

PLANNING COMMISSION-CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
CITY OF LOWELL, MICHIGAN
AGENDA
FOR THE REGULAR MEETING OF
MONDAY, MARCH 9, 2015 AT 7:00 P.M.
AT THE
LOWELL CITY HALL
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
SECOND FLOOR
301 EAST MAIN STREET

1. CALL TO ORDER: PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, ROLL CALL
2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS
 - a. January 12, 2015 – Regular Meeting
4. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS CONCERNING ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA
5. OLD BUSINESS
 - a. Review Summary of Dimensional Regulations
 - b.
6. NEW BUSINESS
 - a. Site Plan Review – 835 West Main Street
 - b. Site Plan Review – 210 East Main Street
 - c. Site Plan Review Revisions – Administrative Review
 - d.
7. STAFF REPORT
8. COMMISSIONERS REMARKS
9. ADJOURNMENT

**OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
PLANNING COMMISSION-CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
CITY OF LOWELL, MICHIGAN
FOR THE REGULAR MEETING OF
MONDAY, JANUARY 12, 2015, AT 7:00 P.M.**

1. CALL TO ORDER: PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, ROLL CALL

The Meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Deputy City Clerk Susan Ullery and the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Present: Commissioners Dave Cadwallader, Kelly Carney, John Gerard, Jim Hall, Shannon Hanley, Jim Salzwedel and James Zandstra.

Absent: None.

Also Present: City Manager Mark Howe, Deputy City Clerk Susan Ullery, and Mayor Jim Hodges.

2. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

A. CHAIR

IT WAS MOVED BY HALL and seconded by CADWALLADER to nominate Shannon Hanley as Chair for the Lowell Planning-Citizen Advisory Commission.

No further nominations were made.

IT WAS MOVED BY GERARD and seconded by SALZWEDEL to nominate Shannon Hanley as Chair for the Lowell Planning-Citizen Advisory Commission.

YES: 7. NO: 0. ABSENT: 0. MOTION CARRIED.

The meeting was turned over to Chair Hanley.

B. VICE CHAIR

IT WAS MOVED BY SALZWEDEL and seconded by HALL to nominate Dave Cadwallader as Vice Chair for the Lowell Planning-Citizen Advisory Commission.

YES: 7. NO: 0. ABSENT: 0. MOTION CARRIED.

3. REVIEW AND ADOPTION OF PLANNING COMMISSION RULES OF PROCEDURE. The Commission reviewed the Rules of Procedure were reviewed.

IT WAS MOVED BY CADWALLADER and seconded by CARNEY to adopt the Rules of Procedure as corrected.

YES: 7. NO: 0. ABSENT: 0. MOTION CARRIED.

4. **APPROVE 2015 MEETING DATES.**

IT WAS MOVED BY GERARD and seconded by CADWALLADER to approve the 2015 meeting dates.

YES: 7. NO: 0. ABSENT: 0. MOTION CARRIED.

5. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA.**

IT WAS MOVED BY HALL and seconded by SALZWEDEL to approve the agenda as presented.

YES: 7. NO: 0. ABSENT: 0. MOTION CARRIED.

6. **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF DECEMBER 8, 2014.**

IT WAS MOVED BY HALL seconded by SALZWEDEL that the minutes of the December 8, 2014 meeting be approved as written.

YES: 7. NO: 0. ABSENT: 0. MOTION CARRIED.

7. **PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS CONCERNING ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA.** No comments were received.

8. **OLD BUSINESS**

- A. Public Hearing – Mixed Use. Williams and Works Planner Andy Moore explained this is a public hearing for a zoning amendment to adopt the language for the Mixed Use District but also to rezone the properties to Mixed Use. The version of the amendment being presented is unchanged from what was previously reviewed.

Kelly Holst of 517 E. Main questioned the reason for the change. City Manager Mark Howe explained the City has a master plan. There is a long range plan to create these mixed use districts or downtown edge. The Planning Commission has been going through the process of identifying areas where they would actually write language and then rezone them as mixed use. There is one particular request where a parcel of property has been purchased, with the possibility of mixed use.

Moore explained mixed use means allowing a property owner to use one parcel for multiple purposes.

Commissioner Salzwedel questioned building height. Howe stated building height will remain at 40 feet for now.

IT WAS MOVED BY CADWALLADER and seconded by ZANDSTRA to recommend to the City Council the adoption of the language for the Mixed Use District and to rezone the proposed properties to Mixed Use.

YES: 7. NO: 0. ABSENT: 0. MOTION CARRIED.

- B. Review Summary of Dimensional Regulations. City Manager Howe wanted the Planning Commission to continue to review and provide possible recommendations.

9. **NEW BUSINESS**

- a. **Planning and Zoning Essentials Training.** Williams and Works Planner Andy Moore presented a power point presentation regarding planning and zoning essentials.
- b. **Priorities 2015.** The Planning Commission reviewed the Planning Commission Goals/Ideas for 2015 as well as reviewing their goals from 2014.

10. **STAFF REPORT.** City Manager Howe referred to the South Monroe parking lot project which is the lot behind the old Moose Building. The Planning Commission will be reviewing some site plans and parking issues in the future. Also, Unity School has been purchased by a developer. Currently, the developer is considering whether to keep or demolish the large building. Howe also noted the building at the corner of Main Street and Valley Vista has been demolished in order to make the property more desirable for purchase.

11. **COMMISSIONERS COMMENTS.** Commissioner Salzwedel congratulated Chair Hanley and Vice Chair Cadwallader on a second term as Chair and Vice Chair.

IT WAS MOVED BY CADWALLADER to adjourn at 8:30 p.m.

DATE:

APPROVED:

Shannon Hanley, Chair

Susan S. Ullery, Deputy City Clerk



City of Lowell Zoning Ordinance – Summary of Dimensional Regulations

Updated: 11.10.14

District	Min. Lot Area	Min. Lot Width	Min. Front Setback	Min. Side Setback	Min. Rear Setback	Max. Lot Coverage	Max. Building Height
SR Suburban Residential	23,000 sq ft	125 ft	30 ft	20 ft total/8 ft min ¹	35 ft	35%	35 ft or 2½ stories
R-1 Residential	9,750 sq ft	75 ft	30 ft	20 ft total/ 8 ft min ²	25 ft	35%	35 ft or 2½ stories
R-2 Residential	8,200 sq ft ³	66 ft ⁴	30 ft	15 ft total/6 ft min ⁵	25 ft	30%	35 ft or 2½ stories
R-3 Residential	8,200 sq ft ⁶	66 ft ⁷	30 ft	13 ft total/5 ft min ⁸	25 ft	30%	35 ft or 2½ stories
MHP Manufactured Home Park ⁹	5,000 ft	40 ft	10 ft	16 ft or 10 ft	14 ft		35 ft or 2½ stories
C-1 Neighborhood Business	15,000 sq ft	80 ft	25 ft	0 or 10 ft ¹⁰	35 ft	60%	35 ft or 2½ stories
C-2 Central Business	None	None	None	0 or 10 ft ¹¹	None/25 ft ¹²	100%	40 ft
C-3 General Commercial	20,000 sq ft	100 ft	35 ft	0 or 10 ft ¹³	35 ft	60%	40 ft or 3 stories
I-L Light Industrial	20,000 sq ft	100 ft	50 ft	20 ft ¹⁴	25 ft ¹⁵	60%	40 ft
I Industrial	Same as I-L						
PF Public Facilities ¹⁶	None	None	0 ft min 10 ft max	Varies	0 ft	40%	That of adjacent bldgs
MU Mixed Use (as proposed)	None	None	0 ft min 10 ft max	0 ft	0 ft	100%	40 ft

¹ For residential buildings: at least 8 ft and the sum of both side yards must be at least 20 ft; for nonresidential buildings: 30 ft

² For residential buildings: at least 8 ft and the sum of both side yards must be at least 20 ft; for nonresidential buildings: 30 ft

³ For single and two-family dwellings: 8,200 sq ft.; for multi-family dwellings: 12,000 sq ft for the first 4 units plus 2,500 sq ft for each unit over 4, not to exceed 6 units per acre.

⁴ For single-family dwellings: 66 ft; for two-family and multi-family dwellings: 100 ft.

⁵ For single- and two-family dwellings: at least 6 ft and the sum of both side yards must be at least 15 ft; for multi-family dwellings: the height of the building or 20 ft, whichever is greater; for non-residential uses: 20 ft.

⁶ For single-family dwellings: 8,200 sq ft.; for two-family dwellings: 9,000 sq ft; for multi-family dwellings: 12,000 sq ft for the first 4 units plus 2,500 sq ft for each unit over 4, not to exceed 10 units per acre.

⁷ For single-family dwellings: 66 ft; for two-family dwellings: 80 ft; for multi-family dwellings: 100 ft.

⁸ For single- and two-family dwellings: at least 5 ft and the sum of both side yards must be at least 13 ft.; for multi-family dwellings: the height of the building or 20 ft, whichever is greater; for non-residential uses: 30 ft.

⁹ See Chapter 9 for more detailed regulations

¹⁰ For side abutting residential districts or uses: 25 ft; for side abutting other districts: 0 or 10 ft; for street side of a corner lot: 35 ft

¹¹ For side abutting residential districts or uses: 5 ft; for side abutting other districts: 0 or 10 ft

¹² For side abutting residential districts or uses: 25 ft; for side abutting other districts: none

¹³ For side abutting residential districts or uses: 25 ft; for side abutting other districts: 0 or 10 ft; for street side of a corner lot: 35 ft

¹⁴ For side abutting residential districts or uses: 50 ft; for side abutting other districts: 20 ft; for street side of a corner lot: 50 ft

¹⁵ For side abutting residential districts or uses: 50 ft; for side abutting other districts: 25 ft

¹⁶ See Chapter 16 for more detailed regulations

MEMORANDUM

TO: City of Lowell Planning Commission
FROM: Andy Moore, AICP
DATE: March 2, 2015
RE: Site Plan Review: 835 West Main Street

We have reviewed the site plan submitted by Mr. Pete Ricards for 835 West Main Street. The applicant has proposed to use the existing building for a small scale grocery store. The subject property is located at the northeast corner of Main Street and Center Street.

Background. The property is zoned C-3 General Business, and the principal building is the only building that exists on the site, although it also contains a small parking lot that is accessed from Center Street. The applicant is seeking to reuse the existing building and is not proposing any exterior changes. The surrounding properties are also zoned C-3. The proposed use is permitted by right in the C-3 district. The Zoning Ordinance requires that a site plan be reviewed by the Planning Commission prior to the creation of a use or the erection of a building. Since this will be a new use in the building, site plan review is required.

Site Plan Review. Following are our review comments for your consideration:

1. **Dimensional Requirements.** Section 12.04 of the Zoning Ordinance requires a front setback of 35 feet. The applicant owns two adjacent lots, and each lot individually does not meet the lot area or width requirements of the C-3 District. Therefore, we must consider the two lots as one undivided parcel. Since the subject property is a corner lot, there are two front lot lines and two front yards. The primary front lot line is adjacent to Center Street as it is the shorter of the two front lot lines, so the 35' setback requirement is measured from Center Street. This standard is met as the building is 35.35 feet from the primary front lot line. The secondary front yard setback (front Main Street) is also required to be at least 35 feet. However, the definitions allow for the setback for the secondary front yard to be ½ of the required setback, so this standard is also met. The building also meets the required side and rear yard requirements.
2. **Landscaping.** Section 12.04, B requires a minimum of one canopy tree and three deciduous shrubs per 20 linear feet of lot width. Based on lot width, the applicant would be required to plant six trees and 18 shrubs along the frontage of the property, which includes both Main Street and Center Street. The site currently contains two trees and six shrubs, and four of those shrubs are within the primary front yard. However, the Center Street frontage is limited in area because of the existing parking area.

The Planning Commission is authorized to approve equivalent landscaping in areas other than the front yard, per Section 13.02, B. The Planning Commission may include a condition of approval requiring installation of four additional trees and 12 additional shrubs on the site. Given the limited area in the primary front yard, these plantings may be located elsewhere on the lot.

3. Parking. Section 19.07 requires one parking space per 200 square feet of floor area of a retail business. The 880 square foot building therefore would require five spaces, and nine spaces are provided.
4. Signs. The existing ground sign on the property appears to meet the standards of the Ordinance, although detail is not provided, nor is it clear if the sign will be modified. At one time, the sign (or a portion of it) advertised an establishment not located on the same property, which is prohibited. The Planning Commission may require, as a condition of approval, that the existing sign only be used to advertise the business located on the same parcel. This prohibition of "off-premise" signs is already in the Zoning Ordinance, but this condition would address any potential claims that the off-premise sign should be treated as a nonconformity and be permitted to continue.

Review Standards. To approve a site plan, the Planning Commission should find that the standards listed in Section 18.06 would be met. Following are the standards and our comments on each:

- A. The uses proposed will not adversely affect the public health, safety or welfare. Uses and structures located on the site shall be planned to take into account topography, size of the property, the uses on adjoining property and the relationship and size of buildings to the site. The site shall be developed so as not to impede the normal and orderly development or improvement of surrounding property for uses permitted in this ordinance.

Comment: The use as a retail establishment is permitted in the C-3 district. The building and parking facility are already in existence and would not impede the development of adjacent properties. The Planning Commission may therefore find that this standard is met.

- B. Safe, convenient, uncongested, and well-defined vehicular and pedestrian circulation shall be provided for ingress/egress points and within the site. Drives, streets and other circulation routes shall be designed to promote safe and efficient traffic operations within the site and at ingress/egress points.

Comment: The property contains a sidewalk along Main Street and Center Street and pedestrian access from the parking lot is sufficient. The existing layout of the site appears functional and the Planning Commission may find that this standard is met.

- C. The arrangement of public or private vehicular and pedestrian connections to existing or planned streets in the area shall be planned to provide a safe and efficient circulation system for traffic within the City of Lowell.

Comment: A sidewalk exists on the site and connects to adjacent properties, and the site is well connected to the City's transportation network. The Planning Commission may find that this standard is met.

- D. Removal or alteration of significant natural features shall be restricted to those areas, which are reasonably necessary to develop the site in accordance with the requirements of this ordinance. The planning commission requires that approved landscaping, buffers and/or greenbelts be continuously maintained to ensure that proposed uses will be adequately buffered from one another and from surrounding public and private property.

Comment: The applicant has not proposed any additional landscaping. Subject to conditions addressing landscaping, the Planning-Citizens Advisory Commission may find that this standard is met.

- E. Satisfactory assurance shall be provided that the requirements of all other applicable ordinances, codes, and requirements of the City of Lowell will be met.

Comment: The proposed development is the reuse of an existing building. The Planning Commission should determine whether this standard would be met, and a condition of approval can stipulate continual compliance.

- F. The general purposes and spirit of this ordinance and the Comprehensive Plan of the City of Lowell shall be maintained.

Comment: This site is zoned for commercial uses, and the proposed use and configuration are generally consistent with the character of this block. The proposed business would be a welcome addition to the City of Lowell and is generally consistent with the City's Master Plan. The Planning Commission may find that the overall intent of the master plan and the zoning district are met.

Recommendation. The Planning Commission should discuss the proposed site plan and any comments or concerns that would supplement or amend those presented here. It is recommended that the Planning Commission approve the site plan, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to issuance of any City permits, the applicant shall have paid all application, permit, reimbursable escrow, and other fees related to this request.
2. No grading, preliminary or final earthwork shall be undertaken on the site until a building permit has been issued consistent with this site plan approval.
3. The applicant shall install four additional trees and twelve additional shrubs on the site. The location and types of plantings can be submitted to the Zoning Administrator for approval.
4. If changes to the sign are proposed, such changes shall be disclosed to the Zoning Enforcement Officer for review prior to installation. All signage on the site shall only pertain to the establishment located on the same property.
5. The applicant and the site shall at all times comply with local standards and ordinances.
6. Any other conditions deemed necessary by the Planning Commission.

City of Lowell
Site Plan Review Application

Applicant Information

Applicant Name: PETER G RICARDS dba HEALTHY HORIZONS
Address: 835 W MAIN ST LOWELL MI 49331
Telephone: 616-862-6041
Email: pgricards@msn.com

Owner Information (complete only if different from applicant)

Owner Name: PETER GUY RICARDS
Address: 5105 BYRNE AVE NE
LOWELL, MI 49331
Telephone: 616-862-6041
Email: pgricards@msn.com

Property Information

Address of subject property: 835 W. MAIN ST, LOWELL, MI, 49331
Property Number: 41-20-02-352-003
Zoning District: C3

1. Description of project: SMALL GROCERY/CAFE UTILIZING EXISTING BUILDING. NO PROPOSED CHANGES TO EXISTING SITE.
2. Legal description of subject property
LOT 7 SWEET & SMITH'S Addition

(use backside or additional paper if necessary)

City of Lowell, Site Plan Review Checklist

- A. The date, north arrow, and scale. The scale shall not be less than one (1) inch equals twenty (20) feet for property under three (3) acres and at least one (1) inch equals one hundred (100) feet for those three (3) acres or more.
- B. The name and firm address of the professional individual responsible for the preparation of the site plan.
- C. The name and address of the property owner or petitioner.
- D. A location sketch.
- E. Legal description of the subject property.
- F. The size (in acres) of the subject property.
- G. Property lines and required setbacks shown and dimensioned.
- H. The location of all existing structures, driveways, and parking areas within one hundred (100) feet of the subject property's boundary.
- I. The location and dimensions of all existing and proposed structures on the subject property.
- J. The location of all existing and proposed drives (including dimensions and radii), acceleration/deceleration lanes, sidewalks, signs, exterior lighting, curbing, parking areas (including the dimensions of a typical parking space and the total number of parking spaces provided), and unloading areas.
- K. The location, pavement width and right-of-way width of all streets, and access easement within one hundred (100) feet of the subject property.
- L. The existing zoning and use of all properties abutting the subject property.
ALL C-3
- M. The location of all existing vegetation and the location, type, and size of all propped landscaping, and the location, height and type of existing and proposed fences and walls.
- N. Size and location of existing and proposed utilities, including any proposed connections to public sewer or water supply systems.

MEMORANDUM

TO: City of Lowell Planning Commission

FROM: Andy Moore, AICP
Nathan Mehmed

DATE: March 2, 2015

RE: Site Plan Review: 210 East Main Street

We have reviewed the site plan submitted by Mr. Greg Canfield for 210 East Main Street. The applicant is proposed to use the existing building for a restaurant. The subject property is located on the south side of Main Street between the Flat River and Monroe Street in Lowell.

Background. The subject property is zoned C-2 Central Business District. The principal building is the only building that exists on the site. The applicant is seeking to reuse the existing building and is not proposing any exterior changes. The surrounding properties are also zoned C-2. The proposed use is permitted by right in the C-2 district. The Zoning Ordinance requires that a site plan be reviewed by the Planning Commission prior to the creation of a use or the erection of a building. Since this will be a new use in the building, site plan review is required.

Site Plan Review. Following are our review comments for your consideration:

1. **Dimensional Requirements.** Section 11.04 of the Zoning Ordinance requires a front, side, and rear setback of 0 feet. This standard is met. Additionally, the Zoning Ordinance does not require any lot width or area requirements, so this standard is also met.
Parking. Section 19.07 requires one parking space per two (2) persons allowed within the maximum occupancy load of a restaurant. According to the applicant, the building has an occupant load of 120 persons which requires 60 spaces. Section 19.02 (C) states that in the C-2 District parking shall be provided on the same lot as the use, unless the property adjoins or has access to a community parking lot, or common parking area maintained by participating property owners. The applicant has indicated that 100 spaces exist within 250 feet of the building. A quick review of aerial photography confirms that more than 100 spaces exist within 250 feet of the subject property.
2. **Signs.** The applicant has not submitted any material regarding the placement, size, or general characteristics of new or additional signs on the existing building. This can be addressed as a condition of approval.

Review Standards. To approve a site plan, the Planning Commission should find that the standards listed in Section 18.06 would be met. Following are the standards and our comments on each:

- A. The uses proposed will not adversely affect the public health, safety or welfare. Uses and structures located on the site shall be planned to take into account topography, size of the property, the uses on adjoining property and the relationship and size of buildings to the site. The site shall be developed so as not to impede the normal and orderly development or improvement of surrounding property for uses permitted in this ordinance.

Comment: The use as a restaurant is permitted in the C-2 district. The building is already in existence and would not impede the development of adjacent properties. The Planning Commission may therefore find that this standard is met.

- B. Safe, convenient, uncongested, and well-defined vehicular and pedestrian circulation shall be provided for ingress/egress points and within the site. Drives, streets and other circulation routes shall be designed to promote safe and efficient traffic operations within the site and at ingress/egress points.

Comment: The property is serviced by a sidewalk along Main Street and pedestrian access from surrounding uses and parking facilities is sufficient. The existing layout of the site is functional and is consistent with the character of the downtown. The Planning Commission may find that this standard is met.

- C. The arrangement of public or private vehicular and pedestrian connections to existing or planned streets in the area shall be planned to provide a safe and efficient circulation system for traffic within the City of Lowell.

Comment: A sidewalk services the site along Main Street and connects to adjacent properties, and the site is well connected to the City's transportation network. The Planning Commission may find that this standard is met.

- D. Removal or alteration of significant natural features shall be restricted to those areas, which are reasonably necessary to develop the site in accordance with the requirements of this ordinance. The planning commission requires that approved landscaping, buffers and/or greenbelts be continuously maintained to ensure that proposed uses will be adequately buffered from one another and from surrounding public and private property.

Comment: The parcel is built out to the lot line and contains no existing landscaping. The Planning Commission may find that this standard is met.

- E. Satisfactory assurance shall be provided that the requirements of all other applicable ordinances, codes, and requirements of the City of Lowell will be met.

Comment: The proposed development is the reuse of an existing building. The Planning Commission should determine whether this standard would be met, and a condition of approval can stipulate continual compliance.

- F. The general purposes and spirit of this ordinance and the Comprehensive Plan of the City of Lowell shall be maintained.

Comment: This site is zoned for commercial uses, and the proposed use and configuration are generally consistent with the character of this block. The proposed business would be a welcome addition to the City of Lowell and is generally consistent with the City's Master

Plan. The Planning Commission may find that the overall intent of the master plan and the zoning district are met.

Recommendation. The Planning Commission should discuss the proposed site plan and any comments or concerns that would supplement or amend those presented here. It is recommended that the Planning Commission approve the site plan, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to issuance of any City permits, the applicant shall have paid all application, permit, reimbursable escrow, and other fees related to this request.
2. If new or additional signs are proposed, such signs shall be disclosed to the Zoning Enforcement Officer for review prior to installation.
3. The applicant and the site shall at all times comply with local standards and ordinances.
4. Any other conditions deemed necessary by the Planning Commission.

Request Number: _____

Filing Fee: _____



301 East Main Street
Lowell, Michigan 49331
Phone (616) 897-8457
Fax (616) 897-4085

APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW / SPECIAL LAND USE

- All drawings must be sealed by an architect, engineer or surveyor unless waived by the Zoning Administrator.
- 15 copies of the site plan must be submitted to the City Manager's office no later than four weeks before the Planning Commission meeting to allow adequate staff review.
- The Planning Commission meets the second Monday of the month at 7:00 p.m. where plans are approved, rejected or modified.
- Preliminary plans may be presented for Planning Commission comment, but no final approval is given until all required conditions are met.
- After approval, public works and building permits must be secured before construction may commence.

1. Street Address and/or Location of Request: 210 E. MAIN

2. Parcel Identification Number (Tax I.D. No.): #41-20- 02-413-021

3. Applicant's Name: GREG CANFIELD Phone Number 616 292 4948

Address: 403 N. WASHINGTON LOWELL MI 49331
Street City State Zip

Fax Number 616 897 0867 Email Address gregcanfield@aol.com

4. Are You: Property Owner Owner's Agent Contract Purchaser Option Holder

5. Applicant is being represented by: SELF Phone Number 616 292 4948

Address: 403 N. WASHINGTON

6. Present Zoning of Parcel C2 Present Use of Parcel PRIVATE LODGE

7. Description of proposed development (attach additional materials if needed):
CHANGE OF USE FROM PRIVATE LODGE
TO RESTAURANT

The facts presented above are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Signature: Greg Canfield Date: 2-16-15

Type or Print Your Name Here: GREG CANFIELD

Property Owner Approval: As owner I hereby authorize the submittal of this application and agree to abide by any decision made in response to it.
Owner Greg Canfield 2-16-15 Date

The following 16 points make up the **CHECKLIST** of required information needed on the drawing for final plan approval (unless specifically waived by the Planning Commission). Please go over this **CHECKLIST** with the City Manager and Zoning Administrator before presenting to the Planning Commission.

- | | INITIAL |
|---|---------------|
| 1. Date, north arrow and scale (not more than 1" = 100', supplementary site plans at a 1" = 50' or larger scale are encouraged) | <u>GC</u> |
| 2. A city locational sketch | <u>GC</u> |
| 3. Legal description and City address of the subject property | <u>GC</u> |
| 4. The size in acres or square feet of the subject property | <u>GC</u> |
| 5. All lot and/or property lines with dimensions, including building setback lines | <u>GC</u> |
| 6. The location of all existing structures within one hundred (100) feet of the subject property's boundary | <u>GC</u> |
| 7. The location and dimensions of all existing and proposed structures on the subject property | <u>GC</u> |
| 8. The location and dimensions of all existing and proposed: | |
| ▪ Drives | <u>GC</u> |
| ▪ curb openings (NOTE: all new openings onto M-21 (Main Street) must receive State Transportation Department approval) | _____ |
| ▪ sidewalks | _____ |
| ▪ exterior lighting | _____ |
| ▪ curbing | _____ |
| ▪ parking areas (include and delineate the total number of parking spaces showing dimensions of a typical space) | _____ |
| ▪ unloading areas | _____ |
| ▪ recreation areas | _____ |
| ▪ common use areas | _____ |
| ▪ areas to be conveyed for public use and purpose | _____ |
| 9. The location, pavement width and right-of-way width of abutting roads, alleys or easements | <u>GC</u> |
| 10. The existing zoning of all properties abutting the subject project | _____ |
| 11. The location of all existing and proposed: | |
| ▪ landscaping and vegetation | N/A |
| ▪ location, height and type of existing and proposed fences and walls | <u>GC</u> |
| 12. Proposed cost estimates of all site improvements | _____ |
| 13. Size and location of existing and proposed hydrants and utilities including proposed connections to public sewer or water supply systems | _____ |
| 14. The location and size of septic and drain fields | N/A <u>GC</u> |
| 15. Contour intervals shown at five (5) foot intervals | N/A <u>GC</u> |
| 16. FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT , the following information is required (affixed to the drawing): | |
| ▪ Net developable area, in acres or in square feet, defined as all areas that could be developed subtracted by lands used or dedicated for existing easements and rights of way | _____ |
| ▪ the number of dwelling units proposed (by type), including typical floor plans for each type of dwelling | _____ |
| ▪ the number and location of efficiency and one or more bedroom units | _____ |
| ▪ typical elevation views of the front, side and rear of each type of building | _____ |
| ▪ Dwelling unit density of the site (total number of dwellings / net developable area) | _____ |

MEMORANDUM

TO: City of Lowell Planning Commission

FROM: Andy Moore, AICP

DATE: March 2, 2015

RE: **Site Plan Review Revisions – Administrative Review**

The purpose of this memorandum is to discuss some potential changes to the site plan review zoning language in Chapter 18 of the City of Lowell Zoning Ordinance. These potential changes were brought to our attention by several recent site plan review requests where the only change to the building or property that affects zoning is that the use is changing.

The current language requires that a site plan review be submitted to the Planning Commission prior to the “creation of a use”. For example, if a property owner buys a vacant building and wants to move his/her business here, a site plan is required to be submitted to the Planning Commission for review despite no proposed physical dimensional or façade changes to the outside of the building.

Currently, site plan reviews are required for all special uses and all land uses in the R-3, MHP, C-1, C-2, C-3, I, PUD and PF districts, except that single- or two-family dwellings, state licensed residential family care facilities, family day care homes, and home occupations are exempt.

Many applicants are surprised to find that a site plan review is required when no changes to the site or the approved site plan on file are proposed, and some are frustrated by the time needed to complete a site plan and wait for a Planning Commission meeting. While we feel that that site plan review process is important, as it allows the City to review and parking, signage, landscaping, and other pertinent issues, we also think the Zoning Ordinance could be amended so that the re-use of an existing building where no additions, alterations or exterior changes are proposed could be administratively reviewed to assist property owners get through the planning process quickly. This would only occur when the new use is a use by right in the district in which it is located.

This is beneficial for a couple of reasons. First, it accelerates the process for developers looking to re-use vacant buildings in the City while still allowing for a zoning review to ensure the site is adequate for the proposed use and has sufficient parking, landscaping, pedestrian access, etc. However, the current practice can be cumbersome for applicants who are unfamiliar with zoning and are simply trying to convert an existing building to a new use, such as a restaurant or small business. Since the approval of the Planning Commission is required for applications that meet zoning requirements, such an approach would not take any discretionary authority away from the Planning Commission.

City of Lowell Planning Commission

March 2, 2015

Page 2

The best way to approach this amendment would be to authorize, in the Zoning Ordinance, the Zoning Enforcement Officer to be the reviewing body for site plans where (1) the proposed use is permitted by right in the subject zoning district, and (2) where no additions, alterations or exterior changes are proposed to any part of the site. This would be best accomplished with an amendment to Section 18.03 of the Zoning Ordinance.

As always, please feel free to contact me with any questions or concerns. With the Planning Commission's approval, we will draft amendment language for the next meeting.

2014 Staff Reports

<u>Open Date</u>	<u>Close Date</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Name/Business</u>	<u>Subject</u>
01/21/2014	01/23/2014	723 Avery	John Sterly	Remodel
01/14/2014	01/23/2014	905 N. Wash.	Dave Pasquale	Front Porch
03/11/2014	03/11/2014	1320 E. Main	Lowell Moose Lodge	Remodel
03/12/2014	08/07/2014	829 N. Monroe	Jan Sabin	Fence Permit
03/10/2014	03/26/2014	1000 Foreman	Root Lowell Mfg.	Inside/Remodel
				Pads/Silos on outside
03/10/2014		1427 W. Main	O'Reilly's	New Construction
03/20/2014	03/26/2014	706 Riverside	Steve Doyle	Attached garage
03/25/2014	03/27/2014	206 E. Main	Edward Jones	Inside Remodel
03/26/2014	03/27/2014	2384 W. Main	Xtreme Towing	Inside Office Space
		Suite B		
03/26/2014	04/03/2014	2240 W. Main	Napa Auto Parts	New Signage
04/08/2014	04/15/2014	206 E. Main	Edward Jones	New Signage
04/30/2014	05/06/2014	545 North St.	Timothy Groenhof	Porch and deck
04/29/2014	05/07/2014	329 N. Jefferson	ICCF Non Profit Housing	New Home
05/02/2014	05/23/2014	812 Grindle	Sable Construction	New Home
05/12/2014	05/12/2014	208 North	Jerry Bishop	Screen Porch
05/12/2014	05/19/2014	942 Sibley	Donna Keech	Deck
05/09/2014	05/16/2014	1425 W. Main	Lowell Chiro.	Remodel
05/16/2014	05/19/2014	319 N. Monroe	Terry Fisher	Deck/Porch
05/22/2014	05/29/2014	2232 Gee Drive	Katie Harrington	Fence
05/22/2014	05/28/2014	180 S. Center	Jeff Beach	Re-roof
05/29/2014	05/29/2014	206 N. Jackson	Tony Ellis	Windows/Siding
05/29/2014	05/29/2014	222 S. Division	Sally Eickhoff	Demo

06/12/2014	06/23/2014	402 Amity	St. Marys Church	Remodel
06/16/2014	06/19/2014	820 N. Wash.	Terry Tarchala	Shed
06/18/2014	06/18/2014	613 Avery	Methodist Church	Demo
06/18/2014	06/18/2014	208 N. Division	Methodist Church	Demo
06/24/2014	06/24/2014	2275 W. Main	First Baptist	Remodel
06/25/2014	06/25/2014	200 W. Main	Advanced Building	Remodel
07/02/2014	07/22/2014	329 N. Jackson	Roberta Miller	Single antenna
07/03/2014	07/08/2014	415 North	Daniel Beckett	Remodel
07/07/2014	07/08/2014	237 Jane Ellen	Nathan Masterson	Pergola
07/08/2014	07/08/2014	2420 Gee Dr.	J & L Gerard	Deck Rails
07/10/2014	07/10/2014	1302 Laurie Gail	Rich Conrad	Shed
07/16/2014	07/16/2014	705 Grindle	Kathn Manzewski	Covered Porch
06/26/2014	07/16/2014	2055 Bowes	American Tower	Upgrades
07/15/2014	07/16/2014	404 Lincoln Lake	Mark Fleet	Bath/Kirch Alterations
07/18/2014	08/07/2014	820 N. Wash.	Terry Tarchala	Deck
07/21/2014	08/07/2014	701 Amity	Greg Carlson	Wood Privacy
07/22/2014	08/07/2014	830 Shepard	City of Lowell	Shed
08/21/2014	08/27/2014	619 Lafayette	Nicole Raimmer	Re-Roofing
09/08/2014	09/18/2014	1308 H. Hills	Allen Edwin Homes	New Home
09/08/2014	09/18/2014	1314 H. Hills	Allen Edwin Homes	New Home
09/25/2014	10/10/2014	2163 W. Main	Snap Fitness	Inside Improvements
10/15/2014	10/17/2014	2810 Valley Vista	Loretta Durkin/Maureen Lopez	Deck
10/16/2014	10/16/2014	12675 Foreman	Lowell Area Schools	Storage Building
10/21/2014	10/23/2014	521 Elizabeth	Don Schneider	Shed
10/29/2014	11/04/2014	423 Suffolk	Kraig Haybarker	Accessary Building
11/05/2014	11/05/2014	350 N. Center	Laurels of Kent	Fence
11/06/2014		2275 W. Main	First Baptist Church	Accessary Building
11/26/2014	12/16/2014	1275 H. Hills	Allen Edwin Homes	New Home
12/08/2014	12/15/2014	521 W. Main	Builders Fireplace	Accessary Building

12/18/2014

12/29/2014

1400 W. Main

Red Frog/Car Wash

Demolition

2015 Staff Reports

Open Date
02/24/2015

Close Date

Address
2475 Gee Drive

Name/Business
Scott Barriger

Subject
Inground pool