forth for awning signs in the B1].
    c. Each parking entrance will be allowed up to a 24 square foot projecting sign.
    d. The applicant is given approval to have an awning at all other ingress/egress points on the building.

First motion and vote:
Member Lippard made a motion, seconded by Member McCracken that the proposed amendment to the Town's zoning map is consistent with the Towns comprehensive plan and other applicable plans of the Town which relate to this application because of the following:

1. It [the Marketplace development] meets the call from the Boone 2030 plan for mixed-use development;
2. It [the Marketplace development] provides the possibility for more much-needed commercial parking in the B1 downtown district;
3. The parcel is located in the Primary Growth Area and the parcel is located in the G-4 Downtown Boone sector, which is appropriate for redevelopment and new infill mixed-use downtown development.
4. The development is further supported by the Comprehensive Plan Update as follows:
    a. 2.3.2(E) New development, redevelopment and rehabilitation of structures and sites shall occur in a manner which is consistent with the neighborhood and architectural context of

the immediate area and supportive whenever possible of Boone's original community character as a High Country small town, and

b. 2.1.5(B) The Town in concert with the downtown property owners and merchants shall encourage public and private efforts to develop and publicize adequate and appropriately designed off-street parking lots in the downtown area, and

c. 2.1.1(F) Commercial uses may be encouraged to develop by consolidation and expansion of existing commercially zoned property, only when such consolidation and expansion does not encroach upon a viable residential area, and

d. 2.1.5(A) A compatible design character for the downtown area, drawing upon the locality's original High Country small town features, shall be identified, reinforced and supported to put forth a quality image and sense of place.

e. 2.1.5(B) A variety of mutually compatible and supportive mixed uses shall be encouraged in the downtown area;

f. 2.3.3(D) Factors in determining preferred locations for high density residential development shall include: close proximity to the university, employment or shopping centers, access to major thoroughfares and the transit system; the availability of public services and facilities; and compatibility with adjacent land uses.

g. 2.3.3(G) Compact, full service neighborhoods offering opportunities for living, working, shopping, and gathering places, shall be encouraged in newly planned developments as well as for redeveloping areas.

5. It [the Marketplace development] presents a unique application of the new planned development procedures because:

   a. The proposed PD will produce a development of equal or higher quality than otherwise required by the strict application of district regulations that would otherwise govern;

   b. The proposed PD will encourage innovative arrangement of buildings and open spaces to provide efficient, attractive, flexible, and environmentally sensitive design;

   c. The proposed PD will produce a development functioning as a cohesive, unified project; and

   d. The proposed PD will not substantially injure or damage the use, value, and enjoyment of surrounding property nor hinder or prevent the development of surrounding property in accordance with the adopted plans and policies of the Town.

Vote:

Aye – All
Nay – None

The vote was unanimous.

Second Motion and Vote:

Chair Woolridge made a motion, seconded by Member Catoe that the Planning Commission recommends approval with the following developer agreed upon conditions:

1. Where there is a conflict between the application information and the plans (site plans and architectural plans bearing a received date of May 27, 2016 and as amended on June 13, 2016), the plans shall control. Insignificant deviations may be permitted to comply with the requirements of the UDO.
2. Any commitments and representations concerning the proposed project made by the applicant or its (his or her) representatives at the public hearing shall also become a condition of the permit, and a basis for a stop work order and/or permit revocation if violated.
3. Final plans shall be submitted that are in compliance with the provisions of the UDO and other provisions of the Town Code.
4. All driveway permits shall be obtained prior to the issuance of a Zoning Permit.
5. The applicant will be required to satisfy all NCDOT requirements prior to the issuance of a Zoning Permit.
6. At least forty percent (40%) of the project's parking will be dedicated for short-term hourly parking.
7. The development is limited to the proposed five 3 bedroom units and is not allowed to have any 4 bedroom units.
8. The applicant is granted an exception to allow cast concrete or similar material (such as cast moldings) for accent trim as shown on the building.
9. The applicant's removal of the request for the deviation regarding attached wall signage to be allowed the following:
    a. The applicant is allowed to place a building identification sign [such as "Marketplace"] within the sign band or cornice band at each of the 45 degree angles proposed for the building.
    b. Each [commercial] tenant will be allowed up to a 16 square foot projecting sign and an awning sign [meeting the requirements set forth for awning signs in the B1].
    c. Each parking entrance will be allowed up to a 24 square foot projecting sign.
    d. The applicant is given approval to have an awning at all other ingress/egress points on the building because of the reasons listed within the first motion.

Vote:

Aye – All
Nay – None

The vote was unanimous.

CASE 20160295 Wellness District Standards: Amend the UDO to create a new Wellness District zoning district which contains standards specific to the district.

Ms. Shook reviewed the revisions to these standards changes on page 225 highlighted in gray.

Ms. Shook noted that many of the items that were of concern had been removed for further discussion at the workshop that would be scheduled in the fall.

Discussion ensued regarding the connection of the Middle Fork Greenway to the Town of Boone's greenway. Chair Woolridge asked if the proposed College of Health Sciences included the connection as shown in the adopted plan. Mr. Bailey further explained that the multi-use path on the site plan is 10 feet wide and concrete.

Mr. Bailey talked about the rezoning of the State of North Carolina property and that the university repositioned their building to incorporate the Middlefork Greenway.

Chairperson Woolridge asked if the Planning Commission should recommend that the language of the trail to be more explicit in Section 17.08.01. He suggested leaving this language general.

Ms. Shook noted the changes to the definition of "façade" and noted that definitions for "primary façade" and "secondary façade" had been added.

Member Templeton recused himself from the meeting because of a financial conflict. He left the meeting at 9:45 p.m.

First motion and vote:
Member McCracken made a motion, seconded by Member Vincent that the proposed amendment to the Town's zoning ordinance is consistent with the Towns comprehensive plan and other applicable plans of the Town which relate to this application because of the Comprehensive Plan focus on economic development in this area acknowledging the area's natural beauty, university and medical center presence as the town's greatest asset for economic development and jobs creation. Furthermore this is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan 2.1.1(D) economic development efforts shall encourage the revitalization and reuse of currently unused or underutilized structures, sites and infrastructure in appropriately located areas and 2.1.1(E) the Town shall encourage a public service and regulatory environment conducive to business recruitment and expansion, while at the same time enhancing the area's physical and human resources.

Vote:

Aye – All
Nay – None

The vote was unanimous.

Second Motion and Vote: Chair Woolridge made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Simmons that the Planning Commission recommends approval provided that language is incorporated that requires incorporation of the B-Well section of the Middle Fork Greenway Master Plan for the reasons stated in the first motion.

Vote:

Aye – All

Nay – None

The vote was unanimous.

CASE 20160299 State of North Carolina – General Use Zoning Map Amendment Rezone property owned by the State of North Carolina located at the corner of Deerfield Road and State Farm Road (Watauga County PIN: 2910-72-682-000).

Mr. Bailey said the rezoning is for one piece of property that would be subject to the Wellness District standards, if adopted.

Vice-Chairperson Simmons asked what are the consequences, if this property does not get rezoned. Mr. Bailey said it reverts back to the current standards.

Discussion ensued on how zoning impacts state owned properties. Mr. Bailey said the Town Staff will review the appearance and zoning of the property.

Mr. Bailey said the Staff has committed to work through the zoning issues for this project because the State of North Carolina is ready to break ground.

First motion and vote:
Member McCracken made a motion, seconded by Member Vincent that the proposed amendment to the Town's zoning map is consistent with the Towns comprehensive plan and other applicable adopted plans of the Town which relate to this application because this change recognizes the area's natural beauty and the university and medical center presences as the town's greatest asset for economic development and jobs creation and this project recognizes the cooperative planning among town, county and the university, and this property is located within a focus area selected in the Boone 2030 Land Use Plan.

Vote:

Aye – All
Nay – None

The vote was unanimous.

Second Motion and Vote:
Chair Woolridge made a motion, seconded by Member Catoe that the Planning Commission recommends approval for the reasons stated in the first motion and because the rezoning for the School of Health Sciences will provide a basis, and an anchor, and a tool to spur the redevelopment within the recently created Wellness District.

Vote:

Aye – All
Nay – None

The vote was unanimous.

OTHER MATTERS BY BOARD MEMBERS OR STAFF

Chairperson Woolridge noted that this was the last commission meeting that Vice-Chairperson Simmons would attend as a result of the expiration of his term on the Planning Commission. Chairperson Woolridge thanked Vice-Chairperson Simmons for all of his work on the Planning Commission.

ADJOURNMENT

Member Lippard made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:57 p.m., seconded by Member McCracken.

Vote:

Aye – All
Nay - None

The motion is unanimous.

_________________________ _____________________________

Chairperson, Eric Woolridge **Board Secretary, Marlene Crosby**