

**Planning Commission
Staff Report Addendum**

March 15, 2018



Case:	17DEVPLAN1237
Project Name:	Mellwood Art Center
Applicant:	Mose Putney, Putney Architecture
Case Manager:	Laura Mattingly, AICP, Planner II

STAFF FINDINGS

Staff finds that the requested parking waiver appears justified and meets the standard of review.

STANDARD OF REVIEW AND STAFF ANALYSIS FOR PARKING REDUCTION WAIVER

- (a) The Parking Waiver is in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan; and

STAFF: Guideline 7 Policy 10 states that parking requirements should take into account the density and relative proximity of residences to businesses in the market area, the availability and use of alternative modes of transportation, and the character and pattern of the form district. Additional considerations including hours of operation and opportunities for shared parking may be factored on a site by site basis. On-site parking standards should reflect the availability of on-street and public parking. These guidelines are not violated as the site is located in an urban area with nearby transit access along Frankfort Ave. Additionally, the various uses that operate within the center have different peak times, resulting in a lower need for parking overall.

- (b) The applicant made a good faith effort to provide as many parking spaces as possible on the site, on other property under the same ownership, or through joint use provisions; and

STAFF: The applicant made a good faith effort to provide as many parking spaces as possible on the site, on other property under the same ownership, or through joint use provisions as parking is proposed in all of the available space on the site. The parking area directly across Mellwood is part of the development but could not be counted because no pedestrian access currently exists.

- (c) The requested waiver is the smallest possible reduction of parking spaces that would accommodate the proposed use; and

STAFF: The applicant applied all possible parking reductions for the site resulting in the smallest possible reduction for the requested waiver.

- (d) Adjacent or nearby properties will not be adversely affected; and

STAFF: Adjacent or nearby properties will not be adversely affected as the applicant has displayed that the on-site parking provided contains enough spaces for the use.

- (e) The requirements found in Table 9.1.2 do not accurately depict the parking needs of the proposed use and the requested reduction will accommodate the parking demand to be generated by the proposed use; and

STAFF: The requirements found in Table 9.1.2 do not accurately depict the parking needs of the proposed use and the requested reduction will accommodate the parking demand to be generated by the proposed use as this is an adaptive reuse of a large warehouse. The gross square footage which the parking requirement is calculated on does not accurately represent the area of the building that is utilized for the proposed use.

- (f) That there is a surplus of on-street or public spaces in the area that can accommodate the generated parking demand;

STAFF: The area does have street parking available in the neighborhood to the south and east. The parking counts provided by the applicant appear to display that the parking needs will be met by the on-site parking and any overflow should be minimal.