

Planning staff has received feedback about the proposal. For example, the following was noted by Engineering and the Zoning staff:

1. The River Road frontage must be considered the front yard and this precludes the use of chain link fencing. The project planner has contacted the site designer in hopes an alternative screening/buffering method in keeping with LDC 18-554(e) can be determined.

2. It is worth repeating to state that easement access is being purported as sufficient to perpetuate adequacy of paved access to prospectively creating two tracts out of the subject property. Bill McDow commented on this matter on 4/19. Specifically, approval of a waiver to the 500/800 foot rule by the City Engineer would be needed. In the waiver request, the specific length of deviation beyond the spec needs to be stated.

a. Since the proposal still anticipates a split of the property into more than one parcel, SRB review:

i. Is the venue where the configuration of access may have to be reviewed and approved. At minimum, review and approval of a Minor Prelim Subdiv Plan would be needed

ii. Would therefore likely be the review body for the 500/800 rule waiver as would be sought by applicant

iii. May be able to address the lack of Lot Frontage on an unimproved (non-standard) easement since to date this has not been resolved (Bill also alluded to this)

3. No detail has been provided to date regarding the River Road easements as to the parties and restrictions on the use of the property affected i.e. its function and whether encroaching uses or screens proposed by the applicant would be prohibited. Please clarify prior to the next plan submission. It would not be unusual for the applicant to have to provide written confirmation from the holder of the easement that encroachments being submitted for planning and permitting review are acceptable.

4. Another major concern for the applicants is conformity of the proposed uses with LDC requirements. Recall that Kathryn Thurston issued a ruling that the concrete recycling would not require rezoning the property. But specifically, Chuck and Mike need to be aware that outdoor work on equipment and construction material storage is to be screened from view and repairs conducted indoors.

5. Please consider the attached drawing because its intent is to give you guidance so as to ensure that future uses (as existing currently) and proposed (as Chuck and Mike are representing) don't create new zoning violations for the ongoing uses proposed for the property.

Jim Diepenbrock

06.13.16

Development Review Planner, PDT