Project Summary

Location: Corner of Matthews Station St Extension and E. Matthews St

Owner(s): Brookchase Properties LLC

Agent: Garry Smith, Brookechase Properties

Current Zoning: R-20

Proposed Zoning: C-MF Innovative

Existing Use: Vacant

Proposed Use: Up to 24 dwellings in a multifamily building

Community Meeting: Occurred August 21, 2014

Summary of Request

The proposed development of the site consists of a 24-unit multifamily building, associated parking and a small, publicly accessible pocket park at the corner of the site nearest to Town Hall.

Staff Recommendation

The proposed apartments meet the Downtown Master Plan goal of providing significant numbers of new residential units to create a more vibrant, pedestrian friendly downtown with thriving shops and restaurants. Although not every lot within the Downtown area features a concept plan, this particular lot does indicate a residential infill building in the same layout as has been proposed. While Matthews Station Street has been a successful area for government and business uses, it has never had a residential component. The addition of residents to the area will benefit restaurants and shops by creating a small built in customer base that is within walking distance. Based on conformance with adopted plans and policies, Planning Staff are encouraged by the proposal and wish to continue working with the applicant to fine tune the plan prior to a decision on the request.
Planning Staff Review

Background And History

The subject parcel is a vacant lot that originally was situated in a row of single family homes prior to the construction of the Matthews Station St extension. Once the new road was constructed, the property was transformed into a corner lot configuration with significant road frontage on the new road.

Details of the Site Plan

The 24-unit proposed building is fronted along Matthews Station Street extension. The parking lot was revised to a one-way design with angled parking. Drivers would enter the site from E. Matthews Street and exit onto the driveway next to Town Hall. An access easement from the Town will ultimately be required as the asphalt beside Town Hall is a driveway, not a Town street. Also differing from the original site plan is the corner pocket park concept. The newest site plan indicates removal of the existing white oak tree and grading work to flatten the corner out and remove the retaining wall.

Innovative Request

The applicant requests the use of Innovative Standards for several aspects of the development.

1. To reduce the minimum corner side yard from standard of 10' to 5'.
2. To reduce minimum project edge abutting residential from 20' to 10'.

Pre Public Hearing Staff Analysis
Outstanding Issues/Planning Staff Comments

(Please see additional comments in staff memos for more detail)

1. The first parking space appears to encroach into the ROW and will require an encroachment agreement.

2. The large white oak tree on the site was originally proposed to be preserved. The applicant contends that removing it allows the corner to be leveled out and a better pocket park created. Additional discussion regarding the preservation or removal of the tree should occur.

3. Staff suggests that a shared parking agreement, recorded at the register of deeds as required by code, should be created to allow residents to also park at the Matthews Executive Center office development on Matthews Mint Hill Rd. That site, also owned by Brookechase Properties, features only office uses, is close walking distance and is ideal for overflow residential parking should on-street spaces be occupied or have time restraints in the future.

4. Although no storm water detention is required, Public Works has indicated concern about additional impervious area in relation to flooding that occurs on Matthews Station and in front of Town Hall.
Consistency with Adopted Plans and Policies and Town Vision Statements

Both the Land Use Plan and the Downtown Plan call for an emphasis on additional residential units in the Downtown area.

Reports from Town Departments and County Agencies

**Matthews Police**
See Attached

**Matthews Fire**
See Attached

**Public Works**
See Attached

**Matthews Parks and Recreation**
See Attached

**Charlotte Mecklenburg Schools**
See report from Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools. Estimate of 4 additional students for the site.

PCO Concept Plan Approval Required?
No
Impact Analysis

For residential properties, the largest financial impact is typically associated with trash pickup. However, the Town does not provide trash pick up for apartment communities.

Projected Financial Impact of the Request

Over the past several years, there has been an increase in “boutique” small scale apartment projects in the Charlotte area. After analysis of comparable apartment buildings in both Matthews and Charlotte, the following estimated tax revenues were generated:

- **Current Tax Revenue from vacant parcel:** $131.76
- **Anticipated Annual Tax Revenue From Project:** $5,953
- **Total Increase in Annual Property Revenue:** $5,822

As expressed in terms of property tax per acre, the development would increase Matthews property tax revenue per acre from approximately $262 dollars/acre today to approximately $11,900/acre. This represents a 4,442% increase in property tax over the current tax bill.

In comparison, the recently approved Eden Hall townhomes are estimated to generate approximately $4,235/acre in annual property tax for Matthews.
Pre Public Hearing Staff Analysis
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Pre Public Hearing Staff Analysis
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RECOMMENDATION

We have the following comments that are critical to CMS’ support of this petition:

Adequacy of existing school capacity in this area is a significant problem. We are particularly concerned about rezoning cases where school utilization exceeds 100% since the proposed development will exacerbate this situation. Approval of this petition will increase overcrowding and/or reliance upon mobile classrooms at the schools listed below.

The total estimated capital cost of providing the additional school capacity for this new development is $67,000 calculated as follows:

Elementary School: 2x $20,000 = $40,000
High School: 1 x $27,000 = $27,000

CMS recommends the petitioner schedule a meeting with staff to discuss any opportunities that the petitioner/developer may propose to improve the adequacy of school capacity in the immediate area of the proposed development.

TOTAL IMPACT FROM PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

Proposed Housing Units: 24 apartment units under C-MF (INNOVATIVE)

CMS Planning Area: 10
Average Student Yield per Unit: 0.1860

This development will add 4 students to the schools in this area.

The following data is as of 20th Day of the 2013-14 school year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools Affected</th>
<th>20th Day, 2013-14 Enrollment (non-ec)</th>
<th>Total Classroom Teachers</th>
<th>Building Classrooms/ Teacher Stations</th>
<th>20th Day, 2013-14 Building Utilization (Without Mobiles)</th>
<th>Building Classroom/ Adjusted Capacity (Without Mobiles)</th>
<th>Additional Students As a result of this development</th>
<th>Utilization As of result of this development (Without Mobiles)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MATTHEWS ELEMENTARY</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>130%</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>130%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRESTDALE MIDDLE</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>1306</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUTLER HIGH</td>
<td>2086</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>111%</td>
<td>2488</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>111%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INCREMENTAL IMPACT FROM PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT*

Existing number of housing units allowed: 1 single family home under R-20; site is vacant

Number of students potentially generated under current zoning: zero

The development allowed under the existing zoning would not generate students, while the development allowed under the proposed zoning will produce 4 students. Therefore, the net change in the number of students generated from existing zoning to proposed zoning is 4 students.

As requested, we are also providing information regarding the difference in the number of potential students from the existing zoning to the proposed zoning. Please note that this method of determining potential numbers of students from an area underestimates the number of students CMS may gain from the new development.

9/3/2014
To: Jay Camp, Sr. Planner  
From: Ralph S. Messera, Public Works Director  
Date: September 3, 2014  
Subject: Matthews Street Rezoning  2014-616

Matthews Public Works offers the following comments:

1. The street curb and sidewalk on Matthews street should be parallel to the R/W lines, not angled. Off-street parking should not be located within the right-of-way, unless an encroachment is approved by the Board.

2. The Dept. would prefer to see the existing White Oak remain. If it is removed and the wall removed, then the sidewalks and ramps at the intersection (both sides) should be reconfigured to a standard form, rather than curving around the tree as they currently do.

3. An easements shall be required for any sidewalk located outside the rights-of-way.

4. It appears that dumpster service is to be provided. The owner shall also provide recycling service to residents for materials normally recycled in the Town.

5. How is sanitary sewer to be provided?

6. The plan does not indicate the impervious square footage, but even if under the 20,000 sq. ft. minimum, consideration needs to be given for detention due to flooding issues in the Town Square area that this project will exacerbate.
Memorandum

From: Chief Rob Hunter
To: Jay Camp, Town Planner
Date: September 2, 2014
Subject: Review of Proposed Site Plan

Regarding: 2014-616 / Towns 316

After a complete review of the applicant and the requested location, I find / recommend the following:

X No concerns / recommendations with proposed site / location

Concerns / recommendations with proposed site / location (see below)

Comments:

If you have any questions, please let me know.
TO:    Jay Camp, Senior Planner  
DATE:   August 19, 2014  
RE:    Comments on Zoning Petitions 2014-615 & 2014-616  
FROM:  Corey King, Parks, Recreation & Cultural Resource Director

Zoning Petition 2014-615  
I do not have any comments from the Parks, Recreation & Cultural Resource perspective, related to this project.

Zoning Petition 2014-616  
I would like to see language included in the notes stipulating that the pocket park planned as part of the project will be available for Town use (department programs/events) in addition to being available to the public daily.
MEMORANDUM

TO:      Jay Camp, Senior Planner
FROM:    Chief Dennis N. Green, Fire & EMS Chief
DATE:    Thursday, September 04, 2014
RE:      REZONING PETITION #2014-616 – Town 316

Fire & EMS has reviewed the current plans for the new Town 316 at 324 East Matthews Street. I do not have any issues with the current plan.