
RE: Fountains Matthews _ PCO Concept Consultation Meeting

1 message

Nowocin, Adam <Adam.Nowocin@mecklenburgcountync.gov>

Fri, Feb 7, 2014 at 11:46 AM

To: Jay Camp <jcamp@matthewsnc.gov>

Cc: Mary Jo Gollnitz <mjgollnitz@matthewsnc.gov>

Jay,

I met with Wyatt Dixon (Owner) and Jeff Orsborn, PE (Consultant) this past Tuesday to discuss the BMP options for the Fountains Matthews Project. The Rezoning Site Plan (Attached) provides for four (4) separate possible BMP/Water Quality on-site locations. I feel the project will end up using above ground BMP features combined with an underground detention system to meet the Town of Matthews Post Construction BMP Requirements. This combined BMP & Detention System should not cause any extensive changes to the Site Plan.

Also, during the meeting it was stated that there was a desire to see Wet BMP Ponds with Fountains on-site due to the name of the project. Per the BMP Design Manual this site does not offer the minimum drainage area required to sustain a Wet BMP Pond. I would recommend that the project include some other type of fountain system to achieve this look. If a Wet BMP Pond is still desired then a well system would need to be installed to accomplish this goal by keeping the minimum water level within the Wet BMP Pond.

Conceptually moving forward I feel that the project will meet the requirements of the Town of Matthews Post Construction Ordinance without any major changes to the Rezoning Site Plan. If any changes were needed it would be the impact of the loss of units.

Feel free to contact me if you have any questions or need any additional information.

Sincerely,

Adam M. Nowocin, PE

Project Manager



Mecklenburg County, NC

LUESA

Land Use and Environmental Services Agency

700 North Tryon Street

Charlotte, NC 28202

(704) 432-1321 Office



Consider the environment before printing this email or the attachment.

From: Wyatt Dixon
Sent: Wednesday, February 05, 2014 8:22 AM
To: 'adam.nowocin@mecklenburgCountyNC.gov'
Cc: Jay Camp; Jeff Orsborn (jorsborn@orsborn-eng.com); Wyatt Dixon (wyatt@proffittdixon.com)
Subject: Fountains Matthews- Thank you

Adam,

I wanted to thank you for your time yesterday morning discussing the PCCO plan for Fountains Matthews. I'm copying both Jeff Orsborn and Jay Camp, the Senior Planner from Matthews who has been our "quarterback" with the Town. Yesterday evening, the Matthews Planning Board gave us a unanimous approval and so our next step is to be in front of the Town Board next Monday night.

I explained to Jay that you would not have final "sign off" on our PCCO concept plan prior to Monday. Jay asked me to ask you if—based on what you have seen so far—if you would be willing to provide a quick e-mail to him indicating that "based on what you have seen 'so far' if you foresee any issue that might require a significant site plan adjustment". We all realize that a BIG disclaimer to this statement would be that you haven't actually done a review, but a preliminary e-mail to Jay would be a big help if you would be so kind.

Thank you again for your time. Jeff will be in touch with you very soon.
Wyatt

Agenda Item: Continuation of Public Hearing for Application 2013-602, Fountains Matthews

DATE: January 8, 2014
RE: Update on Changes to Application 2013-602
FROM: Jay Camp, Senior Planner

Background/Issue:

In October, the Public Hearing for this project was opened however due to protest, the hearing was continued to after the election. Since this time, the applicant has made a number of key revisions to the proposal in response to input from both Staff and the Board. Overall, we are pleased with the changes to the plans. However, some certainty should be provided so that the project retains a mixed-use dynamic. The proposed single nonresidential building should be developed as public open space should construction of the building not occur within a given time. If the live/work units do not develop as such, the project would evolve into a traditional apartment complex without a mixed-use aspect. Some mixture of apartments, open space or nonresidential uses must occur for the project to meet the intentions of the MUD zoning.

Following is a brief summary of changes that have occurred since October:

1. Live/work is proposed for the ground floor of a portion of the project. These units are not required to be live/work if they cannot be rented within a certain amount of time.
2. The separate nonresidential building is now proposed as potentially a green space should development never occur.
3. A pedestrian crossing of Northeast Parkway and sidewalk into the Matthews Corners shopping center are planned provided that NCDOT and the adjacent owner consent to the improvements
4. The multiuse path along Northeast is planned for 10' in width. The conditional note states that it may be reduced below 10' only where grade would require the installation of a 4' in height or greater retaining wall
5. Building facades facing Matthews Township Parkway will be at least 50% brick
6. Building "I" will be constructed as a 2-story carriage house
7. The trash compacter may only be used between the hours of 7am and 7pm
8. New building elevations are provided

Memo

To: Jay Camp, Sr. Planner
From: Ralph S. Messera, Public Works Director
Date: January 3, 2014
Subject: Fountains Matthews



Public Works has completed a second review of this project and offers the following comments regarding the rezoning request:

1. No curb and gutter is shown on Northeast Parkway. Have we approved this already, or should that be required?
2. One garbage and recycling area. Is that adequate for a project this size? It's a long way from the front units.
3. Common Mailbox location? Parking spaces for mailbox area?
4. Notes allow for multi-use trails to be reduced for 10 ft where a retaining wall of more than 4 ft is required. Notes need to be amended to state that in no case will trails be less than 8 ft. and the trail on Northeast Parkway must be 10 ft its full length.
5. Wet-ponds- methods for goose control?
6. Public Works, as a storm water utility, still objects to the destruction of the wetlands in development parcel A, with no mitigation or detention shown.

Project Summary

Location: Southeast corner of NC 51 and Northeast Parkway

Owner: Crosland Matthews Corners LLC

Agent: Keith MacVean, Moore & Van Allen

Current Zoning: B-1 SCD

Proposed Zoning: MUD

Existing Use: Vacant Land

Proposed Use: Apartments and non-residential uses

Community Meeting: Occurred 9/26/13

Summary of Request

The proposal entails 250 units of multifamily housing in elevator serviced, interior corridor apartment buildings with up to 8,000 square feet of non-residential space.

Staff Recommendation

Based on recent revisions to the site plan, staff recommends the project contingent upon satisfaction or all outstanding issues. The proposal represents a quality development that meets the intent of the land-use plan and provides a relatively high value per acre return on investment for tax purposes.

Planning Staff Review

Background And History

The site is part of a much larger rezoning that occurred in the same time frame as the construction of the North Carolina 51 bypass that was built in the early 1990's. The current entitlement for the property is for a 108,000 square foot retail power center and several retail outparcels along 51. The planned shopping center design would be similar in scale and character to the existing Matthews Corners Shopping Center across Northeast Pa

Details of the Site Plan

The main feature of the proposal is a central courtyard surrounded by 250 apartments. Nonresidential uses are planned for a freestanding building along Township Parkway and may also be located on the first floor of some of the apartment buildings. A private drive provides access to the site from both Township Parkway and Northeast Parkway.

Summary of Proposed Conditions

1. Site to be devoted to 250 apartments and 8,000 sq ft nonresidential space
2. Access on Northeast and Matthews Township
3. Decorative landscaping at corner of Northeast and 51
4. Fencing along property boundary with Bella Sera

Planning Staff Review

Outstanding Issues/Staff Comments

1. The currently balance of residential vs. nonresidential space does not appear to meet the intent of the Mixed-Use District. Staff recommends increasing the projected nonresidential at the site to a minimum of 20,000 ft.
2. A list of allowed uses should be included in revisions. The B-1 table of uses are prescribed for nonresidential uses in the MUD District.
3. Staff recommends a pedestrian crosswalk across Northeast Parkway connecting the development to existing retail and services at Matthews Corners Shopping Center.
4. Parking spaces should counted and projected unit sizes listed to ensure project can meet parking requirements.
5. Elevations have not yet been provided for review.
6. The innovative request requires a letter to the Planning Director stating the components of the request. We have not yet received this letter.
7. Some nonresidential space should be built prior to completion of the project otherwise the site becomes single use and not in compliance with the MUD.
8. The option to move the driveway to align with the Matthews Corners driveway does not appear to work well with the revised site plan. This language may no longer be necessary.
9. Staff recommends increasing the proposed 6' sidewalk on Northeast to a 10' multiuse path. Multiuse path along the entire segment of Northeast from Matthews Township to Matthews Mint Hill Rd would eventually connect Windsor Park, the Sycamore Commons Greenway and the new greenway at Royal Park.

Consistency with Adopted Plans and Policies and Town Vision Statements

In the Land Use Plan, NC 51 Action Item Number 5 states: "Promote mixed use developments and planned business parks along the Matthews Township Parkway portion of NC-51 (i.e. between Monroe Road and Northeast Parkway).

Reports from Town Departments and County Agencies

Matthews Police

Non reported

Matthews Fire

Non reported

Public Works

Recommendation to add speed table to private street "A" and to consider removing the non-residential building along 51 due to SWIM Buffer impacts

Matthews Parks and Recreation

Recommendation to increase proposed 6' sidewalk on Northeast to 10' multiuse path

Charlotte Mecklenburg Schools

See report from Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools

PCO Concept Plan Approval Required?

Yes

Impact Analysis

Based on staff analysis of numerous apartment communities in Matthews and similar Mecklenburg County locations, 15 dwelling units per acre or less represents a break point where tax value per acre is similar to that of single family zoning. Sites with a density higher than 15 units per acre on average yield a much higher tax value.

Due to the nature of this proposal as an elevator serviced, interior corridor style product, the total valuation per apartment unit is expected to be higher than typical garden apartment projects. One site that we benchmarked was the largest, most recent apartment community in Matthews, Colonial Grand on Sam Newell Rd. That project, with a density of only about 11.5 du/ac returns tax values of about \$842,000/acre. In comparison, a similar product along I-485 in Charlotte in the Arysley development has a higher density and yields. Based on these observations, staff recommends that density should not be arbitrarily reduced and additional nonresidential space should be included to increase average tax value per acre.

Colonial Matthews	Colonial Arysley	Fountains Mooresville
Units 216	Units: 209	Units: 227
Acres: 18.83	Acres: 9.8	Acres: 8
Density: 11.5 du/ac	Density: 21.3 du/ac	Density: 28.4 du/ac
Total Value: \$16,026,500	Total Value: \$16,866,200	Total Value: \$22,500,000
Per acre value: \$842,000	Per acre value \$1,721,040	Per acre value: \$2,812,000
Per unit value \$74,000	Per unit value \$80,000	Per unit value: \$99,000

Project Financial Impact of Proposed Fountains Matthews

Units: 250

Acres: 15

Density: 16.7 du/ac

Total Estimated Value: \$21,250,000

Total value with 8,000 sq ft of nonresidential: \$22,850,000

Per acre value \$1,523,333

Estimated Annual Local Taxes: \$72,548

*The above are estimates of potential tax generation based on research by the Planning Department. The tax assessors office will ultimately determine the value of the property