

SDP-24-04 / 105 S Main Street
1st Submittal
Planning/Zoning Comments

The following is the review of the Site Development Plan for renovations/improvements to an existing developed property (which may/does have existing, nonconforming situations) located at 105 S Main Street. The plans propose a compliant parking lot as the primary improvement to the subject property. The subject property is currently zoned GC, General Commercial District.

General Comments:

1. Subject Property - This Site Plan details a significant amount of work that ‘off site’ of 105 S. Main, specifically on 109 S. Main. Neither the Application, the Property Owner Consent Form, nor the SDP Cover Sheet makes any mention of (109 S. Main, owned by KET REAL ESTATE LLC per Wake County records) being party to this Application. Please explain / clarify/ revise Submittal to include both properties being party to this Application.
2. Regarding LDO Section 10.3, Nonconformities - Add a declaratory note, with Section citations, of what the existing nonconformities of this lot/development are. Staff then must review and agree with that. Once that is done, then Staff can review all proposals in the light of Section 10.3.
3. Existing Use – Explain if this property is actively being used or if it is non-occupied/ abandoned/not in active use.
4. Proposed Use - Remove all references to “salon” – this is a SDP to make improvements to an existing building not predicated upon a/the end-use tenant ultimately inside the building (outside of the shown parking calculations). This project is essentially a shell building site improvement. Note that the LDO has no Zoning Specific Use of “salon”, but rather, ‘salon’ is one of the descriptive examples under the Section 5.1.4.P. description of the ‘Retail and Service, Neighborhood’ Zoning specific Use.
5. Architectural Plans - Provide architectural elevations to demonstrate compliance (OR explain legal non-conforming status) not only with LDO Section 6.8.2, Non-residential building design standards. Note 6.8.2.B., Applicability; property fronts on one public right-of-way (S. Main) and is adjacent 2 properties zoned General Commercial, and 1 property (PIN 1769015048) that is zoned RL, Residential Low Density.
6. Per LDO Section 6.2.2.1.B. – Perimeter Bufferyards –
 - a. GC zoned adjacent GC zoned properties require No perimeter bufferyards.
 - b. GC zoned adjacent RL zoned property (PIN 1769015048) requires a Type 3 (25’) buffer.
 - c. Sheet C-6, Landscape Plan, indicates NO bufferyard adjacent PIN 1769015048 which indicates to Staff that Applicant finds this project to be considered 6.2.2.1.B.1., Repair and Renovation, whereby there would be no Perimeter Bufferyard required. Staff notes that B.1. only speaks to Building improvement, not Site, and this plan clearly includes Site improvements, and thus, this project cannot be considered subject to 6.2.2.1.B.1.
 - d. Staff observes Sheet C-6 / Note #2 states *“No change of use is proposed. Thus, Perimeter Buffers are not required.”* Staff disagrees with this note and this assessment that the scope of this project falls under Section 6.2.2.1.B.4. and this is merely a ‘change of use’. If what was occurring was simply a ‘change of use’ – a different Zoning Specific Use from the existing/last Zoning Specific Use going into the existing building and site – there would be No need to process a SDP. Applicant would simply file a Change of Tenant Form with

the Town, declaring that along with a Change of Tenant, it was a Change of Use, and so long as that Proposed/New Use was a Permitted Zoning use under the GC Zoning, it would be permitted; additional aspects such as Section 5.1.1. Specific Use standards and then Section 6.4.3. Off-Street Parking requirements would need to be vetted as well; see earlier comments about Existing and Proposed Uses. In Staff's review, this project is clearly an "improved site area" scope of work; see next Comment.

- e. Clarify/explain/demonstrate if this project entails a "Minor" (B.2) or a "Major" (B.3) improved site area; the Plans indicate the Building to NOT be increasing in square footage.
 - f. Revise plans accordingly to demonstrate compliance. Staff identifies that this would appear impossible given the "off-site" improvements to/on PIN 1769015048 that are demonstrated. Applicant has the option to pursue a Zoning Variance if they believe a physical hardship exists precluding compliance. Staff further notes that, if PIN 1769015048 were zoned GC, Perimeter Bufferyard would be a moot point.
7. Regarding LDO Section 6.8.8., Mechanical Equipment Screening (and 6.8.2.D.7.a.) – Sheet C-2 indicates a "Ex. HVAC to be relocated"; Sheet C-3 does not note a new/planned HVAC unit. These sections speak to screening of roof top units (RTU's). Explain/clarify/revise plans to indicate location of proposed HVAC equipment and then, demonstration of compliance w this section if applicable.
 8. Regarding LDO Section 6.8.3.E, Accessory Features - If HVAC units (and/or any other mechanical type equipment) are to be ground-mounted, clarify that on plans and demonstrate compliance. IF equipment is not visible from S. Main Street, and "Fully contained", that is compliance.
 9. Per LDO Section 6.8.4.B.4, Sidewalks - These shall be at least 6' in width; per (b.) of this section, they shall be provided along the full length of building facades with a customer entrance. Sheet C-3 appears to indicate an exterior door/entrance exists along S. Main Street, and then a new set of 2 exterior doors are proposed on the 'back' (parking lot) side of building. The lack of Architectural elevations does not help staff understand the full intent of improvements (see other comments on this topic). Clarify/explain/revise plan set to clearly indicate what the intentions are regarding customer entrances, and then demonstrate compliance with this pedestrian access requirement pursuant to customer entrances.
 10. LDO Section 6.8, Design Standards - All exterior modifications to the non-conforming structure shall meet the requirements provided in Section 6.8, Design Standards; see previous comment about the lack of architectural elevations which limit Staff's review.
 11. Impervious Coverage – Sheet C-3 Site Data Table indicates existing IC is 1,600 SF (25% of site) and Proposed IC is 5,830 SF (80%) of site – Staff does not observe any information as to how stormwater drainage, at least for the increased amount of IC [4,230 SF] is being dealt with. Defer to Town Engineer and/or Wake County Watershed Management on this topic ultimately.
 12. LDO Section 6.6, Lighting – Clarify/explain that there is NO lighting being proposed (indicated by lack of any plan information regarding lighting, OR provide a lighting plan as part of the revised plan set in accordance with the requirements of Section 6.6, Lighting as they relate/apply to the scope and level of lighting being proposed.
 13. FYI/ Signage - All proposed signage shall conform with the requirements of Section 6.1 of the LDO and will require a sperate Town sign permit and possibly a building permit (TBD based on scope of sign/structure/etc.).

Cover Sheet

14. Add site plan project number 'SDP-24-04' to the cover sheet in a clear and obvious spot – suggest in the top/center title area. "SDP-24-04" should also be somewhere consistent on EVERY sheet in the plan sheet (suggest the vertical side banner area).
15. Please provide a Site Data Table, similar to what is shown on Sheet C-3, along with a general notes table stating previously mentioned item (other comments that relate to Cover Sheet).

Existing Conditions/Demolition Plan (C-2)

16. Provide the BM/Pg or Bk/Pg recordation number for the existing 25' ingress & egress Easement. Documentation will be required which demonstrates that the property owner for the subject site is in fact an easement holder and that all proposed improvements to the easement (i.e., asphalt paving) are agreeable by all parties. *See previous comment about 109 S Main involvement.*
17. Graphically show the distances/dimensions of existing structure from all property lines.
18. Label/call-out any Existing vegetation to remain including the species and caliper measurement.
19. Label/add call-outs of all existing structures / features within the (S. Main St.) right-of-way.
20. Revise to add/clearly show the dimensions of all property lines and building footprint(s).

Site Plan (C-3)

21. Per LDO Section 6.4.4.C. - Revise to show all 90-degree parking spaces are minimum 8'x19' dimensioned.
22. Sight Triangles at S. Main Street – Revise/Show/label the site distance triangles. Also, confirming this driveway will be a right-in right-out (RIRO) only as site distances appear to be impacted due to the location of the existing building.
23. Site Data Table/Required Minimum Building Setbacks - Due to nature of this being an existing possibly non-conforming situation (development), add/provide in the summary information table the actual, existing building setbacks.
24. Per LDO Section 6.8.4.B.2. - Revise/ demonstrate compliance by adding at least four (4) pedestrian amenities (from the menu in this section) as required for all non-residential developments.
25. Site Data Table/Required Parking – Revise to clarify that the noted required Parking (2.5 space/1,000 SF) is for Permitted use groups of: Bank, Eating Establishment, Retail Sales and Services; this way, any of those Permitted Zoning uses that fall into those parking requirement categories (or categories with LESSER parking requirements) will be understood to be permitted so far as parking is required at this property.

Landscaping Plan (C-6)

26. Per LDO 6.2.2.4.G. – Revise plans to demonstrate compliance that parking perimeter plantings (shrubs) shall extend the entire perimeter of the parking lot.