

**Planning Commission Comments on Proposed Draft Amendments
to the Maple Avenue Commercial (MAC) Zone, as Discussed at February 27, 2019 Work Session**

MAC Code Section	Planning Commission Comments with Staff Response/Follow-Up
18-95.11 - Mobility and Circulation 18-95.7 - Area Requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Baum - How are encroachments/cantilevered features addressed? - Meren - 11. When parcels are merged, large sites like Giant, 28 ft. does not seem like enough of a setback - Kenney - D. MAC serves first-come-first-serve, when it comes to windows and doors on side yards. Suggested increase from 8' to 10' in order to accommodate projections.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Staff posted proposed streetscape zones, primary and secondary side streets map and analysis on the <i>Maple Avenue Vision</i> webpage. - Staff recommends adding the following language to Sec. 18-95.11.A.1., "The area between the edge of the front building wall and the face of the curb adjacent to Maple Avenue East and West and the primary and secondary side streets, as defined in Section 18-95.7.C., shall be considered the streetscape area."
18-95.13 - Open Space Set-Asides ("Gathering Spaces")	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kenney - No minimum open to the sky and contiguous - Baum - Open space should be considered if at least 6' wide or other minimum width to prevent piecing small spaces together - Couchman - providing less prescribed minimums for gathering space is okay, because small spaces will not meet the use of gathering space - Baum - disagrees, wants more definition - define "gathering space"
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Staff posted proposed gathering spaces analysis on the <i>Maple Avenue Vision</i> webpage - Staff offers the following language to Sec. 18-95.13.A. "Gathering spaces may include partially and fully-covered spaces that are open on at least one side. Partially and fully-covered spaces cannot be more than 25% of the required minimum gathering space."
18-95.14 - Site Development Standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kenney - Create diagram showing block sizes and building setbacks for visualization - Meren - Make large sites have greater setbacks from the Maple Ave frontage - McCullough - Ordinance and design guidelines streets will match - Baum, Kenney & McCullough - How will we require medical uses to have more loading space, more emergency vehicles or covered space? Should we require covered space? - Couchman - Should awning be included as a condition of the CUP? Where is the most appropriate place in code?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Staff posted proposed building and façade break analysis on the <i>Maple Avenue Vision</i> webpage. - Staff offers a new subsection 18-95.14.K. "Ambulance areas. Nursing, assisted or independent living facilities for seniors must designate a covered area, on-site, for ambulances." - Staff will provide a map at 3/13/19 work session showing block lengths along Maple Avenue - Staff would like to further discuss Sections 18-95.14.B. and C. at the 3/13/19 work session.

18-95.16 - Neighborhood Compatibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Gelb - How does working from the "setback" create more distance than "property line" - Baum - Why are outdoor vending machines allowed? - McCullough - Need to think of other utilization of vending-type equipment for other uses, while not as prevalent currently - Staff will review language <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Staff indicated at the 2-27-19 work session that the proposed setback area increases the rear setback by 5 ft. and the side and corner setback by 5-7 ft. for single-family detached dwellings. Staff will provide a map at 3/13/19 work session showing the existing setback area compared to the proposed setback area. - Staff posted proposed setback area analysis on the <i>Maple Avenue Vision</i> webpage. - Staff recommends adding "townhouse development" to Sections 18-95.16.B.1., 18-95.16.D.1.b., and 18-95.16.E. - Staff recommends adding the following language to Sec. 18-95.16.D.1. "General. Buildings within 100 feet of a property line of a single family dwelling, townhouse or townhouse development are subject to these following standards shall." - Staff offers the following deletion to Sec. 18-95.16.D.1.b. "Orient porches, balconies, outdoor space, and other exterior site features such as vending machines away from adjacent single family dwellings, townhouses and townhouse developments."
18-95.9 - Height Limit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kenney - Building shall have an appearance of no more than 4-stories, why allow more stories to be "crammed" into the 54' feet, seems redundant - let them meet building code - Kenney - If we want to allow what will be 5 story buildings by building code we will need to have some public input - due to difference in definition between codes - Gelb - Would we allow roof-top structures for dining, etc., or would that be a 5th story? Neighbors concerned about privacy, are roof-top activities desired - Baum - Aren't grills not permitted by code? - McCullough - Struggled with retail depth because of lot sizing - variation - Maybe set a ratio of depth to lot depth - Kenny - 50 is pretty reasonable shallow retail - Don't go too shallow to create ridiculous retail - 40' is a good depth - Gelb - But, do we need 54' to attract the type of development we want?? - McCullough - The ad hoc wanted to retain 54' without evidence that development will take place at lower heights - given that they are not now - Couchman - Good representation of scale - addresses comparison to Church Street. We have antidotal evidence that the 4th story is needed. Should reference other code changes that will impact the residential setback, lowering height down to 35' feet within 100' feet of residential - Baum - We need a study to show that 45' will not develop. Traffic will increase and sewer and water will need to be upgraded. - Gelb - Clarified that he was not suggesting an arbitrary change, but some empirical evidence - Basnight - Studies were done. - Couchman - First comparison of apples to apples MAC development (building scale analysis)

	- Kenny - Major issue we run into is concern over density, don't set density because the units get larger or town houses. Setbacks and step backs reduce density, like is proposed. More graphics we have at workshops the better. Including, development blocks broken up, variation on roof-lines/stories etc.
	- Staff posted the building scale analysis on the <i>Maple Avenue Vision</i> webpage.
	- Staff recommends the following changes to Sec. 18-95.9.A. "The maximum building height shall be the lesser of four stories or 54 feet, as shown in Figure 18-95.9.1, Determination of Height. Buildings shall have the appearance of, at most, four stories when viewed from every cardinal direction. Mezzanines shall comply with the applicable section(s) of the Virginia Uniform Statewide Building Code. "
	- Staff recommends the following change to Sec. 18-95.9.B. "The minimum height of the first story of a principal building shall be 15 feet, which shall be maintained for a minimum depth of 40 feet."
General	- Staff would like to further discuss Sec. 18-95.9 at the 3/13/19 work session.
	- McCullough suggested adding references throughout the MAC to the applicable design guidelines sections and vice versa.
	- Staff will provide section references and hyperlinks in the final version of both documents.