



**Planning Department**  
**Planning and Zoning Commission**  
**March 2nd, 2016 Meeting**

**Staff Report**

**DATE:** February 22, 2016

**TO:** Planning & Zoning Commission Members

**FROM:** Joshua Langen, Senior Planner, AICP

**SUBJECT:** **Z-2016-01** Request by Robert W. Nixon to rezone property located at 3773 Kannapolis Parkway from C-2-CZ/O-I-CZ/RL-CZ (General Commercial-Conditional Zoning/ Office-Institutional-Conditional Zoning/ Residential Low Density-Conditional Zoning) to C-2-CZ/O-I-CZ/RC-CZ/RL-CZ (General Commercial-Conditional Zoning/ Office-Institutional-Conditional Zoning/ Residential Compact-Conditional Zoning/Residential Low-Density-Conditional Zoning ). The property measures approximately 136 acres in area and consists of four (4) parcels; #5602-28-4977, #5602-19-3677, #5603-10-3716 and #5603-20-5223.

**A. Actions Requested by Planning & Zoning Members**

1. Hold Public Hearing
2. Motion to approve (deny) a Resolution to Adopt a Statement of Consistency
3. Motion to approve (deny) a Resolution to Zone

**B. Decision and Required Votes to Pass Requested Action**

Section 3.3.4.2.2 of the UDO allows the Planning and Zoning Commission to render a final decision on the rezoning request, subject to an affirmative vote of three-fourths of the Commission members present and not excused from voting, or if there is no appeal of the decision. If there is a denial, an approval by a vote of less than three-fourths, or an appeal of the decision, then only the City Council shall have final decision making authority. Any final decision rendered by the Commission may be appealed within fifteen (15) days to the City Council.

## **C. Background**

### Summary

The applicant, Robert W. Nixon, is requesting a rezoning in order to build a mixed-use development consisting of general commercial, single-family attached homes, and single-family detached homes on parcels #5602-28-4977, #5602-19-3677, #5603-10-3716 and #5603-20-5223 (see attached site plans for proposed layout). The general commercial portions will share ingress and egress for the development; however, they will not be developed as part of this proposal. Future development of the commercial portions will require an amendment and application for Conditional Zoning. The remainder of the project will be developed in three (3) phases, as shown on the attached site plans.

### Background

The parcels to be developed are currently zoned C-2-CZ/O-I-CZ/RL-CZ (General Commercial-Conditional Zoning/ Office-Institutional-Conditional Zoning/ Residential Low-Conditional Zoning) and are restricted by a site plan approved by the Planning & Zoning Commission on February 6, 2008. The current site plan has expired and cannot be developed without re-adoption by the Planning and Zoning Commission; however, the plan still acts as a condition of development and must be removed, replaced or amended in order to develop a project with a different configuration. A Development Agreement was approved by City Council on January 28, 2008; however, the Development Agreement is now null and void due to inaction. A Conditional Use application to allow for single-family attached dwellings in a portion of the O-I-CZ zoning on this property was denied by the Board of Adjustment on January 19, 2016.

### Proposed Site Plan

The proposed site plan includes two (2) commercial sections along Kannapolis Parkway to be accessed by a central entrance similar to the Rogers Lake Road cross-section across the Parkway. Two secondary entrances to the North and South of the central entrance are also proposed. The central entrance will be constructed in stages, in accordance with the proposed phasing plan and recommendations from a Traffic Impact Study, ultimately resulting in the full street cross-section as shown. The two secondary entrances have been preliminarily approved as right-in/right-out access points by NCDOT and will serve to provide alternate access points to the development.

The plan also proposes two types of attached single-family homes south of the commercial sections on the portion proposed for RC-CZ zoning. A block of 35' wide lots with single-family homes attached by connected storage spaces would form the center of this section of the plan. These units would be surrounded by attached single-family townhomes on 20' wide individual lots. This section will be required to conform to Section 11.2 Multi-Family Design Standards of the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO).

The applicant is proposing detached single-family homes for the O-I-CZ portion on 60' wide lots which would be required to conform to the UDO Residential Compact (RC) lot development standards. This section is bordered by Afton Run creek and will require a bridge in order to connect to the rear section along the western boundary. The plan also proposes to keep the current RL (Residential Low Density) in the rear/western portion, yet limit the configuration to one-acre lots. A total of 299 lots are proposed for the entire site. The floodplain section of Afton Run creek has the potential to host a greenway for residents of the development and

possibly for public access. Open Space and recreational amenities will be required to conform to Section 6.5 Open Space Standards as well as Section 11.2 of the UDO. The financial investment requirements for recreational amenities in Section 11.2 will be satisfied through a public access greenway or through the provision of an amenity center. The exact recreational amenity configuration will be determined during Final Site Plan review.

#### **D. Fiscal Considerations**

None

#### **E. Policy Issues**

UDO Section 3.3.5 states that the Planning and Zoning Commission may consider the following questions, at a minimum, in reviewing an application for a rezoning:

**1. The size of the tract in question.**

The size of the subject tracts is approximately 136 acres.

**2. Does the proposal conform with and further the goals and policies of the Land Use Plan, other adopted plans, and the goals, objectives, and policies of this Ordinance?**

The subject property is located in the “South Kannapolis Growth Area” as designated in the City of Kannapolis 2015 Land Use Plan (LUP). The LUP designates this property as being located within the Heavy Commercial, Mixed Use and SFR1 Single-Family Residential Future (Recommended) Land Use categories.

The proposed preliminary Major Site Plan proposes General Commercial along Kannapolis Parkway and bordered by single-family attached homes to the south and single-family detached homes to the west. The design layout for the proposed development incorporates an interconnected street and sidewalk system, along with shared open space and recreation amenities. The configuration of the development would encourage pedestrian activity and allow residents to visit the commercial section by walking or bicycling. The plan proposes an interconnected mix of uses and building types. Based on the foregoing, staff considers the proposed rezoning to be in conformance with the goals and policies of the LUP and the UDO.

**3. Is the proposed rezoning compatible with the surrounding area?**

The property is surrounded primarily by low-density residential and vacant land uses, along with the proposed Kellswater Traditional Neighborhood (TND) commercial development to the east of Kannapolis Parkway. The commercial component of the applicant’s proposed plan would complement the anticipated future commercial component of the Kellswater Traditional Neighborhood (TND) to be located east of Kannapolis Parkway at its intersection with Rogers Lake Road, which is likely to occur as the residential component of Kellswater continues to develop. To the west of the residential portion of the proposed rezoning is a large-lot subdivision (Pine Creek), against which applicant proposes to develop one-acre lots. Rural residences are located south of the site and will be buffered through the use of vegetative buffer yards as well as considerable open space between those lots and the remainder of the development. Single-family attached homes will serve as transitional uses between the commercial portion and rural residential areas to the north. Additional development further north of the site along Kannapolis Parkway, includes office, medical and other commercial uses. The proposed rezoning would contain uses

similar to those being developed in the surrounding area and it is therefore staff's position that the proposed rezoning is compatible with the surrounding area.

**4. Will there be adverse effects on the capacity or safety of the portion of street network influenced by the rezoning?**

The proposed site plan shows the development would be accessed at three (3) points, with the main entrance to be located at the Kannapolis Parkway/Rogers Lake Road intersection. The applicant's site plan shows a street cross section at this main entrance which is identical to the cross-section for Rogers Lake Road to the east of Kannapolis Parkway. Staff believes that the proposed cross-section would be adequate to accommodate the additional traffic to be generated by the requested rezoning. The two other access points, one north and one south of the main access, will be right-in/right-out and will serve as alternate routes for the residential (as well as commercial) portions of the development. NCDOT has given preliminary approval, with comments, for all three (3) access points; however, a Traffic Impact Study must be submitted and approved in order for final site plan approval to be granted by the Technical Review Committee (TRC). Accordingly, based on the existing capacity of Kannapolis Parkway, a fully-configured Rogers Lake Road intersection and any improvements required by a Traffic Impact Study, staff believes that the proposed rezoning will have no adverse effects on the capacity or safety of the portion of the street network to be influenced by this rezoning request.

**5. Will there be parking problems?**

The residential portions of the development would be required to have driveways to accommodate residential parking. Future commercial/office development at the main entrance would be required to comply with the parking requirements of the UDO. Based on compliance with the parking requirements of the UDO, staff does not anticipate any parking problems resulting from the proposed rezoning.

**6. Will there be environmental impacts that the new use will generate, such as excessive storm water runoff, water, air or noise pollution, excessive nighttime lighting, or other nuisances?**

The proposed development will be required to receive Final Site Plan approval from the TRC, which will include compliance with all applicable storm water, lighting, landscaping and infrastructure requirements of the UDO. Based on compliance with these requirements, the development is not anticipated to generate excessive storm water runoff, water, air or noise pollution, excessive nighttime lighting, or other nuisances.

**7. Has there been any change of character in the area due to installation of public facilities, other zone changes, new growth trends, deterioration, and development?**

The area surrounding the proposed rezoning has experienced an increase in development growth pressure due to the construction of Kannapolis Parkway as well as improvements to the Kannapolis Parkway/Rogers Lake Road intersection. Other development that has occurred in close proximity to the proposed rezoning includes medical offices, the Integra Springs Apartments, and the residential component of the Kellswater TND. Development that will occur in conjunction with the proposed rezoning will be consistent with recent growth trends in the surrounding area.

**8. Is there compliance with the adequate public facilities criteria?**

Water and sewer facilities capacity to serve the project have been confirmed by the Department of Public Works. The developer is responsible for the extension of those utilities to the subject property. NCDOT has given preliminary approval, with comments, for the planned improvements at the main entrance to the site, and other proposed access points. Completion of a Traffic Impact Study (including a commitment to install any recommended traffic improvements) will be required before Final Site Plan approval can be given. Therefore, subject to compliance with all requirements for adequate facilities, staff believes the development can be considered to be in compliance with the adequate public facilities criteria listed in the UDO.

**9. What are the zoning districts and existing land uses of the surrounding properties?**

Properties to the North are zoned AG (Agricultural) and contain rural residential land uses. Properties to the South are zoned RE (Rural Estate) and include rural residential land uses. Properties to the East are zoned C2 (General Commercial) and TND (Traditional Neighborhood Development) and host a mixed use development. Property to the West is Zoned RE (Rural Estate) and is occupied by a single family detached residential subdivision.

**10. Is the subject property suitable for the uses to which it has been restricted under the existing zoning classification?**

The current zoning, C-2-CZ/O-I-CZ/RL-CZ currently allows for a mix of general commercial, office and residential uses and is tied to a specific site plan, which has expired. The expired plan includes a specific configuration of retail and office which is not flexible enough to accommodate a wider range of uses and changing market conditions. The proposed rezoning request includes C-2-CZ (General Commercial) zoning across from C2 and TND (east of Kannapolis Parkway), along with RC-CZ zoning as a transitional district between the proposed commercial and the existing rural residential to the south. The RC-CZ zoning will include a mixture of single-family townhomes on 20' lots and single-family attached housing on 35' lots. The remainder of the property would include single-family detached housing and would include one-acre lots along the property's western border. The proposed configuration represents the applicant's response to current market conditions.

Based on the change in market conditions since approval of the initial rezoning of this property in 2008, along with the expiration of the site plan which accompanied this rezoning, staff believes that the subject property is not entirely suitable for the uses to which it has been restricted.

**11. Is the rezoning compatible with the adjacent neighborhood, especially residential neighborhood stability and character?**

The requested rezoning is similar to the 2008 approved rezoning, which included a condition restricting residential development along the western property boundary to one-acre lots and office uses as a buffer between the commercial portions and adjacent properties to the south. The current proposal keeps the one-acre lots to the west and reduces the amount of commercial permitted. The office has been substituted with attached single-family homes and townhomes. Significant buffers and open space have been included and far exceed the buffering and separation included as part of the plan which accompanied the 2008 rezoning approval. In consideration of these modifications,

staff believes that the requested rezoning (subject to compliance with all applicable UDO requirements) is compatible with the adjacent neighborhood, especially residential neighborhood stability and character.

**12. What length of time has the subject property remained vacant as zoned?**

The subject property has been remained vacant since it was rezoned in 2008.

**13. Is there an adequate supply of land available in the subject area and the surrounding community to accommodate the zoning and community needs?**

There is a considerable amount of vacant property along Kannapolis Parkway. However, most of this vacant property is zoned AG or RE. In addition, most of the vacant property does not include a high-capacity intersection similar to the Kannapolis Parkway/Rogers Lake Road intersection. There is also no similar existing development with the mix of uses proposed by the applicant available within the general area of the applicant's property. Therefore, there does not appear to be an adequate supply of appropriately zoned land available in the subject area and the surrounding community to accommodate the requested zoning and community needs.

**14. Was the existing zoning in error at the time of adoption?**

No.

**F. Legal Issues**

None

**G. Finding of Compliance with Adopted Plans and Reasonableness**

Staff finds that the subject property is located in the "South Kannapolis Growth Area" as designated in the City of Kannapolis 2015 Land Use Plan (LUP). The LUP designates this property as being located within the Heavy Commercial, Mixed Use and SFR1 Single-Family Residential Future (Recommended) Land Use categories. The proposed site plan contains a mix of uses, including general commercial, which could include office uses, two (2) types of single-family attached homes and single-family detached homes with a range of a lot sizes. Therefore staff believes that the proposed rezoning and site plan complies with the 2015 Land Use Plan and is therefore considered reasonable.

**H. Attachments**

1. Zoning/Vicinity Map
2. Aerial Map
3. 2015 Future Land Use Map
4. Rezoning Application
5. Site Plan
6. Cross-Sections/Building Elevations
7. Notice of Neighborhood Meeting
8. Resident Letter
9. List of Adjacent Property Owners
10. Legal Ad
11. Signs Posted on Property
12. Resolution to Adopt a Statement of Consistency
13. Resolution to Zone

## **I. Staff Recommendation and Alternative Courses of Action**

### **Staff Recommendation**

The Planning and Zoning Commission may choose to approve or deny the petition as presented.

**Based on the request being consistent with the goals and strategies of the City of Kannapolis, staff recommends approval of Conditional Zoning Z-2016-01 with the following conditions;**

1. Completion of a Traffic Impact Study and compliance with recommended items to be shown during Final Site Plan Review.
2. Compliance with NCDOT requirements during Final Site Plan Review.
3. Accommodate stub-out from northern access road to northern boundary in order to provide connectivity and to potentially serve as portion of Milestone Avenue extension. Location and feasibility to be determined by Planning Director.
4. Compliance with all applicable Sections of the Unified Development Ordinance as well as all comments issued by City of Kannapolis departments and other State or other relevant agencies during Final Site Plan review and other reviews as necessary for issuance of related permits.
5. Minor adjustments to the site plan may be made in response to Final Site Plan Review, Subdivision Review, and Construction Drawing Review, provided the number of lots is not increased. Such adjustments shall require the approval of the Planning Director.
6. Development of commercial portions shall require an amendment to the Submitted Site Plan, to be processed as a Conditional Zoning application in accordance with Section 3.4 of the UDO.

### **Alternative Courses of Action**

#### **APPROVAL**

#### **2 Motions required**

##### **Motion #1**

Should the Commission choose to **approve** Z-2016-01, a motion should be made to **adopt** the following Statement of Consistency:

**Statement of Consistency:** *The Planning and Zoning Commission finds this zoning map amendment, as represented in Case Z-2016-01, is consistent with the recommendations of the 2015 City of Kannapolis Land Use Plan which recommends Heavy Commercial, Mixed Use and SFR1 Single-Family Residential Future (Recommended) Land Uses for the subject property, is reasonable and in the public interest and is therefore approved based on consideration of the application materials, information presented at the public hearing, and recommendations provided by Staff.*

##### **Motion #2**

Should the Commission choose to **approve** Z-2016-01, a motion should be made to **adopt** the Resolution to Zone.

**DENIAL**

**2 Motions required**

**Motion #1**

Should the Commission choose to recommend **denial** of Z-2016-01, a motion should be made to adopt the following Statement of Inconsistency:

**Statement of Inconsistency:** *The Planning and Zoning Commission finds this zoning map and conditional use zoning as represented in Case Z-2016-01 is not consistent with the recommendations of the 2015 City of Knapolis Land Use Plan because (state reason) and is neither reasonable nor in the public interest because (state reason) and is, therefore, denied based on consideration of the application materials, information presented at the public hearing, and recommendations provided by Staff.*

**Motion #2**

Should the Commission choose to **deny** Z-2016-01, a motion should be made to **deny** the Resolution to Zone.

**J. Issue Reviewed By:**

City Manager  
City Attorney  
Public Works Director  
Planning Director



## **Planning Department**

### **Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting**

**March 2, 2016**

### **Staff Report**

**DATE:** February 22, 2016

**TO:** Planning and Zoning Commission Members

**FROM:** Zachary D. Gordon, AICP, Planning Director

**SUBJECT:** Public Hearing for Text Amendments to Article 12, Sign Standards, Table 12.1-1, Table 12.1-2 and Table 12.1-3 of the Unified Development Ordinance, regarding signage standards for Institutional and Civic uses.

#### **A. Actions Requested by Planning and Zoning Commission Members**

1. Hold Public Hearing
2. Consider Resolution to Adopt (not adopt) a Statement of Consistency for TA-2016-01
3. Consider motion to recommend approval (denial) of proposed text amendment by City Council.

#### **B. Required Votes to Pass Requested Action**

Per Sections 3.8.3.2 and 3.8.3.3 of the UDO, a majority vote of the Planning and Zoning Commission is required to recommend approval of a text amendment. A recommendation to approve is then forwarded to City Council who shall then approve or deny the text amendment by a majority vote.

#### **C. Background**

Article 3.8 of the UDO addresses the procedures for processing amendments to the text of the ordinance. Per Section 3.8.2, "*Any person, board, department, or commission may apply for a change in zoning ordinance text*". The proposed text amendment was initiated by the Planning Department.

The proposed text amendments would add signage standards for *Institutional and Civic Uses* in the C-2, O-1, C-1, CD, I-1, I-2, B-1, CC, TND and PUD Zoning Districts.

Currently standards for these uses are only found in Table 12.1-4, which addresses signage in Residential Districts (AG, RE, RL, RM-1, RM-2, RV, RC, PUD and TND). Planning staff believes that it is important that the UDO includes standards for *Institutional and Civic Uses* in “Non-Residential” as well as “Residential” zoning districts. These standards will not only provide guidance for these specific uses, but also serve to insure that the requirements for such uses are addressed throughout the City, not just in residential zoning districts.

**D. Fiscal Considerations**

None.

**E. Policy Issues**

The proposed text amendments to the UDO for Article 12 are highlighted in grey below:

**Table 12.1-1 Standards for Permanent Signs in C-2 Zoning Districts**

Sign Type	Number Allowed	Max. Sign Area	Max. Height	Sign Location
<b>Ground Signs*</b>				
Individual Business	1 per frontage per section 12.5.4.1	64 sf - Pole Sign 64 sf - Monument Sign 9 sf - Arm Sign	15 ft. - Pole Sign 15 ft. Monument Sign 6 ft. Arm Sign	Outside of street right-of-way and site triangle
Combined Development	1 per frontage per section 12.5.4.1	64 sf plus 10 sf per additional tenant up to a maximum of 100 sf 9 sf - Arm Sign	20 ft. - Pole Sign 20 ft. - Monument Sign 6 ft. Arm Sign	Outside of street right-of-way and site triangle
Commercial Subdivision Entrance Sign	1 per entrance road 1 per frontage	64 square feet plus 32 square feet	20 ft. 6 ft.	Outside of street right-of-way and site triangle
Institutional and Civic Uses	1 per frontage per section 12.5.4.1	64 sf - Pole Sign 64 sf - Monument Sign 9 sf - Arm Sign	15 ft. - Pole Sign 15 ft. Monument Sign 6 ft. Arm Sign	Outside of street right-of-way and site triangle
Wall Signs				
Individual Business and Combined Developments	1 per frontage per sections 12.5.2.2	1.0 sf per lineal ft. of the building wall sign is attached to, up to 120 square feet maximum sign area	not to extend above the vertical wall	n/a
Canopy/ Awning Signs	May be substituted for allowed wall signs	12 sf	n/a	n/a
Projecting/ Suspended Signs	May be substituted for allowed wall sign	Projecting sign - 6 sf or Suspended sign - 4 sf	n/a	No portion of a projecting or suspended sign shall extend more than 5 ft. from building wall

\* Ground signs may include Pole, Monument, or Arm style signs

**Proposed Text**

**CITY OF KANNAPOLIS UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE**

**Article 12**

**Table 12.1-2 Standards for Permanent Signage in O-I, C-1, CD, I-1 and I-2 Zoning Districts**

<b>Sign Type</b>	<b>Allowed</b>	<b>Area</b>	<b>Height</b>	<b>Location</b>
<b>Ground Signs*</b> Individual Business	1 per frontage per section 12.5.4.1	For principal structures with 25,000 GFA or greater building area - 64 sf - Monument Sign 9 sf - Arm Sign For principal structures with less than 25,000 GFA 32 sf - Monument Sign 9 sf - Arm Sign	6 ft. - Monument Sign for principal bldgs of 25,000 GFA or more 4 ft. - Monument Sign for principal bldgs less than 25,000 GFA 6 ft. - Arm Sign	Outside of street right-of-way and site triangle
Combined Development	1 per frontage per section 12.5.4.1	32 sf plus 8 sf per additional tenant up to a maximum of 64 sf 9 sf - Arm Sign	6 ft. - Monument Sign 6 ft. - Arm Sign	Outside of street right-of-way and site triangle
Subdivision Entrance Sign	1 per entrance road	32 sf - Monument Sign 9 sf - Arm Sign	6 ft. - Monument Sign 6 ft. - Arm Sign	Outside of street right-of-way and site triangle
<b>Institutional and Civic Uses</b>	1 per frontage per section 12.5.4.1	64 sf - Monument Sign 9 ft. - Arm Sign	8 ft. - Pole Sign 6 ft. Arm Sign	Outside of street right-of-way and site triangle
<b>Wall Signs</b> Individual Business and Combined Developments	1 per frontage per sections 12.5.2.2	1.0 sf per lineal ft. of bldg. wall attached to, up to 64 sq.ft. in O-I, 120 sq. ft. in C-1, CD, I-1, and I-2 districts	not to extend above the vertical wall	n/a
<b>Canopy/ Awning Signs</b> Individual and/or Combined Developments	May be substituted for allowed wall signs	12 sf	n/a	n/a
<b>Projecting/ Suspended Signs</b> Individual and/or Combined Developments	Maybe substituted for allowed wall sign	Projecting sign - 6 sf or Suspended sign - 4 sf	n/a	No portion of a projecting or suspended sign shall extend more than 5 ft. from building wall

\* Ground signs may be Monument or Armstyle only. Pole signs are prohibited.

**Proposed Text**

**CITY OF KANNAPOLIS UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE**

**Article 12**

**Table 12.1-3 Standards for Permanent Signage in B-1, CC, TND, and PUD Zoning Districts**

Sign Type	Number Allowed	Max. Sign Area	Max. Height	Sign Location
<u>Ground Signs*</u> Individual Business	1 per frontage per section 12.5.4.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For principle structures with 10,000 GFA or greater building area 32 sf - Monument Sign 9 sf - Arm Sign</li> </ul>	4 ft. - Monument Sign 6 ft. - Arm Sign	Outside of street right-of-way and site triangle
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For principle structures with less than 10,000 GFA 16 sf - Monument Sign 9 sf - Arm Sign</li> </ul>		
Combined Development	1 per frontage per section 12.5.4.1	Monument - 16 sf plus 8 sf per additional tenant up to a maximum of 32 sf 9 sf - Arm Sign	4 ft. - Monument Sign 6 ft. - Arm Sign	Outside of street right-of-way and site triangle
Subdivision Entrance Sign	2 per entrance road along major thoroughfares	16 sf - Monument Sign 32 sf - Monument Sign on major thoroughfares 9 sf - Arm Sign	6 ft. - Monument Sign 8 ft. - Monument Sign on major thoroughfares 6 ft. - Arm Sign	Outside of street right-of-way and site triangle
<u>Institutional and Civic Uses</u>	1 per frontage per section 12.5.4.1	64 sf - Monument Sign 9 ft. - Arm Sign	8 ft. - Pole Sign 6 ft. - Arm Sign	Outside of street right-of-way and site triangle
<u>Wall Signs</u> Individual Business and Combined Developments	1 per frontage per section 12.5.2.2	1.0 sf per lineal ft. of bldg. wall attached to, up to 32 sq. ft. in CC**, 64 sq. ft. in B-1, TND, and PUD districts	not to extend above the vertical wall	n/a
<u>Canopy/ Awning Signs</u> Individual Business and Combined Developments	May be substituted for allowed wall signs	12 sf	n/a	n/a
<u>Projecting/ Suspended Signs</u> Individual Business and Combined Developments	1 per frontage per section 12.5.2.2	Projecting sign - 6 sf or Suspended sign - 4 sf	n/a	No portion of a projecting or suspended sign shall extend more than 5 ft. from building wall

\* Ground signs may be Monument or Arm style only. Pole signs are prohibited.

\*\* For businesses located in the CC District with frontage on a major thoroughfare, except properties located along Main Street between 1st Street and Dale Earnhardt Boulevard, and Institutional & Civic Uses, total signage may be increased up to 120 sf. (Text amended 2/23/2015-TA 2015-02)

**Proposed Text**

**F. Legal Issues**

None

**G. Alternative Courses of Action and Staff Recommendation**

The Planning and Zoning Commission may choose to recommend approval or denial of the text amendment as presented. The Commission may also add, delete, or change any of the language as proposed.

Based on the foregoing analysis, staff recommends approval of the proposed text amendment to Article 12, Table 12.1-1, Table 12.1-2 and Table 12.1-3 of the UDO as presented.

**The following actions are required to recommend approval of TA 2016-01**

1. Consider Resolution to Adopt a Statement of Consistency for TA 2016-01
2. Consider motion to recommend approval of proposed text amendment by City Council.

**The following actions are required to recommend denial of TA 2016-01**

1. Consider Resolution to not Adopt a Statement of Consistency for TA 2016-01
2. Consider motion to recommend denial of proposed text amendment by City Council.

**H. Attachments**

1. Application for Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment
2. Newspaper Advertisement Notification
3. Resolution to Adopt a Statement of Consistency

**I. Issue Reviewed By:**

City Manager  
City Attorney  
Planning Director